



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

█
Docket No. 7685-22
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 limitations 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 27 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 service 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)/mental health condition (MHC) (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 an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 26 April 1995. You received a waiver for entry into service due to pre-service drug use.

On 15 August 1996, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for violation of Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) Article 86, for a twenty-five minute period of unauthorized absence (UA) from your unit. You explained that your tardiness was due to an electrical outage that interfered with your alarm. On 6 November 1996, you received your second NJP for violating UCMJ Article 91, for disobedience by not marking your uniforms properly for cleaning. On

7 August 1997, you received your third NJP for violating UCMJ Article 112(a), for wrongful use of a controlled substance (marijuana). You did not appeal these NJPs.

In August 1997, you were medically evaluated for substance dependence, wherein you denied other substance abuse and you were not recommended for additional treatment at that time.

On 14 August 1997, you were notified that you were being processed for an administrative discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You waived your right to consult with qualified counsel and your right to present your case at an administrative separation board. Ultimately, on 24 October 1997, you were discharged from the Marine Corps for misconduct (drug abuse) with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service and assigned an RE- 4B reentry code.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating and/or extenuating 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: (a) your desire to upgrade your characterization of service, (b) your contention that you were struggling with severe mental health issues during service, and (c) the impact of those mental health issues on your conduct. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide documentation related to your post-service accomplishments or character letters.

In your petition, you contend that you were suffering from severe mental health issues during service that needed to be addressed, but that you were denied counseling while stationed at 29 Palms. 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 11 January 2023. 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. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his statement in service and pre-service substance use that apparently continued in service. 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 insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence his misconduct could be attributed to PTSD."

After thorough review, the Board concluded the potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. In accordance with the Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos, the Board gave liberal and special consideration to your record of service and your contentions regarding mental health. Specifically, the Board felt that your misconduct, as evidenced by your three NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. The Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct

and the fact that it involved a drug offense. Further, the Board also considered the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board determined that illegal drug use is contrary to Marine Corps values and policy, renders such Marine unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of fellow servicemembers.

In making this determination, the Board concurred with the advisory opinion that there was no convincing evidence that you suffered from any type of mental health condition while on active duty, or that any such mental health condition was related to or mitigated the misconduct that formed the basis of your discharge. The Board observed that you did not submit any clinical documentation or treatment records to support your mental health claims despite a request from BCNR on 18 October 2022. Throughout your disciplinary processing, you never raised concerns of a mental health condition or mental health symptoms that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. You did not appeal your NJPs and you waived your right to present your case at an administrative separation board with the assistance of counsel. As a result, the Board concluded that your misconduct was not due to mental health-related symptoms. The Board found that your active duty misconduct was intentional and willful and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. The Board also determined 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. As a result, the Board determined your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Marine and continues to warrant an OTH characterization.

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. Therefore, 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,

3/3/2023

█
Executive Director
█