



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

█
Docket No: 6389-22

Ref: Signature date

█
█
█
Dear █

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 4 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.

On 2 April 2002, you were discharged from the Navy's Delayed Entry Program (DEP) with an Entry Level Separation as a result of testing positive during urinalysis. You later reenlisted in the Navy with a waiver for DEP and began a period of active duty on 31 July 2002. From a period beginning on 25 December 2002 to 9 November 2003, you had two periods of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 301 days. On 24 December 2003, you were administratively separated from service with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization in lieu of trial by court martial.

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 24 December 2003 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is “In Lieu of Trial by Court Marial,” your separation code is “KFS,” and your reenlistment code is “RE-4.”

Based on the information contained on your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), it appears that you submitted a voluntary written request for an other than honorable (OTH) discharge for separation in lieu of trial (SILT) by court-martial. In the absence of evidence to contrary, it is presumed that prior to submitting this voluntary discharge request, you would have conferred with a qualified military lawyer, been advised of your rights, and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. As part of this discharge request, you would have acknowledged that your characterization of service upon discharge would be an OTH.

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 you were suffering from mental illness and the Navy did not offered mental health counseling. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did provided a letter from your medical provider in support of your application.

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. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims and the letter from █ is temporally remote to service, and is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct in service. 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 periods 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is

insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. Finally, the Board determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the Navy agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and likely punitive discharge. 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 █