



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

■
Docket No. 1311-23
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 20 September 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 (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 the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by 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 Navy and began a period of active duty on 1 September 1988. On 9 November 1989, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance/conduct. Specifically, failure to report to your appointed place of duty and failure to report loss/misplacement of government property. You were advised any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative separation. On 27 August 1990, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence. On 31 August 1990, the Navy Drug Laboratory reported your urine sample tested positive for cocaine. You were evaluated by a credentialed

provider regarding your substance abuse, and found to be non-drug dependent. On 5 September 2000, you received a second NJP for wrongful use of cocaine.

On 6 September 1990, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You waived your procedural right to consult with military counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board (ADB). Your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation for administrative discharge, and directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 5 October 1990, 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 change your discharge character of service and contentions that you had a drug addiction that was, in part, due to the stress of deployment and anxiety, you needed help but instead was discharged in your condition, you finally received help after being addicted for 12 to 15 years after your discharge, you have been clean and sober for over 20 years, and you were a good Sailor apart from your addiction. 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 process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 24 July 2023. The AO noted 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. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., active duty medical records containing the events described by the Petitioner, post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) would 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 that his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition."

After 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 two NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug offense. 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. Further, the Board considered the likely negative effect your misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Furthermore, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As the AO noted, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with your misconduct. The Board 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. Finally, the Board noted that you did not provide any evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. There is no documentation in your record that shows you were drug dependent and your command was under no obligation to send you to drug rehabilitation treatment unless it was determined, by competent medical authority, that you were drug dependent. 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 Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos and reviewing the record liberally and 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 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,

10/3/2023

