			AIR FOR	RCE DISCHARGE I	REVIEW BO	ARI	HEARIN	G RECOR	D			
NAME OF SERVICE MEMBER (LAST, FIRST MIDDLE INITIAL)							GRADE			AFSN/SSAN		
TYPE GEN	TYPE GEN X PERSONAL APPEARANCE				-	RECORD REVIEW						
NAME OF COUNSEL AND OR ORGANIZATION						ADDRESS AND OR ORGANIZATION OF COUNSEL						
YES No	-											
MEMBER SITTING						ř	HON	GEN GEN	LOF THE BO	ARD OTHER	DENY	
money respective for the second	en (f., physika, a) (to	Pyradinatia Just		No the Long Balletin Filips							X*+	
E.P.C.V. or a second se	de adequesas (CES Door was	destable control (186) save	Service Company of the Service of Company of Com	Application and the second sec							X*+	
(January Contract Con	Ajerbanda de alego una pardima lo	er beginning afterstation	mayo o commente de v	Commence of the commence of th							X*+	
e sycon person of evidence.	agi wa tao taojana a maggini ay		A. VICES TO CHARLES AND THE COLUMN ASSESSMENT OF THE COLUMN ASSESSMENT	The second secon			-				X*+	
V)- (minute) de (native des	na. o des la resta	ili delonge este este	Control of the Contro								X*+	
1	A92.35 INDEX NUMBER A67.10					1	CAUBIUS SUBMULTED TO THE BOARD ORDER APPOINTING THE BOARD					
A93.01					2	APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF DISCHARGE						
						3	LETTER OF	FNOTIFICATI	ON			
						4		PERSONNEL F				
						-			O THE BOARD SUBMITTED A			
							PERSONAL APPEARANCE					
							TAPE RECO	ORDING OF PI	ERSONAL APP	EARANCE HE	ARING	
HEARING DATE			CASE NUMBER									
24 Aug 2012			FD-2010-0									
2 7 2				E EREDISCUSSED ON THE ATT	ACHED AIR FORCE E	ISCHA	RGE REVIEW BO	ARD DEGISIONAL	RATIONALE	e de la companya de La companya de la co	en e	
Case heard	in Wa	ashington, D	D.C.									
Advise applapplication	icant to the	of the decise AFBCMR.	sion of the Bo	oard, the right to a p	personal appo	earai	nce with/v	vithout cou	nsel, and the	e right to su	ıbmit an	
Names and	votes	will be mad	de available	to the applicant at the	he applicant'	s rec	quest.					
*Narrative		son and A	uthority								:	
TO: SAI	·/MRBI	R		No. S. Co.	FROM:				E PERSONNEL CO	UNCIL		
550 C STREET WEST, SUITE 40 RANDOLPH AFB, TX 78150-4742							1535 COMMAN	SCHARGE REVIE D DR, EE WING, 3 B, MD 20762-7001				
AFHQ FORM 0-2077, JAN 00					(EF-V2)					Pro	evious	

AIR FORCE DISCHARGE REVIEW BOARD DECISIONAL RATIONALE

FD-2010-00293

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.

IAW AFI 36-3213, the applicant was offered a personal appearance before the Discharge Review Board (DRB), however failed to make a timely response to the Board's notification of a scheduled hearing. Therefore it has been deemed that the applicant has waived his right to a personal appearance and the DRB completed a review of the discharge based on the available service records.

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

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

ISSUE: Applicant received a General discharge for Misconduct – Minor Disciplinary Infractions

Applicant contends discharge was inequitable because it was based on an isolated incident in twenty-six months of service. Additionally, he states that immaturity contributed to his misconduct. The records indicated the applicant received two Article 15s, and one Record of Individual Counseling. His misconduct included failure to pay just debt, leaving base during restricted hours, with intent to deceive made a false statement to an OSI agent, assaulted a marine and assaulted an airman. The Board opined the applicant was the same age as the vast majority of first-term members who properly adhere to the Air Force's standards of conduct. 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.

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