



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

█
Docket No: 4956-22

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 7 December 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 an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional dated 15 September 2022. Although you were provided an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to do so.

You entered active duty with the Marine Corps on 24 June 1992. On 1 February 1996, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial due to being in an UA status for 772 days. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted and your commanding officer (CO) was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the good of the service. On 1 March 1996, you were so discharged.

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 contention that you developed PTSD during your military service after learning of the death of your uncle. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided an advocacy letter and personal statement.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 15 September 2022. The AO stated in pertinent part:

That 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. 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. While his statement is consistent with his record with respect to the loss of his uncle, it is difficult to attribute extended UA to a mental health condition associated with bereavement, and there is no evidence of a traumatic precipitant to support a diagnosis of PTSD. 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 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 your misconduct, as evidenced by your lengthy period of UA and request to be discharged for the GOS, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded it showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support your contention. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition. Finally, the Board considered that you already received a large measure of clemency when the Marine Corps agreed to discharge you for the GOS; thereby sparing you from the stigma of an additional court-martial conviction and a likely punitive discharge. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct was a significant departure from that expected from a Marine and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. While the Board commends your post-discharge good character and desire to be a part of the local American Legion Post, 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 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,

12/19/2022

█