

Sequence Number	PC Includes:	Result	ACOM / ASCC/ DRU	Office of Inquiry	Complaint Start Date	Approval Date
1	Sexual Assault	Not-Substantiated	USARPAC	2nd INF Div [82]	23-Aug-13	11-Sep-14

2 Sexual Assault

Ongoing

FORSCOM

US Army Reserve
Cmd (USARC)
[7HQ]

15-Oct-13 Ongoing

3 Sexual Assault	Not-Substantiated	MEDCOM	US Army Medical Department Center & School & Ft Sam Houston [HA]	31-Mar-14	18-Jun-15
------------------	-------------------	--------	---	-----------	-----------

4 Sexual Assault	No Further Investigation Warranted	TRADOC	INF Center & Ft Benning [TI]	14-Mar-14	27-Aug-14
------------------	--	--------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------

5 Sexual Assault	Admin Closure	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	20-Jun-14	29-Jul-15
------------------	---------------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	-----------

6 Sexual Assault	Dismissal	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	27-Aug-14	4-Jun-15
------------------	-----------	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------	----------

7 Sexual Assault	Admin Closure	USMA	US Military Academy [YZ]	15-Oct-14	15-Dec-14
------------------	---------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	-----------

8 Sexual Assault	Ongoing	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	7-May-14 Ongoing
------------------	---------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------

9 Sexual Assault	Ongoing	AMC	Army Contracting Cmd (ACC) [XK]	2-Mar-15 Ongoing
------------------	---------	-----	------------------------------------	------------------

10	Sexual Assault	Ongoing	FORSCOM	US Army Reserve Cmd (USARC) [7HQ]	216-March-15	Ongoing
11	Sexual Assault	Ongoing	NGB	Puerto Rico National Guard [NPR]	10-Jun-15	Ongoing
12	Sexual Assault	Admin Closure	FORSCOM	101st Abn Div & Ft Campbell [F7]	1-Apr-15	6-Jul-15

13	Sexual Assault	Ongoing	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	3-Jun-15	Ongoing
14	Sexual Assault	Ongoing	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	27-Apr-15	Ongoing
15	Sexual Assault	Admin Closure	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	29-May-15	19-Aug-15

16 Sexual Assault	Ongoing	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	DAIG Assistance Division (WIOB)	12-Jun-15	Ongoing
-------------------	---------	---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------	---------

17 Sexual Assault	Ongoing	FORSCOM	JRTC & Fort Polk	18-Aug-15	Ongoing
-------------------	---------	---------	------------------	-----------	---------

Synopsis

On 13 May 2013, Complainant filed a restricted SHARP report. On 1 July 2013, RMO 1 (Commander, HHC 1BSTB, 1ABCT, 2ID) restricted Complainant's Conditions on Liberty due to notification from Behavioral Health of the prescriptions a MHCP prescribed for her and also advising no weapons. On 9 August 2013, Complainant contacted the 2ID IG to request status of her liberty restriction dates. RMO 1 informed the 2ID IG that just the day before (8 August) he extended Complainant's liberty restrictions an additional 30 days (based on his risk assessment) and that he provided Complainant the info via memo dated 8 August 2013. He then provided the IG a copy of that memo. On 13 August 2013, Complainant changed her restricted SHARP report to unrestricted. [RMO 1 did not know about the SHARP report until after the SHARP report changed to unrestricted.] On 23 August 2013, Complainant alleged RMO 1 extended her liberty restrictions for an additional period of 30 days for being too secretive with Behavioral Health and the Chaplain as an act of reprisal for her communications to a Chaplain and Behavioral Health personnel. The Chaplain and the Behavior Health personnel were not in Complainant's chain of command and therefore did not qualify as recipients for protected communications (PCs). The IO changed the complaint to alleged reprisal due to PCs made to Division SHARP, 2ID IG and her Battalion CSM.

ALLEGATION: That RMO 1 extended Complainant's liberty restrictions for an additional period of 30 days as an act of reprisal for a protected communication, in violation of DODD 7050.06, Military Whistleblower Protection, was not substantiated.

DAIG agrees with the not substantiated finding but does not agree with the OOI that liberty restrictions qualify as an unfavorable personnel action, particularly as it applies to this complaint. Even so, evidence indicated that RMO 1 was not aware of any PC prior to 8 August 2013 when he extended Complainant's liberty restrictions in South Korea.

Complainant's first PC was to SHARP on 13 May 2013 when she reported a sexual assault and filed a restricted report. Complainant testified that she told no one in her chain of command or any of her friends about this PC to SHARP [ROI Exhibit E-1, p 2] and that no one in her command had knowledge of it until 13 August 2013 when she changed her report from restricted to unrestricted. Complainant also testified that RMO 1 extended her liberty restrictions (on 8 August 2013) before she contacted the IG (on 9 August 2013) and that he did not mention anything about SHARP or the IG in that counseling [ROI Exhibit E-1, p 4]. There is no evidence to show RMO 1 had any knowledge of this May 2013 PC.

RMO 1 testified Complainant never mentioned her restricted SHARP case to him, he didn't learn about it until after she went unrestricted on 13 August, the date he counseled Complainant to extend her liberty restrictions was 8 August 2013, and he provided a copy of his Memorandum dated 8 August 2013 for [then] complainant, stating the restriction extension [ROI Exhibits E-2, p 5; C-2]. Other eye witnesses provided testimonial evidence that RMO

Although the complainant alleged that three responsible management officials withheld her promotion by refusing to sign her weapon record firing scorecard, the 79th Sustainment Support Command ROI and case evidence revealed no record of individuals refusing to sign the scorecard or attempting to withhold promotion opportunities for the complainant. The evidence revealed that SSG RMO did in fact initial the complainant's DA 5790-R record firing scorecard and email it to both CW2 RMO and CPT RMO for their review and endorsement. Both CW2 RMO and CPT RMO testified that they did not recall receiving the scorecard via email due to the high volume of emails and work associated with their battalion operations officer transition. CPT RMO and CW2 RMO both testified that they would have endorsed the firing scorecard and had no reason to dismiss it or inhibit the complainant from completing her promotion board packet. While CPT RMO did have knowledge of complainant's sexual harassment complaint to SFC Davis on 15 August 2013 (PC 2), no evidence indicated any motive whatsoever for CPT RMO to reprimand against the complainant or deliberately stall her promotion packet. CW2 RMO had no knowledge of the complainant's protected communications. Additionally, the final five protected communications identified in the case (PC 3 – PC 7) occurred after the alleged refusal to sign the record firing scorecard and have no bearing on the whistleblower reprisal allegations. The preponderance of the evidence indicated that the chain of command's actions were not in reprisal for the complainant's protected communications.

The results of the sexual harassment and sexual assault investigations were pending at the time the 79th SSC completed the ROI, however, DAIG obtained the results of these investigations during our oversight review of the case. The sexual harassment investigating officer substantiated a MSG for sexually harassing two individuals in the 364th Expeditionary Sustainment Command (ESC), including the complainant. The approving authority, Brigadier a General, approved the findings and recommendations with the exception of one alleged sexual harassment incident (13 August 2013 elevator occurrence) due to insufficient evidence. The sexual harassment investigation was elevated to a sexual assault case on 17 March 2014 and investigated by the 44th Military Police Detachment (CID). The CID investigation concluded on 17 May 2014 and determined that insufficient evidence existed to believe the MSG committed the offense of Abusive Sexual Contact. The unit actions, including the initiation of the sexual harassment / assault investigations and the Soldier transfer to another Combat Support Battalion were appropriate based on the unit sexual harassment incidents. The investigation results do not change the whistleblower reprisal investigation determinations since the MSG had no role in the complainant's promotion board recommendation and there is no evidence of RMO motive to reprimand due to the SHARP investigations. Case was recently forwarded to DODIG for approval

