



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

██████████
Docket No. 5085-23
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 28 February 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.

You enlisted in the Navy and completed an Honorable period of active duty from 12 March 1980 to 21 March 1984. You immediately reenlisted and began your second enlistment. You served without incident until 23 January 1988. At that time, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for assault and drunk and disorderly conduct. On 15 July 1988, you received a special court martial (SPCM) conviction for two specifications of unauthorized absence, and three specifications of wrongful use of a controlled substance. You were sentenced to a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD), confinement, and forfeiture of pay. You underwent a medical evaluation on 19 July 1988, which indicated you were not dependent on drugs or

alcohol. After completion of all levels of review, on 21 September 1989, you were discharged with a BCD as a result of a SPCM conviction.

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 your discharge was due to emotional distress as a result of marital issues, it was a lapse of your judgement, and you had good conduct as evidence by your good conduct medal. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided evidence of post-discharge accomplishments and medical records.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 8 December 2023. The AO noted in pertinent part:

Although the Petitioner was evaluated for mental health concerns and substance use disorder during his enlistment, he denied mental health symptoms and did not receive a diagnosis. Post-service, he has received service connection for hearing loss that is temporally remote to military service. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms of a mental health condition in service, or provide a nexus with his misconduct, which appears to have continued throughout both enlistments, preceding the nasal surgery and marital stress. 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 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 your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included drug offenses. 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 noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. 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 to sufficiently 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 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,

3/18/2024

