



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

█  
Docket No: 3787-22

Ref: Signature date

█  
Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 12 September 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 the 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional dated 27 July 2022. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 21 Jun 1979. On 3 April 1980, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted 145 days and resulted in your apprehension by civil authorities. On 5 October 1988, you requested an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service in lieu of trial by court martial. On 6 October 1988, your commanding officer recommended approval of your discharge request in lieu of trial by court martial. On 19 October 1988, your administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact. On 21 October 1988, the discharge authority

approved your request for an OTH discharge in lieu of trial by court martial. On 25 October 1988, you were 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 for a discharge upgrade and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) benefits assistance. 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, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., postservice medical records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) are required to render an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a 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 in lieu of trial by court martial, outweighed these 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 your unit. Further, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. 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. 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 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, \_\_\_\_\_

9/29/2022

