



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

█  
Docket No: 6318-22  
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 9 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 the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, which was previously provided to you. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the U.S. Navy and began a period of active duty in April 1987. After a period of Honorable service, you reenlisted on 6 April 1991. On 11 December 1996, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA). On the report of desertion, the Commanding Officer (CO) stated you were pending charges for larceny of Navy Exchange (NEX) property and were on leave before deserting. You later returned to military custody on 22 September 1997.

Unfortunately, the 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 31 October 1997 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct," your separation code is "HKQ," and your reenlistment code is "RE-4." Your separation code indicates you were separated for misconduct due to commission of a serious offense.

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 was not limited, your request to upgrade your characterization of service and contentions that you were singled out by an officer who didn't like you, he made a point to get rid of you, you took a stand and did what was right, you did not disobey any orders, and your record shows you were a good veteran. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide advocacy letters of support or any medical documentation.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 24 October 2022. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner's service record is incomplete. However, there is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in the military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. 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 this 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 that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to PTSD."

After thorough review, the Board concluded that your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your larceny and long-term UA, 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. In particular, the Board found your UA totaling 286 days to be especially egregious conduct. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence your

misconduct could be attributed to PTSD. Finally, the Board noted you provided no evidence to substantiate your contentions. As a result, the Board determined your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Sailor and continues to warrant an OTH. 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,

12/20/2022