ALLEGATION 1: That 1SG (RMO1) influenced the issuance of a Field Grade Article 15 to Complainant in reprisal for making protected communications (PCs) to the command's Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC) and Criminal Investigations Division (CID) investigators. Note: The original Army Medical Department Center and School (AMEDDC&S) IG's Report of Investigation (ROI) documented CPT (RMO 2) and LTC (RMO 3) as the only responsible management officials (RMOs) for this personnel action. However, an ROI Addendum by DAIG Whistleblower Investigations Oversight Branch (WIOB) noted CPT (RMO 1)'s role as the unit's senior enlisted advisor and his influence on the Article 15 process for Complainant. Therefore, the ROI Addendum considered 1SG (RMO1) as a RMO for this personnel action, analyzed his actions related to the Article 15 process, and reached a final conclusion for an allegation of reprisal. The following summarizes the ROI Addendum's basis for the final conclusion for this reprisal allegation against 1SG (RMO 1). The AMEDDC&S IG's ROI established that on or about October 11, 2013, CPT (RMO 2), with influence by 1SG Blackmon, recommended Complainant for a Field Grade Article 15 based on his extensive, well-documented history of disciplinary infractions and misconduct since arriving at the unit 6 months earlier. On October 30, 2013, after receiving CPT (RMO 2)'s recommendation, LTC (RMO 3) gave Complainant a Field Grade Article 15. During the proceedings, LTC (RMO 3) found Complainant guilty of 12 violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), reduced him from SPC to PVT, directed him to forfeit \$1516, restricted him to the barracks for 45 days, and ordered him to perform 45 days of extra duty. Immediately after the proceedings, Complainant indicated his intent to appeal LTC (RMO 3)'s punishment to COL (RMO 4), the Article 15's appeal authority. On November 18, 2013, Complainant filed complaints with the command's SARC and CID Office alleging that he was sexually assaulted in the unit barracks by an unknown perpetrator sometime in June 2013. On November 26, 2013, after hearing Complainant's matters of mitigation, COL (RMO 4) denied his Field Grade Article 15 appeal and upheld LTC (RMO 3)'s findings and punishment. In his complaint, Complainant alleged that 1SG (RMO1) influenced CPT (RMO 2)'s recommendation, and LTC (RMO 3)'s decision to issue him a Field Grade Article 15 in reprisal for making his PCs to the SARC and to CID investigators. However, after conducting an extensive review of evidence in the AMEDDC&S IG's ROI, DAIG WIOB's ROI Addendum concluded that 1SG (RMO1) influenced the issuance of a Field Grade Article 15 for Complainant based on his extensive and well-documented history of disciplinary infractions and misconduct since being assigned to the unit 6 months earlier. The ROI and ROI Addendum both noted that command officials, including 1SG Blackmon, CPT (RMO 2), and LTC (RMO 3) initiated and completed Complainant's Field Grade Article 15 process several weeks before he made his PCs. Despite this sequence of events, the ROI Addendum assessed CPT (RMO 1)'s influence over the Article 15 process as reasonable given the frequency and severity of Complainant's misconduct over a short period of time and the significant adverse impact it had on the unit's good order and discipline. The ROI Addendum also assessed CPT (RMO 1)'s action as consistent based on the numerous Article 15s (Company and Field Grade) issued to other Soldiers within the command for similar behavior around this same time. Finally, the ROI and ROI Addendum contained no evidence to establish a causal connection between Complainant's PCs about an alleged sexual assault by an unknown perpetrator several months earlier and 1SG (RMO 1)'s Field Grade Article 15-related actions.

