



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

█  
Docket No: 3096-22

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 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 2 November 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)/mental health condition (MHC) (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 30 August 2022. Although you were provided an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to 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 entered active duty with the Navy on 20 September 1993. On 20 November 1994, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence from appointed place of duty and disobeying a lawful order. During the period from 19 April 1995 to 29 June 1995, you received three NJPs for three specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) and two specifications of failure to obey a lawful order. Subsequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. You elected to consult with legal counsel and subsequently requested an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB found that you committed misconduct due to commission of a serious offense and recommended you receive a General (Under Honorable Conditions) (GEN) characterization of service. The separation authority (SA) concurred with the ADB and directed a GEN discharge by reason of commission of a serious offense. On 9 January 1996, 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 Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to your desire to upgrade your discharge and contentions that you incurred a PTSD and other mental health conditions while on active duty and enlisted under false impressions from your recruiter, which contributed to “a life of depression, suicidal thoughts (that still linger), of failure and of much negativity.” For purposes of clemency and equity 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 30 August 2022. The mental health professional stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Although he reported mental health symptoms at discharge, they were evaluated and deemed to be not sufficiently impairing as to interfere with military service. He has provided no medical evidence of a mental health condition. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct, given his successful service for more than a year before his first incident. 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 AO concluded, “it is my considered clinical opinion 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 his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition.”

Based upon this review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your four NJPs, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative effect it had on the good order and discipline of the command. Further, the Board concurred with AO that there is insufficient evidence of PTSD or a mental health condition that may be attributed to your

military service or misconduct. Finally, the Board noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support your contentions. As a result, the Board concluded significant negative aspects of your service outweigh the positive aspects and continues to warrant a GEN characterization. Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants upgrading your characterization of service or granting an upgraded characterization of service as a matter of clemency or equity. 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 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,

11/9/2022

█

Signed by: █