

VETERANS COUNTY-CITY SERVICE OFFICE

COUNTY OF NUECES — CITY OF CORPUS CHRISTI

TELEPHONE 3-8407 -- 1811 SHORELINE BLVD.

P. O. BOX 764

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

Jan 7, 1955

Re: REYNA, ADOLFO de Jesus, Jr.

XC _____

C _____

S _____

Dr. Hector P. Garcia, M. D.
3024 Morgan St.
Corpus Christi, Tex.

Dear Dr. Garcia:

Attached is a 3-page letter from the Army addressed to Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson in connection with the above-captioned veteran's case. You contacted the Senator direct and we feel that you would be able to better explain the case to the mother from a medical standpoint being a doctor, than we could. On the basis of the letter and the fact that he is in receipt of 100% disability compensation from the V.A., I frankly do not believe that any further action should be instituted at this time.

Under the circumstances, we believe that the veteran should return the General Discharge which he has in his possession so that the authorities can replace same with an Honorable discharge under the regulations as set forth in the marked paragraph of the letter, which is considerably better than the General Discharge.

Please return the enclosure for our files after it has served its purpose, and thank you.

Sincerely,


John E. Huey
Veterans Service Officer

JEH:dbb
CC-mother



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF LEGISLATIVE LIAISON
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

In reply refer to:
201 Reyna, Jr., Adolfo de Jesus
US 54 116 379 (29 Oct 54)

28 December 1954

Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson
United States Senator
207 U. S. Courthouse
Austin, Texas

Dear Senator Johnson:

This is in further reply to your recent inquiry in regard to the discharge Mr. Adolfo de Jesus Reyna, Jr., received from the Army.

An examination of Mr. Reyna's records reveals:

That he was inducted on 3 April 1953 and that upon the completion of his training in August 1953, he was sent to the United States Army Europe (USAREUR) for duty.

On 27 October 1953, he was admitted to the hospital for observation due to his poor level of performance, inability to respond to instructions, apparent detachment from his environment and forgetfulness. Psychiatric examination did not reveal that he was suffering from psychoneurosis or psychosis and there was no evidence of delusion, hallucination or disturbance of the formal thinking processes. His main difficulty seemed to be centered around his inability to concentrate or remember. The medical officer further stated that from the history obtained it appeared that the soldier's difficulty dated from his childhood. It was felt that he was suffering from a rather severe personality disorder which prevented him from responding adequately to intellectual, emotional or physical demands, which hindered his adjustment to the Army. Findings: That the soldier was so far free from mental defect, disease or derangement as to be able to distinguish right from wrong and adhere to the right; that he was mentally capable of understanding the nature of any proceedings which might be instituted and to cooperate in his own defense; that he had no physical or mental disability which would warrant his separation for medical reasons, and that hospitalization was not indicated as it would be of no benefit in a personality disorder of that type. Diagnosis: Inadequate personality, manifested by minimum level of performance, inability to respond to instructions, and ineptness. Recommendations: On 27 November 1953, it was determined that the soldier should be returned to

28 December 1954

- 2 -

duty and action taken to effect his separation from the service under the provisions of Army Regulations 615-369.

It was decided that the soldier should be given another opportunity to perform duty and every effort was made to assist him in adjusting to Army life. However, after four months his commanding officer requested that he be brought before a Board of Officers convened under the provisions of Army Regulations 615-369 because he had been unable to perform his normal duties. The Board was convened on 6 April 1954. A company officer, the first sergeant and the platoon sergeant testified before the Board, confirming information contained in their written statements to the effect that the soldier required constant supervision, had been unable to adapt himself to military life, but that he had no objectionable personal habits. They further stated that it was their belief that the soldier's inability to concentrate and adapt was not a form of malingering and that a transfer would be of no value in rehabilitation. Private Reyna was present during all open sessions of the Board, was afforded full opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, to testify in person or submit a written statement. He elected to remain silent. The Board recommended that he be discharged under the provisions of Army Regulations 615-369, because of unsuitability. The action of the Board was approved by the convening authority. Private Reyna was returned to the United States and discharged, as recommended, on 19 May 1954. He received a General Discharge.

Feb 1954
mrd-6
may-7h

Mr. Reyna appealed for a review of his discharge and on 21 September 1954 the Army Discharge Review Board proceeded with the hearing. However, due to his hospitalization in a veterans' facility, the case was continued pending the receipt of clinical and medical records, statement of compensation, etc., from the Veterans Administration. On 5 October 1954, after a thorough review of the evidence, it was determined that the soldier should have received an Honorable Discharge under the provisions of Army Regulations 615-365 and Special Regulations 600-450-10, "Evaluation and Separation for Physical Disability which Existed Prior to Entry on Active Duty." The Adjutant General requested that Mr. Reyna return the General Discharge so that it could be replaced by an Honorable Discharge under the above-cited regulations.

Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson

28 December 1954

- 3 -

It appears now, however, from a letter addressed to you from the Veterans County-City Service Office, Corpus Christi, Texas, 28 October 1954, that the veteran has been advised not to release his General Discharge, due to the service officer's contention that the former soldier's condition is service-connected.

In view of your inquiry, Mr. Reyna's records have been thoroughly examined again and it has been determined that he is properly discharged under the provisions of Army Regulations 615-365 and Special Regulations 600-450-10 as determined by the Army Discharge Review Board on 5 October 1954.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity of looking into this case for you and trust that the information will be of assistance in replying to Mr. John E. Huey, Veterans Service Officer, Veterans County-City Service Office, Corpus Christi, Texas.

Sincerely,

Guy B. McConnell, Maj. Inf.
for

EDWARD N. HATHAWAY
Lt. Colonel, GS
Operations Division

Inclosure

cc - Washington Office