



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

█
Docket No: 4226-22
Ref: Signature Date

[REDACTED]

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 21 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 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional and your response to the AO.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 15 October 1985. On 6 June 1986, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 17 days. On 20 August 1987, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative separation. On 9 June 1988, you received your second NJP for larceny, assault, and wrongful use of cocaine. On 11 June 1988, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense and misconduct due to drug abuse. You were advised of, and waived your procedural rights to consult with military counsel and to present your case to an

administrative discharge board (ADB). Your commanding officer (CO) then forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation for administrative discharge and directed your OTH discharge from the Navy. On 27 July 1988, you were discharged from the Navy with an OTH characterization of service by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse.

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 character of service and contentions that: 1) your misconduct was attributed to you experiencing “discrimination, grief, depression, and cruel and unfair punishment”; 2) you were under severe depression following receiving information concerning your mother’s health condition; 3) you received harassment from your superiors who did not take into consideration your mental state; and 4) due to your mental state, the Navy turned its back on you and did not give you any medical or mental help or support, you were just “thrown out” with an OTH discharge. For purposes of clemency consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters and a certificate of appreciation.

As part of the Board’s review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 16 August 2022. The AO noted 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 provide a nexus with his misconduct. While discrimination and terminal illness of a close family member are stressors, it is not clear how they would contribute to misconduct of substance use, UA, or larceny. 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 mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition.”

In response to the AO, you provided a rebuttal statement that supplied additional clarification of the circumstances of your case.

Based upon this review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your two NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug offense. Further, the Board considered the likely negative effect your misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board also determined that illegal drug use by a Sailor is

contrary to Navy core values and policy, renders such Sailor unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow Sailors. Further, the Board noted you provided no evidence to substantiate your contentions. Finally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As a result, the Board determined 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,



Recoverable Signature

