

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 7755-22 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 25 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). The Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional, dated 27 December 2022, and your response to the AO.

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 entered active duty with the Navy on 13 October 1976. On 16 November 1977, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 39 days. After receiving NJP, you again went UA until 13 February 1978 totaling 87 days. Upon your return to military custody, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted and your commanding officer (CO) was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the good of the service. On 16 March 1978, you were so discharged.

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 to upgrade your discharge and contention that you incurred a mental health condition during your military service due to personal stressors, including the birth of your child and your wife's postpartum depression. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 27 December 2022. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation and properly evaluated during his enlistment. His personality disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. A personality disorder diagnosis is pre-existing to military service by definition, and indicates lifelong characterological traits unsuitable for military service. Unfortunately, he has provided no medical evidence to support his claims of another mental health condition. His misconduct appears to be consistent with his diagnosed personality disorder, rather than evidence of another mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military 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 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 his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition other than his diagnosed personality disorder."

In response to the AO, the Board noted you submitted a personal statement that contained additional evidence regarding the circumstances of your case along with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) decision on your eligibility for benefits.

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and request to be discharged for the GOS, outweighed the potential 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. Further, the Board noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support your contentions. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a MHC. Further, the Board also noted that your misconduct led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and, more likely than not, would have resulted in a punitive discharge and extensive punishment at a courtmartial. Therefore, 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. Finally, the Board noted that VA eligibility determinations for health care, disability compensation, and other VA-administered benefits are for internal VA purposes only. Such VA eligibility determinations, disability ratings, and/or discharge classifications are not binding on the Department of the Navy and have no bearing on previous active duty service discharge characterizations. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a Sailor and continues to warrant an OTH characterization of service. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you provided in mitigation, 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. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence you provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of your misconduct. 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.