ALLEGATION 2: That CPT (RMO 2) recommended a Field Grade Article 15 for Complainant in reprisal for making PCs to the command's SARC and CID investigators. In his complaint, Complainant alleged that CPT (RMO 2) recommended him for a Field Grade Article 15 in reprisal for making his PCs to the SARC and to CID investigators about an alleged sexual assault by an unknown perpetrator. However, the AMEDDC&S IG's ROI and DAIG WIOB's ROI Addendum concluded that CPT (RMO 2) recommended the issuance of a Field Grade Article 15 to Complainant based on the same extensive and well

Synopsis:

The DAIG-AC received an allegation against the Judge Advocate School and referred the case to DAIG-IN IAW paragraph 7-1i(4), AR 20-1. The DAIG-AC received a complaint through the Assist You Mailbox from Complainant, student at the Judge Advocate General (JAG) School, Charlottesville, Virginia, against the JAG school command in Charlottesville, Virginia. While assigned to Fort Benning as a newly assessed SJA officer for initial training prior to attending the BOLC at the TJAGLCS, the complainant did not report to training one morning and was found to be intoxicated. The command initiated an investigation that indicated the complainant had been engaged in an inappropriate sexual relationship with an enlisted Soldier in violation of AR 600-20 and had become too intoxicated to report to duty / training. When offered an opportunity to comment to the investigating officer, the complainant declined to do so. Subsequently, she indicated she was a victim of a sexual assault. The complainant originally filed an unrestricted report of sexual assault at Fort Benning, GA, during her first phase of JAG school. According to the complainant, she was sexually assaulted by one of her NCO instructors during Phase I while at Fort Benning. She stated that when she reported the assault to the command, she was punished for drinking and showing up late the next day; and an inspection did not begin until weeks later. The complainant also claimed she was called a whore and forced to check-in every two hours. During the second phase of JAG school, the complainant claimed the JAG school command arranged her counseling sessions during her class hours, forcing her to miss some classes; and continued the two-hour check-ins initially implemented by the command at Fort Benning. According to the complainant, her company commander (CPT Heidi Steele), discussed her personal matters, proffer, and medical information with students and faculty members. The complainant also claimed the JAG school command failed to respond appropriately to her complaints, as well as failed to follow-up on her report of a harassment involving another 1LT. The complainant was denied graduation and certification and was sent a referred Army Evaluation Report.

DAIG Assistance Division, AH&I Branch was the lead since there was no specific allegation of whistleblower reprisal (WBR) and a lack of documentary evidence to support such a claim however, there were issues to be looked into. The DAIG AH&I AO sent a certified letter to Complainant after several attempts to contact her went unanswered over several weeks. Her SVC has also had no contact with her either. The letter stipulated a deadline of 15 AUG 14 to respond (6 weeks). She finally responded on the last day/last hour of the deadline but failed to provide any dates for the interview, did not coordinate with her special victims counsel (SVC) nor did she fill out the WBR questionnaire. She was then given until 20 AUG 14 to provide the requested information and responded with "My svc is monte sponsor at the moment ... I believe I am on my own as an attorney ... Sorry" Sent from my iPhone.

WBR Investigations and Oversight Branch (WIOB) is closing this case as an assistance issue since we have had no further contact from Complainant. She has failed to coordinate an interview with the AH&I AO and has not returned the whistleblower reprisal (WBR) questionnaire sent 1 JUL 2014. Additionally, she has not specifically mentioned this case as a WBR in any of her emails or original complaint. WIOB will coordinate with the AH&I AO for a single final notification memo to be sent to the complainant. Emails attempting to contact the complaint (directly and through her SVC) are uploaded as well as the certified letter sent to her that was returned to DAIG by the post office as returned mail/undeliverable. This letter was sent to the address provided by the complainant. After a thorough review of the complaint and the extensive AR 15-6 investigations (2x) conducted at Fort Benning and Charlottesville, lack of any substantive evidence, interview and WBR questionnaire it would appear, that without any further evidence, a WBR allegation would be not substantiated or merit further investigation.

