



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

█
Docket No. 5576-23
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 limitations 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 2 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)/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 an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional dated 5 December 2023. Although you were provided an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to do so.

You entered active duty with the Marine Corps on 4 August 1970. On 1 July 1971 and 6 December 1971, you received non-judicial punishments (NJP) for two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 23 days. On 12 June 1972, you received NJP for UA totaling five days. Starting on 30 April 1973, you went into a UA status for 144 days before being apprehended by civil authorities. On 17 September 1973, a special court-martial (SPCM) charged you with being in a UA status for 62 days. However, the charges were dismissed due to lack of a speedy trial. Starting on 22 September 1973, you went into a UA status for 121 days before

surrendering to military authorities on 21 January 1974. Then, on 19 February 1974, you went into a UA status for 196 days before being apprehended by civil authorities and returned to military control on 3 September 1974. On 3 December 1974, you were charged with three specifications of UA totaling 461 days. On 17 December 1974, you received an additional NJP for UA totaling seven days. On 13 January 1975, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial for the aforementioned period of UA. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted and your commanding officer (CO) was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the GOS. On 29 January 1975, 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 and contentions that you incurred mental health concerns and PTSD during military service due to your service in Vietnam, you suffered from the stress of your parents being ill, and you went UA because your parents were terminally ill. 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's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 5 December 2023. The mental health professional stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he 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. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given the extensive nature of his UA. 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 these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, periods of UA, and separation in lieu of trial by court-martial request, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your unit. The Board found that unexpectedly absenting yourself from your command placed an undue burden on your chain of command and fellow service members, and likely negatively

impacted mission accomplishment. Further, the Board noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to substantiate your contentions. Finally, the Board noted that the misconduct which led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and, more likely than not, would have resulted in a punitive discharge and extensive punishment at a court-martial. Therefore, the Board determined you already received a large measure of clemency when the Marine Corps agreed to administratively separate you for the GOS; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and likely punitive discharge. 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 of service. 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,

2/14/2024

