



1983, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted one day, and 7 hours. On 14 July 1983, you began a second period of UA which lasted 7 days, and 5 hours. On 29 September 1983, you were convicted by summary court martial (SCM) for two instances of UA, and wrongful possession of a controlled substance. You were sentenced to reduction in rank, confinement, and forfeiture of pay. On 30 December 1983, you began a third period of UA which lasted two hours. On 4 January 1984, you began a fourth period of UA which lasted 14 days. On 19 January 1984, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for three periods of UA. On 1 February 1984, you were counseled for developing a pattern of misconduct and advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation. On 23 March 1984, you received a second NJP for being disrespectful in language towards a noncommissioned officer, wrongfully communicating a threat, and wrongful use of a controlled substance-cocaine. On 28 March 1984, you were notified of the intimation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse, at which point you elected to waive all your procedural rights. On the same date, your commanding officer recommended an other than honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service by reason misconduct due to drug abuse. On 9 April 1984, the discharge authority approved and ordered an OTH discharge characterization service by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 11 April 1984, you were discharged.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 23 February 2022. The AO determined that there were no psychiatric abnormalities during your separation physical. The AO indicates that there is no evidence that you received any mental health diagnosis during military service, however, there is behavioral evidence of a possible substance use disorder. The AO further states that post-service, civilian providers determined a diagnosis of PTSD is attributed to military service and, while it is possible that increased irritability and avoidance could be unrecognized PTSD symptoms, it is difficult to attribute your misconduct to PTSD, given the limited information regarding you purported traumatic event and symptoms from your medical records and personal statement. In addition, the AO determined that additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing your diagnosis, symptoms, onset, and their specific link to his misconduct) are required to render an alternate opinion. Based on the available evidence, the AO concluded that there is insufficient evidence that the you may have incurred PTSD or another unfitting mental health condition during military service or that your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another unfitting mental health condition.

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 contention that you had three years of stellar service, that the Marine Corps did not know how to deal with young Marines experiencing mental health issues, that you were suffering from nightmares as a result of the bombings of the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, and that some of the Marines who perished that date were related to you. Further, the Board noted you submitted copies of your mental health records from █ Mental Health Clinic, copies of your medical records from █ facility, and four character letters of support to be considered. However, based upon this review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your repeated misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs and SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your

misconduct and determined that it showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. As a result, the Board concluded that your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Marine and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that your request does not merit relief.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon the 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,

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █