								. His		
		AIR FORCE DISCHARGE	REVIEW BOAI	RD	HEARING	G RECORI)		_	
NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)					GRADE			AFSN/SSAN		
TYPE GEN	X PERS	SONAL APPEARANCE			R	ECORD R	EVIEW			
COUNSEL NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION YES No AMERICAN LEGION				ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL ATTN: QUEEN BAKER 1608 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20006						
				VOTE OF THE BOARD						
	N	IEMBER SITTING			HON	GEN	UOTHC	OTHER	DENY	
									X+*	
		4							X+*	
									X+*	
									X+*	
									X+*	
ISSUES A94.	194.05	INDEX NUMBER A67.90		EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD						
		110,770		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					A D INC	
HEARING DATE		CASE NUMBER			TATERICO	KDING OF FI	ASONAL ATT	EAROTIVEE HE.	AIGINO	
18 May 2010	AND THE BOARD'S DEC	FD-2009-00186 ISIONAL RATIONALE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATT	FACHED AIR FORCE DISC	HAR	OF REVIEW BOA	(BD DECISIONAL	RATIONALE			
1.0				an gr				Phy T	215 B 16	
Case heard in	Washington, D	O.C.								
	cant of the decise the AFBCMR.	ion of the Board, the right to a	personal appea	ran	ce with/w	ithout cour	nsel, and the	e right to su	bmit an	
Names and vo	otes will be mad	de available to the applicant at t	he applicant's	req	uest.					
+ Narrative * RE Code	Reason									

TO:

SAF/MRBR

550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40
RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742

DATE: 5/18/2010 FROM:

NT NT

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PERSONNEL COUNCIL AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD 1535 COMMAND DR, EE WING, 3RD FLOOR ANDREWS AFB, MD 20762-7001

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2009-00186

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable, to change the reason and authority for the discharge, and to change the reenlistment code.

The applicant appeared and testified before the Discharge Review Board (DRB), with counsel, at Andrews AFB on 18 May 2010. The following witness also testified on the applicant's behalf: Ms. JT, applicant's mother.

The following additional exhibits were submitted at the hearing:

Exhibit 5: Applicant's Contentions

Exhibit 6: American Legion Statement

Exhibit 7: Character reference letters

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 change of reason and authority for discharge, and change of reenlistment code.

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.

ISSUE:

Issue 1. Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was too harsh in light of his performance over the years. The records indicated the applicant received two Article 15 and three Letters of Counseling (LOC). The applicant did not provide responses to the first Article 15 and the three LOCs. His misconduct included purchasing alcohol for a minor (Article 92), falsely signing an official document (Article 107), failure to go, not prepared for training day, and speeding on a military installation. Both Article 15s involved underage alcohol incidents. Applicant acknowledged his misconduct in response to the last Article 15, and acknowledged all of the misconduct in response to the discharge notification. The DRB opined that through these administrative actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change his negative behavior. The characterization of the discharge received by the applicant was found to be appropriate.

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