



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

█
Docket No: 6908-22

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 6 January 2023. 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). Additionally, the Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health provider, 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 Navy and entered active duty on 12 June 1996. Your pre-enlistment physical examination, on 13 October 1995, and self-reported medical history both noted no neurologic or psychiatric conditions or symptoms.

After a period of Honorable service and reenlisting, on 24 June 2005, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for failing to obey an order or regulation when you engaged in fraternization

and had an inappropriate sexual relationship with a subordinate. At the time of your NJP, you held the rank of First Class Petty Officer (E-6). You did not appeal your NJP.

On 6 July 2005, your command notified you that were being processed for an administrative discharge by reason of misconduct due to the commission of a serious offense. You waived your rights to consult with counsel and to request an administrative separation board. Your command processed your separation using “notification procedures,” which meant the least favorable discharge characterization you could receive was General (Under Honorable Conditions) (GEN). Ultimately, on 20 July 2005, you were discharged from the Navy for misconduct with a GEN discharge and assigned an RE-4 reentry code.

On 19 April 2007, the Naval Discharge Review Board denied your initial application for a discharge upgrade.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warranted relief in your case in accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you were having problems with your Security Officer that was trying to ruin your career and wanted you out of the Navy, (b) you spoke to the Chaplain but he told the Security Officer everything making things worse, (c) you were on the verge of killing yourself and so you “broke the UCMJ” and had a relationship with a junior enlisted Sailor in an effort to get anyone to help and listen to you, (d) you are 100% disabled and need someone to make all of your meals and take care of you, and (e) if you receive a discharge upgrade you could apply to move into a Vets home when you get older. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board review process, the BCNR Physician Advisor who is a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.), reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 21 November 2022. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that 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. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Post-service, he has received treatment for PTSD and other mental health conditions from the VA. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with his misconduct, particularly as it is difficult to attribute an inappropriate sexual relationship with a subordinate to symptoms of PTSD or another mental health condition. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner’s diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The Ph.D. concluded, “it is my considered clinical opinion there is post-service evidence of a

diagnosis of PTSD 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 these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. In accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos, the Board gave liberal and special consideration to your record of service, and your contentions about any traumatic or stressful events you experienced and their possible adverse impact on your service. However, the Board concluded that there was no nexus between any mental health conditions and/or related symptoms and your misconduct, and determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the argument that any such mental health conditions mitigated the misconduct that formed the basis of your discharge. As a result, even under the liberal consideration standard the Board concluded that your misconduct was not due to mental health-related conditions or symptoms. Even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed any and all mitigation offered by such mental health conditions. The Board determined the record clearly reflected that your misconduct was willful and intentional, and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. Moreover, the Board concluded that your fraternization with a junior Sailor was not the type of misconduct that would be excused or mitigated by mental health conditions even with liberal consideration. The Board also concluded that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions.

Additionally, the Board 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. The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board determined that characterization under GEN or Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions is generally warranted for misconduct and is appropriate when the basis for separation is the commission of an act or acts constituting a significant departure from the conduct expected of a Sailor. Lastly, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and even under the liberal consideration standard, the Board concluded that your serious misconduct clearly merited your receipt of a GEN characterization and that your separation was in accordance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of your discharge. 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, _____

1/18/2023

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

[REDACTED]