



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

█
Docket No. 8814-22
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 21 April 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.

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 U.S. Marine Corps and entered active duty on 7 October 1997. Your pre-enlistment medical examination, on 15 November 1996, and self-reported medical history noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions or symptoms.

On 11 March 1998, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for falling asleep while on post. You did not appeal your NJP. The same day your command issued you a "Page 11" retention

warning (Page 11) documenting your sleeping on post. The Page 11 expressly warned you that a failure to take corrective action may result in administrative separation or limitation on further service. You did not submit a Page 11 rebuttal statement. On 30 March 1998, you received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA). You did not appeal your NJP. That same day, your command issued you a Page 11 retention warning documenting your UA. The Page 11 expressly warned you that a failure to take corrective action may result in administrative separation or limitation on further service. You did not submit a Page 11 rebuttal statement. On 31 March 1998, you were involved in a motor vehicle accident while in the process of changing duty stations.

On 8 October 1998, you received NJP for misappropriating government property, and for four separate specifications of failing to obey a lawful order in connection with driving on base with a suspended license, and/or for driving on base when your base driving privileges were suspended due to a civil DUI. You did not appeal your NJP.

On 2 April 1999, your command issued you a Page 11 retention warning documenting your disrespectful comments towards a Gunnery Sergeant (E-7). You did not submit a Page 11 rebuttal statement.

On 8 April 1999, you received NJP for failing to obey a lawful for driving on base while still on the base suspension/revocation list, failing to obey a lawful order/regulation by possessing live ammunition in your BEQ room, wrongfully counterfeiting vehicle passes, and wrongfully possessing several counterfeit temporary vehicle passes. You did not appeal your NJP.

On 16 January 2000, you were involved in an alleged domestic violence incident with your spouse. On 31 January 2000, you received NJP for violating the terms of a military protection order (MPO). You did not appeal your NJP. On 1 February 2000, your command issued you a Page 11 retention warning documenting your MPO violation. The Page 11 advised your that any further deficiencies in performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in proceedings for administrative discharge. You did not submit a Page 11 rebuttal statement. On 3 February 2000, your command substantiated your spousal abuse.

On 2 March 2000, you command notified you that you were being processed for an administrative discharge by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct. On 9 March 2000, you waived your rights to consult with counsel and to request an administrative separation board. Ultimately, on 24 March 2000, you were discharged from the Marine Corps for misconduct with an under Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service and assigned an RE-4 reentry code.

On 13 September 2011, the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) denied your initial application for relief. The NDRB determined your discharge was proper as issued and no change was warranted.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you experienced a serious case of PTSD when you were involved in a major motor vehicle accident while changing duty stations, (b) you have all the symptoms of PTSD and need an upgrade in order to get the medical attention and financial benefits you need, (c) your PTSD totally changed your thinking and behavior, and (d) you suffered permanent brain injury, psychological, and behavioral issues. For

purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a personal statement and photos of the motor vehicle accident and your related injuries.

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 6 March 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 the chronic nature of his misconduct throughout service and the difficulty to attribute misappropriation and counterfeiting to symptoms of PTSD. 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 clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct 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 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. 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 despite a request from BCNR, on 13 December 2022, to specifically provide additional documentary material. Additionally, 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 reflected that your 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 not be held accountable for your actions.

The Board observed that character of military service is based, in part, on conduct and overall trait averages which are computed from marks assigned during periodic evaluations. Your overall active duty trait average calculated from your available performance evaluations during your enlistment was approximately 2.8 in conduct. Marine Corps regulations in place at the time of your discharge recommended a minimum trait average of 4.0 in conduct (proper military behavior), for a fully

honorable characterization of service. The Board concluded that your cumulative misconduct was not minor in nature and that your conduct marks during your active duty career were a direct result of your pattern of serious misconduct.

The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board concluded that significant negative aspects of your conduct and/or performance greatly outweighed any positive aspects of your military record. The Board determined that characterization under OTH conditions 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 Marine. Moreover, 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 misconduct and disregard for good order in discipline clearly merited your discharge. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted 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 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,

4/25/2023