The complainant submitted a Compassionate Reassignment packet on 2 November 2012 that was signed by the acting BN CDR. HRC receives CR packet on 14 December 2012. The CR packet was denied on 28 December 2012 by HRC Special Actions. A SFC demanded the complainant's spouse's medical file that was corrected by an SJA on 13 February 2013. The complainant submitted another CR that was not supported by acting BN CDR RMO on 13 February 2013. Complainant stated that RMO stated that spouse needs to get a job who is permanently disabled on 19 March 2013. Complainant finds out that CR packet is denied again due to mistake of pain clinic checked on 3 May 2013. The complainant contacted the local IG on 24 June 2013 for assistance with RMO directing the BDE Surgeon to call his wife's Doctor. The complainant did not want to make a formal complaint at this time. Complainant's spouse has mini-stroke (TBI) from stress on 25 June 2013. Complainant told to undergo a mental health eval in one hour on 9 July 2013, but complainant did not make appointment. Complainant sent for a Command Directed Mental Health evaluation on 12 July 2013. The complainant was physically assaulted in bathroom by two unknown Soldiers on 18 October 2013. The complainant was sexually assaulted in Field at EFMB detail that he reported to the BDE SARC as an informal complaint on 15 November 2013. The complainant was ordered to conduct a CMD Directed Evaluation and recommended for a CHP 5-17 on 18 February 2014. The complainant gives statement to Vanderbilt detective on 2 March 2014 in reference to 17 October 2013 incident of fellow service member assaulting a dead naked body. Complainant informs a Chaplain about remembering attack on 18 October 2013. Complainant was notified of being chaptered in a counseling on 31 March 2014 by RMO. The Complainant submitted a rebuttal into CHP 5-17 packet on 16 April 2014. The complainant received a formal memorandum stating he is being administratively separated under Chapter 5-17 on 7 May 2014 by RMO. Complainant submits formal Sexual assault report to SARC on 19 May 2014. CID interviews complainant on 20 May 2014. The complainant contacted the The investigation found the actions taken, although related to the protected communication, were focused on the complainant's conduct independent of her report of a sexual assault. The complainant, who was on the Army substance abuse program after she was found drunk on duty (she attended a safety briefing by her brigade commander while intoxicated), attended a party hosted by one of her peers (another LT). The complainant was already intoxicated when she arrived at the party. During the evening, the complainant started two physical altercations. The other attendees paid for her to take a cab home and escorted her. Although the complainant invited the escort into her bedroom, the escort declined and departed in another automobile. The complainant called 911 twice but was uncooperative and combative with local law enforcement personnel who responded to her calls. Subsequently, the complaint stated she was sexually assaulted 17 times by her peers. Complaint was forwarded to CID for inquiry. Complainant was uncooperative with CID; however, in the course of their investigation, CID found that she had made false statements and attempted to destroy evidence of those statements. The complainant was initially recommended for a GOMOR based on collateral misconduct identified during the sexual assault investigation conducted by Criminal Investigations Division (CID) located at Fort Polk. Upon receiving the investigative report, the Brigade Commander determined 1LT Campbell engaged in conduct unbecoming of an officer, misused the 911 system, and made false official statements. The complainant was counseled and informed she was being recommended for a GOMOR. Approximately, thirty days later, 1LT Campbell was observed intentionally ramming her vehicle into two parked cars before fleeing the scene of an accident. The complainant was later apprehended, during in which she resisted Complainant, a Cadet alleged that members of her chain of command, took the following personnel actions against her, in reprisal for communicating to the Army CID, the West Point IG, members of her chain of command, the DODIG, Senators and Members of Congress: Referred honor allegations against her for allegedly cheating on a history report; Threatened her with Art 10 disciplinary actions; Placed her on an extended room inspection; Recommended her separation for the US Military Academy; Disapproved her pass plan, thus denying her pass request; Referred her for a mental health evaluation; Referred honor allegations against her for allegedly cheating on a calculus project; Denied her a meeting under a Commander's open door policy; Turned her back 1 year; Delayed her enrollment in the Honor Mentorship Program by 11 weeks; Disapprover her expedited victim transfer request to the USAir Force Academy; and Threatened her with UCMJ proceeding. Cadet Gross also alleged she was restricted from communicating with an IG.

