



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

█  
Docket No. 2610-23  
Ref: Signature Date

█  
█  
█

Dear █:

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 27 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 (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). 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.

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 Navy and began a period of active duty on 20 October 1986. You subsequently completed this enlistment with an Honorable characterization of service, on 12 March 1987, and immediately reenlisted.

The record shows you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) on 16 March 1988 that concluded upon your return to military authorities on 29 March 1988, a period totaling 13 days. On 31 March 1988, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for UA and missing ship's movement. Additionally, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. On 8 April 1988, you received a second NJP for breaking restriction and were issued a Page 13 counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. On 2 May 1988, you received a mental health evaluation, you reported personal stress with your landlady but denied any psychiatric mental health symptoms.

The record shows you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) on 9 June 1988, that concluded upon your return to military authorities on 7 July 1988, a period totaling 28 days. On 15 July 1988, you again commenced a period of UA that concluded upon your apprehension and return to military authorities on 26 August 1988, a period totaling 42 days. On 20 October 1988, you were convicted by a special court-martial (SPCM) of two specifications of UA, failure to go to your appointed place of duty, failure to obey a lawful order, and wrongful possession of cocaine. As punishment, you were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay, reduction in rank, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). The BCD was subsequently approved at all levels of review and, on 20 September 1989, 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: (1) your behavior of the last six months of your service was because of alcoholism and drug addiction brought on by the discovery of a family member's diagnosis of cancer and eventual death, (2) you requested help at your NJP and was denied, (3) his disease only got worse and led to your discharge, and (4) you have suffered from the negative effects of your BCD for almost 35 years, and would to see that end. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a statement on your behalf but no supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 7 August 2023. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated during military service. The absence of mental health diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. Unfortunately, he has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. His personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct. 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 AO concluded, “it is my clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health diagnosis that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition.”

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct as evidenced by your NJPs, multiple periods of UA, and SPCM conviction, 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. The Board also considered the negative impact your conduct likely had on the good order and discipline of your command. 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 diagnosis that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD. 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. 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. 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 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,

10/13/2023

█  
█

Executive Director

Signed by: █