

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

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

> Docket No. 1672-23 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 Board waived the statute of limitation 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 11 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 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). Additionally, the Board considered an Advisory Opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional 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 enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 16 September 1998. On 3 February 2000, you were found guilty at a special court-martial (SPCM) of two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 117 days and were sentenced to confinement for 60 days, forfeiture of \$650.00 pay per month for two months, reduction in rank



to E-1, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). After your sentence was affirmed on appellate review, you were so discharged on 18 December 2001.

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 characterization of service, have your rank of E-2 restored, and that you incurred PTSD from witnessed sexual assault/harassment and reprisal during military service. You contend that: (1) you incurred PTSD from training during extreme heat conditions, which resulted in the death of another Marine following which exercise you commenced a period of UA, (2) you witnessed a gang rape of an unwilling victim and months later that victim mysteriously fell off the repel tower, (3) you witnessed the sexual assault of your roommate and escaped being assaulted by jumping out of a window, and (4) you reported the incident to the Chaplain who said he would look into it but nothing would likely come of it because of DADT (Don't Ask, Don't Tell). For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a copy of your DD Form 214, character letters, your resume, certificates of achievement, official military personnel file documents, and photos.

Based on your assertions that you incurred PTSD from witnessed sexual assault/harassment and reprisal during military service, which might have mitigated the circumstances of 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, 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 in service or a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., in-service or 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 to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

After reviewing your response to the AO, the original AO remained unchanged.

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 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. Additionally, 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. As pointed out in the AO, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or a nexus with your misconduct. Finally, the Board noted you provided no evidence to substantiate your contentions. As a result, the Board concluded

your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant a BCD. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation, 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. 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 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.

