

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 7520-22 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 10 February 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 an advisory opinion (AO) furnished by 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.

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 enlisted in the Marine Corps and entered active duty on 21 May 2002. Your pre-enlistment physical, on 5 December 2000, and self-reported medical history noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions or symptoms. Following initial recruit training, on 28 August 2002, you reported for duty on board "Infantry School" at




On 1 September 2002, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA). On 3 October 2002 your command declared you to be a deserter. Your UA terminated after 581 days, on 4 April 2004, with your arrest in the community. Upon your return to military control, you were placed in pretrial confinement.

On 4 June 2004, pursuant to your guilty plea, you were convicted at a Special Court-Martial (SPCM) of your long-term UA. You received as punishment eighty-five days of confinement, and a discharge from the Marine Corps with a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). On 20 October 2004, the Convening Authority approved the SPCM sentence as adjudged. On the same day you were placed on involuntary appellate leave awaiting your BCD. On 22 February 2005, the U.S. Navy-Marine Corps Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the SPCM findings and sentence. Upon the completion of appellate review in your case, on 5 May 2005, you were discharged from the Marine Corps with a BCD and assigned an RE-4 reentry code.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant 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 received a BCD due to untreated depression and anxiety from your time in boot camp, (b) it has been seventeen years since your discharge and during such time you have found hardships and prejudice, and have been unable to receive treatment for your mental health disorder caused by the military, (c) your hardships for mental health treatment have been overwhelmingly discouraging throughout this whole time, and (d) you would like to start your life again and be a productive member of society where you can get medical benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs. 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 27 December 2022. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

The Petitioner contends that "depression and anxiety were identified on a medical screening in 2004," and that these diagnoses might have mitigated the circumstances of his discharge. The medical screening was the separation physical that the Petitioner completed on his own, and marked "depression and excessive worry." In the notes to clarify items marked, he indicated, "I worry too much about my freedom and family." 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. 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 his 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 Ph.D. 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 her misconduct could be attributed to a 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 convincing evidence you suffered from any type of mental health condition while on active duty, or that any such mental health conditions or symptoms were related to or mitigated the misconduct that formed the basis of your discharge. As a result, the Board concluded that your misconduct was not due to mental health-related conditions or symptoms. Moreover, the Board observed that you did not submit any clinical documentation or treatment records to support your mental health claims. The Board unequivocally determined the record clearly reflected that your misconduct was willful and intentional and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. 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.

The Board noted 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. Additionally, 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. Accordingly, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and even under the liberal consideration standard for mental health conditions, the Board concluded that your serious misconduct and disregard for good order and discipline clearly merited your receipt of a BCD.

The Board also noted that, although it cannot set aside a conviction, it might grant clemency in the form of changing a characterization of discharge, even one awarded by a court-martial. However, the Board concluded that despite your contentions this is not a case warranting any clemency. The simple fact remains is that you left the Marine Corps while you were still contractually obligated to serve and you went into a UA status for approximately 581 days without any legal justification or excuse. Accordingly, the Board did not find any evidence of an error or injustice in this application that warrants upgrading your 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 granting you the relief you requested or granting relief 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,



