



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

■
Docket No: 4721-22

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 14 November 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 23 September 2022. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

Regarding your request for a personal appearance, the Board determined that a personal appearance with or without counsel will not materially add to their understanding of the issue(s) 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 Navy and began a period of active duty on 12 February 1979. On 1 May 1979, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted 92 days. On 13 August 1979, you were charged with a period of UA. On 24 August 1979, you requested an Other Than

Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service in lieu of trial by court martial. On 30 August 1979, a medical officer determined that you did not suffer from any psychotic or psychiatric issues. On 5 September 1979, your commanding officer recommended approval of your request for discharge in lieu of trial by court martial. On 14 September 1979, the separation authority approved and ordered your request for an OTH discharge in lieu of trial by court martial. On the same date, you were discharged with 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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that you decided to go UA as a result of your poor judgment and that you were sexually assaulted before joining the military. For purposes of clemency and equity 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 the 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. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, the Petitioner's personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Unfortunately, his personal statement and provided medical records are lacking sufficient detail to establish 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 considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your request for 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 brevity of your active duty service. The Board noted that you were UA almost half of the time you were on active duty. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another a mental health condition. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. 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 an upgraded characterization of service as a matter of clemency or equity. 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,

11/30/2022

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █