



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

█
Docket No: 1732-22

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 17 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). Additionally, the Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health provider, one of which was previously provided to you. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you did not do so.

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 originally enlisted in the Navy and commenced active duty on 9 August 1993. Your pre-enlistment physical examination, on 6 October 1992, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions or symptoms.

Between 3 November 1994 and 1 January 1995, you commenced four separate periods of unauthorized absence (UA) lasting that lasted either one or two days. On 4 May 1995, you were convicted at a Special Court-Martial (SPCM) of two separate UA specifications, five separate larceny specifications, four separate forgery specifications, and the wrongful possession of another service member's identification card. You were sentenced to a reduction in rank to the lowest enlisted paygrade (E-1), confinement for 120 days, forfeitures of pay, and a discharge from the Navy with a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). On 22 August 1995, the Convening Authority approved the SPCM sentence, but suspended the confinement in excess of forty-five days. On 13 March 1996, the Navy-Marine Corps Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the SPCM findings and sentence. Upon the completion of appellate review in your case, on 22 May 1996, you were discharged from the Navy with a BCD and assigned a RE-4 reentry code.

On 11 January 1999, the Naval Discharge Review Board determined your discharge was proper as issued and that no change was warranted. On 8 July 2020, this Board denied your initial petition for relief. You had contended, in part, in both applications that you made full restitution for the crimes you committed.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to: (a) you paid your debts on active duty and provided full restitution for your offenses, and (b) you developed PTSD that originated from your time in service. 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 review process, the BCNR Physician Advisor who is a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.), reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 4 May 2022. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. 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 to support his claims. His personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish a clinical diagnosis or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The Ph.D. concluded, “[b]ased on the available evidence, it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition.”

In accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos, the Board gave liberal and special consideration to your record of service, and your contentions about any traumatic or stressful events you experienced and their possible adverse impact on your service. However, the Board concluded that there was no nexus between any purported mental health conditions and/or related symptoms and your misconduct, and determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the argument that any such mental health conditions mitigated the misconduct that formed the basis of your discharge. As a result, the Board concluded that your misconduct was not due to mental health-related conditions or symptoms whatsoever. Moreover, even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed any and all mitigation offered by such mental health conditions. The Board determined the record clearly reflected that your misconduct was willful and intentional, and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. Additionally, the Board concluded that the specific misconduct you committed was not the type of misconduct that would be excused by mental health conditions even with liberal consideration. The Board also concluded that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions.

The Board noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy/Marine Corps regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years. Additionally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating certain VA benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. Accordingly, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and even under the liberal consideration standard, the Board concluded that your serious misconduct and disregard for good order and discipline clearly merited your receipt of a BCD.

The Board also noted that, although it cannot set aside a conviction, it might grant clemency in the form of changing a characterization of discharge, even one awarded by a court-martial. However, the Board concluded that despite your contentions, this is not a case warranting any clemency. You were properly convicted at a SPCM of serious misconduct, and the Board did not find any evidence of an error or injustice in this application that warrants upgrading your BCD. Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board still concluded that given the totality of the circumstances 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,

6/30/2022

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █