



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

█
Docket No. 7938-22

Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

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 6 March 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 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, 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). As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an Advisory Opinion (AO) on 20 January 2023. Although provided with an opportunity to submit a rebuttal to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 17 September 1982. On two separate occasions, you were issued administrative remarks regarding exceeding weight and/or body fat guidelines and advised non-adherence to regiment may result in your administrative separation. On 5 March 1985, you were found guilty at a special court-martial (SPCM) of two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA); the first totaling 6 days, the second totaling 114 days and ending in your apprehension. You were sentenced to be confined for 70 days, to forfeit \$295.00 pay per month for two months and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). On 10 October 1985, your sentenced was affirmed. You were so discharged on 7 November 1985.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge and your contention that you incurred PTSD during military service. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

Based on your assertion that you incurred PTSD during military service, which might have mitigated the circumstances surrounding your separation from service, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request for correction to your record and provided the Board with an AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Although he reported stress symptoms to medical after his first UA, he left UA before he could be evaluated by mental health to determine a diagnosable mental health condition. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service 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) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my 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 or another mental health condition."

After a thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service or your misconduct. The Board noted that you provided no evidence in support of your contention. 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 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 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 is attached 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,

3/22/2023



Executive Director

