



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

█
Docket No. 2392-23
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 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, the 3 September 2014 guidance from the Secretary of Defense regarding discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)/mental health condition (MHC) (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). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the U.S. Navy and entered active duty on 19 November 2003. Upon entry onto active duty, you were granted a waiver for your drug abuse while in the Delayed Entry Program (DEP). You also were also granted a waiver for alcohol related offenses while in DEP.

On 5 August 2004, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP), for disobeying a lawful order, assault and underage alcohol consumption. You received your second NJP, on 7 December 2004, for failure to obey an order or regulation by drinking underage. On 23 February 2005, your suspended punishment from your 7 December 2004 NJP was vacated and you received your third NJP for failure to obey an order or regulation. On 1 June 2006, you received your fourth NJP for false official statement and wrongful use of ecstasy. As a result, the Commanding Officer (CO) made his recommendation to the Separation Authority (SA) that you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization. The SA accepted the recommendation and directed you be discharged for drug abuse. You were so discharged on 9 June 2006.

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 contention that the combat deployment to Iraq caused severe PTSD/Mental Health and substance abuse issues. 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 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 11 July 2023. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence of an in-service mental health diagnosis, although there is behavioral evidence of an alcohol use disorder that pre-dated military service and continued in service. Problematic alcohol use is incompatible with military readiness and discipline and does not remove responsibility for behavior. Post-service, the VA has also diagnosed the Petitioner with PTSD that has been attributed to combat exposure in service. It is plausible that the Petitioner's alcohol use disorder would worsen with comorbid symptoms of unrecognized PTSD. There is insufficient information to attribute his false official statement and reported one-time drug use 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 post-service evidence from the VA of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute all of his misconduct to PTSD symptoms."

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 four NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included 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 concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence to attribute all of you misconduct to PTSD symptoms. As explained in the AO, there is insufficient information to attribute your false official statement and reported one-time drug use

to symptoms of PTSD. Further, the Board noted that you received three NJPs prior to your deployment onboard █. 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 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 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,

9/26/2023

