



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

■
Docket No: 4054-22
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 3 August 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 1 July 2022 and your rebuttal to the AO.

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 25 April 2002. On 11 April 2003, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of marijuana. Subsequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. After electing to waive your rights, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse, with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation and, on 28 April 2003, you were so discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. On 4 February 2010, the NDRB denied your request after determining that your discharge was proper as issued.

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 contention that you experienced mental depression and anxiety, which contributed to your misconduct. 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 1 July 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, 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. He has provided evidence of post service diagnoses of Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD) and PTSD that are temporally remote to his military service, and indicate his civilian clinician has dated the onset of his GAD to military service. His PTSD diagnosis appears to be related to childhood trauma, and there is no evidence that this diagnosis was exacerbated during his military service. In his personal statement and civilian mental health evaluation, he indicated he used marijuana to "soothe himself;" however, there was no evidence that indicated his experience of life stressors was extraordinary or unique, or that he met the diagnostic criteria for a mental health condition during his military service. Records indicated he resorted to a maladaptive coping skill, and there is no evidence that he was unaware of his misconduct or not responsible for his behavior. 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, "[b]ased on the available evidence, it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is post-service evidence of another mental health condition (GAD) that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence Petitioner's misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition."

In response to the AO, you submitted a statement providing additional clarification of the circumstances of your case.

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 NJP, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug related offense

█

during a period when a “Zero Tolerance” drug policy was being emphasized by the Navy. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition. 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,

8/11/2022

█