



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

█
Docket No: 3733-22
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 your application was not filed 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 3 October 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, 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). As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an Advisory Opinion (AO) on 9 August 2022. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to 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 enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 18 July 1975. You subsequently reenlisted three times, the last on 15 March 1986. Your Fitness Report (FITREP)

for the period of 1 January 1989 to 8 June 1989, documents that you were relieved of your duties for positive cocaine use. A second FITREP for the period of 9 June 1989 to 22 September 1989, documents you were administratively reduced to LCPL/E-4 and awarded an OTH discharge for your admitted use of cocaine.

Unfortunately, the documents related to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). In this regard, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Marine Corps on 22 September 1989 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is “Discharged For The Good Of The Service,” your separation code is “KFB1,” and your reenlistment code is “RE-4B.” Based on the information contained on your DD Form 214, it appears that you submitted a voluntary written request for an OTH discharge for separation in lieu of trial by court-martial. In the absence of evidence to contrary, it is presumed that prior to submitting this voluntary discharge request, you would have conferred with a qualified military lawyer, been advised of your rights, and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. As part of this discharge request, you would have acknowledged that your characterization of service upon discharge would be an OTH.

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 your contentions that you incurred mental health concerns during military service. In addition, you contend that: (1) you suffered from depression and self-medicated with alcohol, carrying your addiction for years, (2) while on Recruiter Duty in █, you tested positive for cocaine and were subsequently given a choice to request a discharge or present your case at a court-martial, and (3) you chose to request a discharge in order to avoid the possibility of a felony conviction.

Based on your assertion that you incurred mental health concerns during military service, which might have mitigated the circumstances that led to your characterization of service, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request for correction to your record and provided the Board with the AO. The AO 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. He has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or 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 AO concluded, “it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition.”

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 discharge for the good of the service, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board Considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included multiple drug offenses. The Board determined that illegal drug use by a Marine is contrary to Marine Corps core values and policy, renders such Marines unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow Marines. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service or to your misconduct. Finally, the Board determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the Marine Corps agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and likely punitive discharge. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Marine and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. While the Board commends your post-discharge good character, 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 clemency in the form of an upgraded characterization of service. 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,

10/21/2022

█

Executive Director

█