| | | AIR FORCE DISCHARGE F | REVIEW BOARI |) HE | ARING R | ECORI |) | | | |
|---------|-------------------|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|
| NAME | OF SERVICE N | MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL) | | GRADE | | | | AFSN/SSAN | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| TYPE (| GEN | PERSONAL APPEARANCE | *** | X | REC | ORD R | EVIEW | | | |
| | | OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION | | | | | N OF COUNSEL | | | |
| YES | No | | | | | | | | | |
| | X | | | | | | (A.). KA | | PMINI-FERROR TORON VINCON | |
| | | | VOTE OF THE BOARD | | | | | | | |
| | MEMBER SITTING | | | HON GEN | | | UOTHC | OTHER | DENY | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| ISSUES | A93.01 | INDEX NUMBER A93.01 | 7/1 | EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD | | | | | | |
| | A67.03 | | 1 | | | ER APPOINTING THE BOARD | | | | |
| | A00.29 | | <u> </u> | 2 APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE 3 LETTER OF NOTIFICATION | | | | | | |
| | | | $\frac{3}{4}$ | | | | | | | |
| | | | | COUNSEL'S RELEASE TO THE BOARD | | | | | | |
| | | | | ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS SUBMITTED AT TIME OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE TAPE RECORDING OF PERSONAL APPEARANCE HEARING | | | | | | |
| | | | <u> · </u> | | | | | | | |
| HEARING | DATE | CASE NUMBER | | | | | | | | |
| 24 Jui | n 2010 | FD-2009-00115 | | | | | | | | |
| APPLIC | ANT'S ISSUE AND T | HE HOARD'S DECISIONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTA | | | | ECISIONAL | RATIONALE. | ka ja katin (T | | |
| Case h | neard in Was | shington, D.C. | Sapit 99 S | <u>(1865-265)</u> | <u> </u> | | | 366 (1273 22.1. 21. | Laterna village 11 to 1 | |
| | | , | | | | | | | | |
| | | of the decision of the Board, the right to a p | personal appeara | nce w | ith/witho | ut cour | isel, and the | e right to su | ıbınit an | |
| applica | ation to the | AFBCMR. | | | | | | | | |
| Names | s and votes v | will be made available to the applicant at the | ne applicant's red | quest. | | | | | | |
| | | • | • • | • | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | V V | | | | |
| | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | INC. INC. INC. | | | | D | ATE: 6/25/20 | 10 | | |
| TO: | SAF/MRBR | | FROM: | | | | PERSONNEL COL | INCIL | | |
| | 550 C STRE | ET WEST, SUITE 40 I AFB, TX 78150-4742 | | 1535 CC | RCE DISCHAR DMMAND DR, I EWS AFB, MD 2 | EE WING, 31 | | | | |
| | MADULT | I.A. O, IA 10100-7174 | | | | | | | | |

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2009-00115

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 denies the upgrade of the discharge.

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 reason and authority for discharge inequitable.

ISSUES:

Issue 1. Applicant contends her youth and uncertainty contributed greatly to her misconduct. The record indicates the applicant received a General discharge for misconduct, namely a civilian conviction. She also had other indicators of misconduct to include a Letter of Counseling, and two Letters of Reprimand. The Board concludes that the misconduct was a significant departure from the conduct expected of all military members. The Board relies on the presumption of regularity and finds the characterization and reason for discharge were appropriate.

Issue 2. Applicant notes the good things she did while in the service. The DRB took note of the applicant's duty performance as documented by her performance reports 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 recognized the fact that the applicant had served 4 years total service before the discharge was initiated, but concluded the applicant's misconduct outweighed the positive aspects of her time in the Air Force. Applicant contends that she should not be penalized indefinitely for a mistake she made when young. The DRB recognized the applicant was 22 years of age when the discharge took place. However, there is no evidence she was immature or did not know right from wrong. The Board opined the applicant was older than the vast majority of first-term members who properly adhere to the Air Force's standards of conduct. The DRB concluded that the characterization of the applicant's discharge was appropriate due to the misconduct.

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.

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