



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

█  
Docket No: 7639-21  
Ref: Signature Date

█  
█  
█  
█  
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Section 1552 of Title 10, United States Code. After careful and conscientious consideration of relevant portions of your naval record and your application, the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) found the evidence submitted insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Consequently, your application has been denied.

Although you did not file your application in a timely manner, the statute of limitation was waived in accordance with the 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (Kurta Memo). A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 6 April 2022. The names and votes of the panel members will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include the Kurta Memo, the 3 September 2014 guidance from the Secretary of Defense regarding discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (Hagel Memo), and the 25 July 2018 guidance from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations (Wilkie Memo). The Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional dated 15 February 2022, which was previously provided to you.

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 14 June 1967. During the period from 27 November 1968 to 17 December 1969, you received three non-judicial punishments for two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 16 days, missing ship's movement, destruction of government property, and possession of an altered ID card. On 6 January 1970, a summary court-martial (SCM) convicted you of two specifications of UA, wrongful appropriation of an ID

card, two specifications of breaking restriction, and wrongful possession of an ID Card. On 8 June 1970, a special court-martial (SPCM) convicted you of UA totaling 35 days. On 8 January 1971, you received NJP for being in a UA status for three days. On 22 June 1971, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial due to being in a UA status for 91 days and missing ship's movement. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted and your commanding officer was directed to issue an other than honorable (OTH) discharge for the good of the service. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction, as well as the potential penalties of such a punitive discharge. On 26 August 1971, you were so discharged.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The AO stated, in part, that based on the available evidence, there is insufficient evidence that you may have incurred an unfitting mental health condition during military service or that your misconduct could be attributed to an unfitting mental health condition. The Board substantially concurred with the AO and noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support you suffered from a mental health condition that required counseling.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge and contention that you developed a mental health condition (MHC) during your military service, which might have mitigated the misconduct that led to your OTH characterization of service. The Board also noted your contentions that you served two years in good standing, you did not receive counseling, and you would like to be buried in a veterans cemetery.

Based upon this review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined the seriousness of your misconduct, as evidenced by your four NJPs, SCM, SPCM, and subsequent 91 day UA and missing ship's movement, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board determined that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. In addition, the Board took into consideration the findings of the AO. As a result, when weighing the seriousness of your misconduct against your active duty service, the Board concluded that the preponderance of the evidence supports a finding that your conduct was a significant departure from that expected from a Sailor and continues to merit an OTH characterization of service. Lastly, the Board noted whether or not you are eligible for benefits to be buried in a Veteran cemetery is a matter under the cognizance of the DVA, and you should contact the nearest office of the DVA concerning your right to apply for benefits. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined your request does not merit relief.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new matters, which will require you to complete and submit a new DD Form 149. New matters are those not previously presented to or considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records.

Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

4/13/2022

█

Executive Director

█