DODIG Completed the investigation on 31 August 2015 and provided DAIG with ROI and closure notification letters to the Subject(s) and Complainant. The case was ultimately investigated by DODIG and not substantiated, this case is closed administratively in Assistance Division (WIOB).

Complainant made a series of protected communications; beginning with a report to her unit First Sergeant in November 2012 that she believed the Deputy Commander in the battalion was improperly using guard funds for unauthorized purposes. On February 12, 2013, she filed an unrestricted report of sexual assault. As a result of her sexual assault, she attended many medical, behavioral health, and administrative appointments, which caused her to miss many hours of duty at her unit. Less than 60 days after she filed a sexual assault report, she stated her chain of command forced her to sign a request to leave active duty, and did not provide mandated due process rights for Soldiers known to have filed an unrestricted report of sexual assault. Upon learning that the unit failed to provide these rights, the commanding general of the US Army Maneuver Center of Excellence addressed the issues via a January 14, 2014, memorandum to her National Guard chain of command. After a review, the senior RMO took action to prevent NGB from bringing Complainant back on active duty.

In the WBR Reprisal Questionnaire, the complainant believes his OER is a downgrade in performance. After reviewing the OERs (each in a different format), further investigation is needed to look into the Raters profile and allegations of only one captain being rated. After discussion with the Field IG, they did not validate whether the RMOs profile was correct or not. There might also be an opportunity to teach and train the complainant between the difference of DA Form 67-10-1, MAR 2014 and DA Form 67-9, OCT 2011 when referring to the raters block check. The complainant also alleges he asked to make corrections on the evaluation and was told by the RMO, "...it would not be very beneficial for me." The complainant perceives this as a threat based on the RMOs previous position as a branch manager.

The complainant alleges the counseling he received by the RMO for utilizing the BDE Commanders open door policy is UPA. The RMO did not restrict the complainant from going to the BDE Commander, therefore this is not an UPA. From the Field IGs notes: In accordance with AR 600-20, paragraph 2-2, Open door policies, "Commanders will establish an open door policy within their commands. Soldiers are responsible to ensure that the commander is made aware of problems that affect discipline, morale, and mission effectiveness; and an open door policy allows members of the command to present facts, concerns, and problems of a personal or professional nature or other issues that the Soldier has been unable to resolve. The timing, conduct, and specific procedures of the open door policy are determined by the commander. They are responsible for ensuring that Soldiers are aware of the command's open door policy." The RMO counseled him for not adhering to the Brigade Commander's specific guidance for his open door policy and not for the use of his open door policy. The complainant was advised that this was not a PC; however, he insisted we send it forward as a PC."

