



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

█  
Docket No: 5780-22

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 21 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 6 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.

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 19 April 2012. On 23 April 2014, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted 334 days. On 27 April 2015, you

were administratively separated in absentia with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization by reason of misconduct due to UA.

Unfortunately, some documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Navy on 27 April 2015 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is “Misconduct (AWOL),” your separation code is “HKD,” and your reenlistment code is “RE-4.”

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 contention that your actions were either misunderstood or there was an intent to discriminate against you. Further, you contend that your mental health also played a significant factor on your decision to go UA. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a personal statement but no 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. Unfortunately his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. He mentioned that he got in trouble for having a cell phone while on duty, yet this is not mentioned in his record; unauthorized absence is the only noted misconduct. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. 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 mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that 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 extended period of UA, outweighed these 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. In addition, the Board considered the likely negative effect your misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be

attributed to 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,

12/13/2022

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █