



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

█
Docket No. 5592-22
5673-18
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear █

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. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 23 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 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (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 5 October 2022, which was previously provided to you. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, 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 an upgrade to your characterization of service and were denied on 15 August 2019 (Docket No. 5673-18). Before this Board's denial, the Naval Discharge Review Board also denied your request for relief on 3 September 2009 (Decision letter dated 13 October 2009).

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to change your discharge character of service and receive any due back pay and benefits. The Board considered your assertion that if your medical condition had been acknowledged and properly treated at the time, your mental health condition and medical health condition would not have worsened; you would have been able to extend your career, had an opportunity to better serve your community, and better support your family. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided an advocacy letter but no supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 5 October 2022. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence 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 evidence of post-service mental health conditions that are temporally remote to his military service and appear unrelated. Unfortunately, his personal statement and available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his pre-service behavior. 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 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 your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct as evidenced by your four NJPs and SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard of military authority and regulations. The Board further concluded that the discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD. Finally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that, there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition. As a result, the Board determined your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Marine and continues to warrant a BCD. 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, _____

12/6/2022

■

Deputy Director

Signed by: ■