



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

█
Docket No: 1325-22
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█
Dear █:

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 limitations 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 15 June 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 18 April 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 enlisted in the Navy Reserve on 28 February 1987. According to the information in the record, you accrued 44 unexcused absences during the period from February 1989 to April 1993. On 21 March 1993, you were placed on six months' probation due to unsatisfactory participation in scheduled drills. On 24 March 1993, your commanding officer (CO) mailed you a certified

letter on his intent to nominate you for involuntary active duty. Subsequently, on 14 April 1993, your CO mailed you a certified letter of notification of separation due to unsatisfactory participation and you refused to accept the letter, which resulted in you waiving your rights. As a result, on 19 May 1993, your CO forwarded your separation recommendation to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge due to unsatisfactory participation, with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation and, on 16 June 1993, you were so discharged.

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 contentions that you incurred Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) during military service due to a racial incident, which might have mitigated your discharge character of service, and you need Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) benefits. For purposes of clemency consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments, or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 18 April 2022. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Unfortunately, he has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. His personal statement is insufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with his misconduct or a clinical diagnosis. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) are required to render an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "[b]ased on the available evidence, it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that could be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD."

Based upon this review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your unexcused absences from drills, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact you were provided an opportunity to correct your deficiencies during a probationary period. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD. Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating VA benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Sailor and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. After applying liberal consideration, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants upgrading your characterization of service or

granting clemency in the form of an upgraded characterization of service. 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,

6/27/2022

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █