	AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REV	VIEW BOARD HEARING	G RECORD					
NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (GRADE		AFSN/SS	SAN				
		A1C		6				
	RSONAL APPEARANCE	R	RECORD REVIEW					
YES No X		ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL						
			VOTE OF THE BOARD					
		HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY		
		X						
		Х			<u>-</u>			
		X						
		X						
		x						
A94.06	INDEX NUMBER A67.10		1 ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD					
		I 	3 LETTER OF NOTIFICATION 4 BRIEF OF PERSONNEL FILE					
			COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD					
		1 1	ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE					
		TAPE RECO	TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING					
HEARING DATE	CASE NUMBER							
13 May 2010	FD-2009-00070							
APPLICANT'S ISSUE AND THE BOARD'S I	DECISIONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTACH		RD DECISIONAL RATI	ONALE.	1508 1618(
Case heard in Washington	, D.C.							
Advise applicant of the deapplication to the AFBCM	cision of the Board, the right to a per	sonal appearance with/w	ithout counse	l, and the ri	ight to su	bmit an		
Names and votes will be m	nade available to the applicant at the	applicant's request.						

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2009-00070

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.

FINDING: The Board grants the requested relief.

The Board finds that neither the evidence of record nor that provided by applicant substantiates an impropriety that would justify a change of discharge. However, based upon the record and evidence provided by applicant, the Board finds the applicant's characterization for discharge inequitable.

ISSUE:

Although not explicitly stated, applicant contends his discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh. The records indicated the applicant received five Letters of Reprimand and two Letters of Counseling for misconduct. His misconduct consisted of failure to go, failure to complete required test, being late for work (three times) and failure to complete clinical documentation. While the DRB did not condone the applicant's misconduct, they did feel it would have been more equitable to give him an honorable discharge.

CONCLUSION: 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 was provided full administrative due process.

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 was provided full administrative due process.

However, in view of the foregoing findings, the Board concludes that the overall quality of applicant's service is more accurately reflected by an Honorable discharge. Therefore, the applicant's characterization for discharge should be changed to Honorable.

Attac	hment	t:
Exan	iner's	Brief