The complainant was counseled by 2LT (RMO 1) for failure to utilize the chain of command on 20 February 2015. The complainant was attached to 915th CSTX for AT on 21 February 2015 under CPT (RMO 2). The unit conducted a health and welfare inspection on 27 February 2015. The complainant visited the TMC several times during which became increasingly unprofessional and insubordinate. On 28 February 2015 LTC Wright, head nurse at the TMC suggested to CPT (RMO 2) that a behavioral health exam should be completed on the complainant based on the complainant's issues and shortness of breath/chest pains. The complainant refused to get into an ambulance that resulted in COL (RMO 3) speaking with the complainant on 28 February 2015. COL (RMO 3) signed the complainant's sick call slip on 1 March 2015 advising the complainant undergo a CDMHE. CPT (RMO 2) contacted the complainant's command on or about 1 March 2015 stating it would be best for the complainant to return to home station for treatment. The complainant returned to Altoona, PA on 3 March 2015 to finish out her AT. The complainant contacted the 316 ESC IG on 3 March 2015 from the CA airport for assistance with being sent home from AT early. COL (RMO 3) confirmed via email on 4 March 2015 that he signed the sick call slip on the complainant. RMO CPT Palazzi initiated the CDMHE on 6 March 2015 at the recommendation of COL (RMO 3). RMO CPT counseled the complainant on being CDMHE on 7 March 2015. The complainant submitted a 1559 to 316th ESC IG on 9 March 2015. The complainant submitted a complaint to DODIG on 16 March 2015 alleging reprisal due to the CDMHE. The complainant went to West Point Keller Army Hospital at West Point on 18 March 2015 for the CDMHE. USARC IG Ms. McGhee stated she received a 1559 from the complainant on or about 19 March 2015 that was discussed with 316th ESC IG to ensure nothing new was presented. The complainant received a permanent profile that required an MEB on 23 March 2015 signed by a care provider. LTC RMO appointed a CPT as an IO on 30 March 2015 to conduct a CDR's Inquiry into allegations raised by the complainant pertaining to the CDMHE. The complainant was counseled on 3 April 2015 by RMO CPT Palazzi on being afforded an opportunity for a second MHE. The complainant sent an email to RMO CPT on 5 April 2015 stating she didn't request a second MHE and was not given a copy of the first MHE. An MD approved and signed the permanent profile on 6 April 2015 that stated a MEB is required for the complainant. CPT IO completed the CDR's Inquiry on 9 April 2015 cleared RMO CPT of any wrong doing command directing the complainant for a MHE. The Army Reserve-Medical Management Center (AR-MMC) notified the complainant on 6 May 2015 of her medical disqualifying condition that affords the complainant a choice of PEB and LOD process with a suspense date of The complainant is a 68W in the PR NG and met with her PCM (Dr. RMO1) on 03 MAY 14 and alleges that RMO1 knew she was on numerous mood altering medications at the time of this PHA. Three days after her PHA, on 06 MAY 14, the complainant is seen by the VA and in those progress notes by VA Dr., it states she can perform with her military responsibilities in full. These progress notes have no bearing on what the military providers assess. The PULHES during a PHA will be updated "ONLY" to reflect "Permanent" Profiles, so if the Soldier has "Temporary" Profile it will not be added to the PULHES during a PHA assessment. On 29 JAN 15, the complainant reports being sexually assaulted to the PR State Victim Advocate coordinator. On 05 FEB 15, the complainant is identified by the Bn Training Officer that she is one of the 68Ws who will be going on the deployment mission to Idaho. On 18 FEB 15, RMO1 gives the complainant a temporary profile and the "S" in PULHES is labeled a "3". The complainant believes that Dr. (LTC) (RMO2) had influenced RMO1 to change her PULHES from a 1S to a 3S. According to DAIG-AC AO, the complainant could be confused between a Temporary and Permanent profile. After communicating with the PR Command IG, he stated that RMO2 is also a member of the Sexual Assault Board, which could be why she had knowledge of the complainants protected communication. On 19 FEB 15, the complainant alleges she was not allowed to attend training in Iowa and she also alleges she was removed as a 68W. Complainant (Retired) alleged she was reprisal against for filing a sexual assault report and told her 1SG that her Platoon Sergeant was calling Soldiers inappropriate name, as a result, received an unfavorable NCOER. Complainant filed her reprisal complaint with the Fort Campbell IG and it was forwarded to the Department of the Army IG for case resolution. After coordination with DODIG concerning the sexual assault report, DODIG requested the case be

Complainant claims that the UPA was in reprisal for her protected communications to members of her chain of command. The complainant initially gave a verbal discrimination complaint to SFC Ball (Artillery Mechanic Supervisor), and 1SG Miller on 23 APR 15 about several female Soldiers in the complainant's unit. Complainant claimed that she was discriminated against when she overheard several Soldiers state the following: "You know how black people lie.". On 26 APR 15, the complainant received a Developmental Counseling from 1SG Miller as a result of a sexual harassment complaint filed on the complainant on 25 APR 15. There was no mention of adverse actions within the counseling itself, and no administrative action as taken place as a result of the counseling. The majority of the Soldiers who signed sworn statements against the complainant for the sexual harassment claim, were also directly involved in the complainant's discrimination incident on 23 APR 15. Around the same time frame (after the initial PC), two 15-6 Investigations were initiated concerning allegations of sexual assault and sexual harassment by the complainant. The sexual assault stemmed from an incident that occurred in 2014 (Divulged from the sexual harassment complaint). Complainant was notified of investigations after her 23 APR 15 discrimination complaint. The investigations are still pending, and it is not clear who is responsible for the 15-6 Investigations.

