

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

> Docket No. 3589-23 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 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 30 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, 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, dated 15 September 2023. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

Regarding your request for a personal appearance, the Board determined that a personal appearance with or without counsel will not materially add to their understanding of the issue(s) 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 26 June 2002. Upon your enlistment, you acknowledged your previous use of a controlled substance-marijuana. On 3 June

2003, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for a period of unauthorized absence (UA) and disobeying a lawful order form a noncommissioned officer. On the same date, you were counseled concerning your NJP violations. You were advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation. On 30 June 2003, you were convicted by summary court martial (SCM) for two instances of violation of a lawful general order. You were sentenced to reduction to the inferior grade of E-1, confinement for a period of 30 days, and forfeiture of pay in the amount of \$800.00 for a period of one month. As a result, you were processed for administrative separation due to pattern of misconduct.

Unfortunately, the documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Navy on 24 October 2003 with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) (GEN) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct Due to Pattern of Misconduct," your separation code is "JKA," and your reenlistment code is "RE-4."

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. On 2 September 2010, the NDRB denied your request after concluding your discharge was proper as issued.

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 change to your reentry code. You contend that: (a) this correction should be made because your discharge was both improper and inequitable, (b) you were a teenager dealing with life and mental health related issues which affected your focus and behavior, (c) you continue to experience the depression and shame that correlates with your failure, (d) you have become a productive citizen who have achieved a lot and been awarded numerous accolades. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you submitted in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner 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. Postservice, he has received a mental health diagnosis from a civilian mental health provider that is temporally remote to military service and appears unrelated. Unfortunately, available records are 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 contribute to an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition 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 these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact it had on the good order and discipline of your unit. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct. As a result, the Board concluded your significant negative aspects of your service outweigh the positive aspects and continue to warrant a GEN characterization and RE-4 reentry code. 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 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,