



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

█  
Docket No. 1814-23  
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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 16 October 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (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 30 August 2023. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a 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 previously applied for an upgrade to your characterization of service with the Naval Discharge Review Board and twice this Board. Your requests were denied on 22 September 2004, 18 November 2015, and 12 April 2021.

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 character of service, and your contentions that you incurred PTSD and other mental health concerns during military service. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided official military personnel file, Department of Veterans Affairs documents, and medical documents.

Based on your assertions that you incurred PTSD and other mental health concerns 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. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Post-service, the VA has provided treatment for PTSD and granted service connection for another mental health concern. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with his misconduct. In particular, it is difficult to attribute repeated financial mismanagement to a mental health condition. Additional records (e.g., 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 post-service evidence from the VA of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute a diagnosis of PTSD 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. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, 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 agreed with the AO that there is insufficient evidence to attribute a diagnosis of PTSD to military service and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As explained in the AO, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with your misconduct and it is difficult to attribute repeated financial mismanagement to a mental health condition. 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. 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.

Sincerely,

10/22/2023

█