The complainant provided CID her cell phone IOT support her sexual assault case. While doing so, CID conducted a forensic scrub and found self-incriminating text messages on her phone which showed she was having a sexual relationship with the same Soldier she reported assaulted her. CID also found incriminating text messages from the complainant showing she did not report allegations of Soldiers coming fourth to her as a SHARP advocate because the subject these Soldiers were accusing was her boyfriend. The complainant did not receive an Unfavorable Personal Action (UPA), however the information indicates it was a result of her dereliction of duty as a BN SHARP and Obstruction of Justice. This case meets the elements of reprisal though collateral misconduct exists after the complainant incriminated herself during her Protected Communication (PC) with the Military Police and Criminal Investigation Division.

The complainant was denied a regular pass on 8 January 2015 by RMO. The complainant requested to speak with COL on open door policy through RMO on 9 January 2015. The complainant requested to ask to speak with COL on 9 January 2015. The complainant spoke with COL on 11 January 2015 on open door policy about the work schedule, lunch hours and doctor appointments. COL told the complainant he wanted to meet again after 30 days. The complainant missed battle assembly on 7-8 February 2015 due to child being in the hospital. On 13 March 2015 the complainant asked RMO to do a complete the record evaluation for the upcoming promotion board. The complainant experienced a sexual assault incident on 21 March 2015. The complainant reported the incident on or about 1 April 2015. The complainant submitted a DA 31 for one day pass on 10 April 2015. The complainant was instructed on 16 April 2015 to resubmit the DA 31 as a one day leave form. The complainant spoke with COL on 17 April 2015 on open door policy to address the same issues. A different COL informed the complainant on 22 April 2015 she would report to TSG as a detailed SM. The complainant contacted COL by phone on 10 May 2015 for assistance with the complete the record evaluation. The complainant wrote her own evaluation on 15 May 2015 to be forward to the old chain of command for action. The complainant met with the local IG on 29 May 2015.

The complainant alleges a 15-6 Investigation initiated on her for an inappropriate relationship she had with her supervisor and not from her reporting being sexually assaulted. The investigation was initiated by an independent complaint from a third party (10 USC 1034 expressly prohibits consideration of the motive to make a protected communication in consideration of a protected communication). The field IG identified her not being able to transfer out of the unit quickly due to the flag for the ongoing investigation. This is a regulatory requirement and is appropriate for the situation. Information indicates the command investigation found against the complainant who is now pending further disciplinary action. This case was sent to DODIG for consideration, after review, they returned the case to DAIG as the information does not indicate a causal nexus to the sexual assault complaint.

Case remains under investigation.

The complainant reported that some members in her unit were involved in inappropriate relationships, and she was being ostracized by personnel in her unit. The complainant believed she was being ostracized based on another protected communication in which she reported a sexual assault to the chain of command.

As a result, the chain of command conducted an Informal AR 15-6 Investigation. LTC RMO ordered a subsequent investigation, in order to address accusations which were made towards the complainant. As a subject of this investigation, the complainant received a suspension of favorable personnel actions/flag.

In AUG 15, the complainant stated that her Platoon Sergeant (PSG) accused her of lying, and she was belittled in front of her Company by the 1SG. This was related to the complainant leaving the company area and spending half the day at a Recreational Area. As a result of her not being at work, the Company Commander flagged the complainant for adverse action. The commander also denied her leave request because of the flag. The commander was considering UCMJ punishment for the 10 August 2015 incident.