



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

█  
Docket No. 4205-23  
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 10 January 2024. 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, which was previously provided to you. 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 Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 22 January 2001. You participated in █ from 22 January 2005 to 7 August 2005. Subsequently, you completed this enlistment with an Honorable characterization of service on 11 October 2005 and immediately reenlisted.

On 3 May 2006, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) formally counseling you concerning your misconduct. Specifically, Violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Article 92, failure to obey order or regulation, to wit: misuse of your government charge card. On 21 June 2007, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for misuse of your government charge card. On 12 August 2008, you received a second NJP for absence from your appointed place of duty, failure to obey order or regulation, and false official statement. On 12 August 2008, you were issued a Page 11 formally counseling you concerning deficiencies in your performance.

On 10 September 2008, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Marine Corps by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You waived your procedural right to consult with military counsel and present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your administrative discharge from the Marine Corps with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation for administrative discharge and directed your OTH discharge from the Marine Corps by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. On 25 November 2008, 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 upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that: (1) after returning from combat you suffered from PTSD and your life was spiraling out of control; you lost everything, (2) upon returning to █ your command made your “life hell” after learning of your filing for a congressional inquiry, (3) you truly believe that your military career would have ended differently if you did not suffer from PTSD, and (4) you were struggling with personal issues related to your divorce and child custody dispute. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters describing post service character, documentation describing post service accomplishments, and a letter from a primary care provider.

As part of the Board’s review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 27 November 2023. The AO noted in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition or suffered from PTSD while in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. He submitted evidence of post-service diagnoses mentioned in one letter from a treating Nurse Practitioner, however the letter is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Furthermore, two of his NJP’s preceded his deployment and his misuse of credit

cards pre-dates his active-duty service. Additional records (e.g., post service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your administrative counselings and NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As the AO explained, there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition or suffered from PTSD while in military service, or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Therefore, 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. Furthermore, the Board noted that you did not provide any evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. Finally, the Board noted that you were provided multiple opportunities to correct your deficiencies during your service; however, you continued to commit additional misconduct. 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. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and commends you for your post-discharge accomplishments, 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 your request does not merit relief.

In reviewing your record, the Board believes that you may be eligible for veterans' benefits which accrued during your prior period of Honorable service. However, your eligibility is a matter under the cognizance of the VA. In this regard, you should contact the nearest VA office concerning your rights, specifically, whether or not you are eligible for benefits based on your prior period of Honorable service.

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,

1/23/2024

