



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

■
Docket No: 5182-22
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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. Your currently request has been carefully examined by a three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session on 12 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 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). As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an Advisory Opinion (AO) on 26 September 2022. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, 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 previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade but were denied on 4 April 2007.

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 contentions that, (1) you incurred mental and physical health concerns during your service and (2) you were told you could have your discharge upgraded after six months of discharge. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a letter from your detoxification program.

Based on your assertions that you incurred mental health concerns (MHC) during military service, which might have mitigated your discharge character of service, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request for correction to your record and provided the Board with the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a health condition during military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Upon evaluation, he denied problematic substance use, and there is no evidence he was unaware of his misconduct or not responsible for his behavior. Post-service, he has provided evidence of treatment of substance use disorder that is temporally remote to his military service and appears unrelated. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms during military service or a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his pre-service problematic substance use. Additional records (e.g., 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."

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 NJP, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included a drug offense. The Board determined that illegal drug use by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow service members. The Board noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. Further, the Board noted your preservice history of drug abuse in determining 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 a mental health condition. Finally, the Board also 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. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Sailor and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. While the Board commends your recent sobriety and completion of your

detrification treatment, 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 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,

1/9/2023

