



received counseling warnings regarding the potential for administrative separation. In spite of informal counseling in December of 1983 for another UA, you proceeded thereafter with an ongoing pattern of UAs which resulted in three additional NJPs from January through April of 1984, the last of which included an additional Article 92 violation of a lawful general regulation for not maintaining a full seabag. After your sixth and final NJP, in July of 1984, for an Article 92 violation due to sleeping on watch, you were sent for a mental health evaluation which found no evidence of a psychotic or neurotic disorder. Based on your record of misconduct, you were notified of processing for administrative separation for a pattern of misconduct and, after consultation with counsel, elected a hearing before an administrative board. The administrative board later substantiated your misconduct and unanimously recommended your separation with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) characterization of service. The administrative board's recommendation was approved by Commander, Navy Personnel Command and you were discharged on 28 September 1984.

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 to upgrade your discharge and your contentions that you were injured while serving in Afghanistan and that your subsequent service in the Army National Guard with multiple Honorable discharges merits consideration for an upgraded characterization of service based on your post-discharge character. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments but no advocacy letters.

Because you contend that post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) affected your discharge, the Board also considered the AO. The AO 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 clinical symptoms 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 AO 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 his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD."

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 six NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD. Finally, while the Board noted your subsequent active and reserve periods of service and appreciates that you continued your military career honorably, the Board observed that the characterization of your Navy service is independent from your Army service. As a result, the

