

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD HEARING RECORD

NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL) [REDACTED]		GRADE AMN	AFSN/SSAN [REDACTED]
TYPE GEN	PERSONAL APPEARANCE	X	RECORD REVIEW
COUNSEL NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION		ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL	
YES	No		
	X		

VOTE OF THE BOARD				
HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY
				X
				X
				X
				X
				X

ISSUES A93.23 A92.35 A94.05	INDEX NUMBER A67.90	EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD		
		1	ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD	
		2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE	
		3	LETTER OF NOTIFICATION	
		4	BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE	
			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD	
			ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE	
			TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING	
HEARING DATE 24 Jun 2010	CASE NUMBER FD-2009-00049			

APPLICANT'S ISSUE AND THE BOARD'S DECISIONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTACHED AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE.

Case heard in Washington, D.C.

Advise applicant of the decision of the Board, the right to a personal appearance with/without counsel, and the right to submit an application to the AFBCMR.

Names and votes will be made available to the applicant at the applicant's request.

INDORSEMENT	DATE: 7/6/2010
TO: SAF/MRBR 550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742	FROM: SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL COUNCIL AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD 1535 COMMAND DR, 2E WING, 3RD FLOOR ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7001

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

CASE NUMBER

FD-2009-00049

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable.

The applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB) but declined and requests that the review be completed based on the available service record.

The attached brief contains available pertinent data on the applicant and the factors leading to the discharge.

FINDINGS: The Board denies the upgrade of the discharge.

The Board finds that neither the evidence of record nor that provided by the applicant substantiates an inequity or impropriety that would justify a change of discharge.

ISSUES:

Issue 1. Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh and based on isolated incidents. The records indicated the applicant received an Article 15, a Letter of Reprimand, and three Letters of Counseling for misconduct. His misconduct consisted of failure to go (2x), failing to obey a lawful order, failing to obey and being disrespectful, being drunk and disorderly, and being disrespectful to an NCO. The Board took note that applicant had been diagnosed with clinical depression. After review of the record, the Board found no evidence to indicate that the applicant did not know right from wrong and therefore, his contention is without merit. The DRB opined that through these administrative actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change his negative behavior. The Board concluded that the negative aspects of the applicant's service outweighed the positive contributions he made in his Air Force career. The characterization of the discharge received by the applicant was found to be appropriate.

Issue 2. Applicant states that his discharge did not take into account the good things he did while in the service. The DRB took note of the applicant's duty performance as documented by his performance reports, letters of recommendation and other accomplishments. They found the seriousness of the willful misconduct offset any positive aspects of the applicant's duty performance. The Board concluded the discharge was appropriate for the reasons which were the basis for this case.

Issue 3. The DRB was pleased to see that the applicant was doing well and has a good job. However, no inequity or impropriety in his discharge was suggested or found in the course of the hearing. The Board concluded the misconduct of the applicant appropriately characterized xxhis term of service.

CONCLUSIONS: The Discharge Review Board concludes that the discharge was consistent with the procedural and substantive requirements of the discharge regulation and was within the discretion of the discharge authority and the applicant provided full administrative due process.

In view of the foregoing findings, the Board further concludes that there exists no legal or equitable basis for upgrade of discharge and determines the discharge should remain unchanged.

Attachment:

Examiner's Brief