



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

█  
Docket No. 9321-22  
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 17 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 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, applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include the Kurta memo and 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 the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, dated 8 March 2023, which was previously provided to you. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 30 December 1996. In September 1999, you completed the Level III alcohol rehabilitation treatment. On 24 May 2000, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for three instances of disrespectful in language towards a three noncommissioned officers, and for wrongfully using provoking words. On 24 July 2000, you tested "positive" to use of a controlled substance-marijuana. On 27 July 2000, you submitted a sworn statement to a criminal investigator admitting using marijuana in numerous occasions. On 14 August 2000, a medical officer determined that you failed the substance abuse treatment. On 25 September 2000, you were convicted by summary court martial (SCM) for two instances of use of a controlled substance-marijuana. You were sentenced

to reduction to the inferior grade of E-1, confinement, and forfeiture of pay. On 29 September 2000, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On the same date, your commanding officer recommended an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 6 October 2000, you decided to waive your procedural rights. On 25 October 2000, your administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact. On 2 November 2000, the separation authority approved and ordered an OTH discharge characterization by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 8 November 2000, you were discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. The NDRB denied your request, on 19 August 2005, after determining your discharge was proper as issued.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that you were suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) and other mental health disorders while on active duty service, and are seeking veterans' health benefits. 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's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation and properly evaluated during his enlistment. His alcohol use disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluations performed by mental health clinicians. Problematic alcohol use is incompatible with military readiness and discipline and does not remove responsibility for behavior. There is no evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military service. Additional records (e.g., active duty or post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his military service) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO 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 the circumstances of your separation to a mental health condition, other than his alcohol use disorder."

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included drug offenses. The Board determined that illegal drug use by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their

fellow service members. The Board noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition, other than your alcohol use disorder. Finally, 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 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 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,

5/2/2023

█  
Executive Director  
█