		AIR FORCE DISCHARGE R	REVIEW BOA	RD :	HEARIN	G RECORI)			
NAME OF SERVI		GRADE				AFSN/SSAN				
TYPE GEN X PERSONAL APPEARANCE				RECORD REVIEW						
COUNSEL NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION YES No T				ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL						
MEMBER SITTING				HON GEN UOTHC OTHER DENY					DENY	
COL ANDREW H WEAVER										х
COL BETH A. MANN										X
COL RICHARD STAHLMAN										Х
CMSGT DESRIANN STEVENS							_			Х
LT COL ALLISON WEBER										X
ISSUES A92.21 INDEX NUMBER A67.90			EXHIBITS SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD							
		A01.70		1	ORDER AP	POINTING TH	E BOAR	D		
				2 APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE						
				I—+		NOTIFICATION			-	
				-		PERSONNEL F S RELEASE TO		OARD	<u></u>	·
					ADDITION	AL EXHIBITS APPEARANC	SUBMIT		T TIME OF	
					TAPE RECO	ORDING OF PE	ERSONA	L APPI	EARANCE HE	ARING
HEARING DATE		CASE NUMBER								
25 Oct 2012		FD-2010-00343								
APPLICANT SISSUE	AND THE BOARD'S DE	CISIONAL RATIONADE ARE DISCUSSED ON THE ATTA	ACHED AIR FORCE DIS	CHAR	GEREVIEW BC	ARD DECISIONAL	RATIONAL	LE.		
Case heard in	Washington,	D.C.					den i		10.00 Page	
application to	the AFBCMF	sion of the Board, the right to a p				vithout cou	nsel, aı	nd the	right to su	bmit an
			L crow i mitro- e d	. nr =						
SIGNATURE OF RECORDER SIGNATURE					KKSIDENT	- 4				
			:							
		INDORSEMENT					ATE:	11/8/20	12	
	IRBR STREET WEST, S OOLPH AFB, TX 78		FROM:	1	AIR FORCE DI 1535 COMMAN	OF THE AIR FORCE SCHARGE REVIEV ID DR, EE WING, 3 3, MD 20762-7001	W BOARD		INCIL	

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2010-00343

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable and 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, via video teleconference between Andrews AFB Maryland and Randolph AFB Texas on 25 Oct 2012.

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

FINDING: The requests to upgrade the discharge, to change of reason and authority for discharge, and to change of reenlistment code are denied.

ISSUE: Applicant submitted no issues regarding the inequity or impropriety of her discharge. The applicant does submit that she believes she deserves a second chance despite her discrepancies so that she may serve her country in the United States military. The record indicates the applicant received seven Letters of Reprimand and two Records of Individual Counseling and was convicted by a summary court-martial officer with an adjudged sentence of confinement. Her misconduct included failure to go (3x), failure to perform duties (2x), insubordinate to supervisor (2x), failure to obey an order (2x), and failure to maintain her dorm room within standards. The Board opined that through these administrative and military justice actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change her behavior. They found the seriousness of the willful misconduct offset any positive aspects of the applicant's duty performance. The Board reviewed the entire record and found no evidence of impropriety or inequity to warrant an upgrade of the discharge.

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

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

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2010-00343

GENERAL: The applicant appeals for upgrade of discharge to honorable and 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, via video teleconference between Andrews AFB Maryland and Randolph AFB Texas on 25 Oct 2012.

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

FINDING: The requests to upgrade the discharge, to change of reason and authority for discharge, and to change of reenlistment code are denied.

ISSUE: Applicant submitted no issues regarding the inequity or impropriety of her discharge. The applicant does submit that she believes she deserves a second chance despite her discrepancies so that she may serve his country in the United States military. The record indicates the applicant received seven Letters of Reprimand and two Records of Individual Counseling and was convicted by a summary court-martial officer with an adjudged sentence of confinement. Her misconduct included failure to go (3x), failure to perform duties (2x), insubordinate to supervisor (2x), failure to obey an order (2x), and failure to maintain her dorm room within standards. The Board opined that through these administrative and military justice actions, the applicant had ample opportunities to change her behavior. They found the seriousness of the willful misconduct offset any positive aspects of the applicant's duty performance. The Board reviewed the entire record and found no evidence of impropriety or inequity to warrant an upgrade of the discharge.

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

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