



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

█
Docket No: 4404-22

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 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 30 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). Additionally, the Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) furnished by qualified mental health provider. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal for consideration, 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 Marine Corps and entered active duty on 30 May 2000. As part of your enlistment application, on 9 March 2000, you signed and acknowledged the "Statement of Understanding Marine Corps Policy Concerning Illegal Use of Drugs." Your pre-enlistment

physical examination, on 10 March 2000, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions or symptoms.

On 21 November 2000, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that terminated, after 134 days, with your surrender to military authorities on 4 April 2001. While you were in a UA status, you missed your unit's movement on 17 March 2001. On 22 May 2001, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for missing movement and your long-term UA. You did not appeal your NJP.

On 23 October 2001, a Navy Drug Screening Laboratory message indicated you tested positive for cocaine above the testing cutoff level for the cocaine metabolite. On 2 November 2001, you received NJP for the wrongful use of cocaine. You did not appeal your NJP. On 9 November 2001, you refused a medical officer's drug addiction evaluation.

On 19 November 2001, your command issued you a "Page 11" counseling warning (Page 11) noting your NJP for the wrongful use of cocaine. You did not submit a Page 11 rebuttal statement. On 29 November 2001, your separation physical examination and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic issues or symptoms.

On 3 December 2001, your command notified you that you were being processed for an administrative discharge by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct and drug abuse. You consulted with counsel and waived your rights to submit a rebuttal statement and to request a hearing before an administrative separation board. Ultimately, on 18 January 2002, you were discharged from the Marine Corps for misconduct with an under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions characterization of service and assigned an RE-4B reentry code.

On 29 April 2010, the Naval Discharge Review Board denied your initial discharge upgrade application. On 12 August 2020, this Board denied your petition for relief.

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 for a discharge upgrade, return of your military identification card, "G.I. Bill" benefits, and "100% medical benefits." In addition, the Board considered your contentions that: (a) you were illegally denied your time in grade promotion to E-3 while at █ and experienced harassment at this duty station, (b) your discharge was unjust, and (c) upon requesting mast, no one would help you and you almost lost your life. 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 review process, the BCNR Physician Advisor who is a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.), reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 12 August 2022. The Ph.D. 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 in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish a clinical diagnosis or provide 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 Ph.D. concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence of that his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD."

Based upon this review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. In accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos, the Board gave liberal and special consideration to your record of service, and your contentions about any traumatic or stressful events you experienced and their possible adverse impact on your service. However, the Board concurred with the AO and concluded that there was no convincing evidence that you suffered from any type of mental health condition while on active duty, or that any such mental health condition was related to or mitigated the misconduct that formed the basis of your discharge. As a result, the Board concluded that your misconduct was not due to mental health-related conditions or symptoms. Moreover, the Board observed that you did not submit any clinical documentation or treatment records to support your mental health claims despite a request from BCNR, on 16 June 2022, to specifically provide additional documentary material. Even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed any and all mitigation offered by such mental health conditions. The Board determined the record clearly reflected that your misconduct was willful and intentional and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. The Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions.

The Board observed that character of military service is based, in part, on conduct and overall trait averages which are computed from marks assigned during periodic evaluations. Your overall active duty trait average calculated from your available performance evaluations during your enlistment was approximately 3.85 in conduct. Marine Corps regulations in place at the time of your discharge required a minimum trait average of 4.0 in conduct (proper military behavior), for a fully honorable characterization of service. The Board concluded that your conduct marks during your active duty career were a direct result of your serious misconduct which further justified your OTH characterization of discharge.

The Board noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy/Marine Corps regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years. The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board concluded that significant negative aspects of your conduct and/or performance greatly outweighed any positive aspects of your military record. The Board determined that characterization under OTH conditions is appropriate when the basis for

separation is the commission of an act or acts constituting a significant departure from the conduct expected of a Marine. Moreover, 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. Lastly, the Board determined that illegal drug use by a Marine is contrary to USMC core values and policy, renders such Marines unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow Marines. As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and even under the liberal consideration standard, the Board concluded that your misconduct and disregard for good order in discipline clearly merited your receipt of an OTH, and that your separation was in accordance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of your discharge. Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board still concluded that insufficient evidence of an error or injustice exists to warrant upgrading your characterization of service, returning your military identification card, or granting clemency in your case. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that your request does not merit relief.

Regarding your request for "G.I. Bill" and Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) disability benefits, the Board determined these issues were not within its statutory authority to grant. Eligibility for VA benefits falls solely within the purview of the VA and not the Department of the Navy. Therefore, these particular requests were denied without consideration.

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,

10/7/2022

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █