

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 6084-23 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 14 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. 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 6 April 2004. On 5 August 2005, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of marijuana. Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by



reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You waived your procedural right to consult with military counsel and to 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 Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the recommendation for administrative discharge and directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 24 August 2005, 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 contention that you incurred PTSD from racial harassment, hazing, and unfair treatment, you engaged in misconduct following the denial of your request for leave to visit your father who was ill, you felt marijuana was your only outlet and your only avenue for relief, and you were the victim of reprisal. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a statement, a physician letter, and health care documents; 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 22 December 2023. The AO noted 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. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. He has provided temporally remote evidence from a civilian provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to his military service in part. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to self-medication for PTSD, given his statement that his marijuana use was a one-time event at a party. 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 post-service evidence from a civilian mental health provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service in part. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

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, 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. Additionally, 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. The Board also considered the likely negative effect your misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that while there is post-service evidence from a civilian mental health provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service in part, there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD. As the AO explained, there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to self-medication for PTSD, given your statement that your marijuana use was a one-time event at a party. There is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition and throughout your disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. 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. 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, 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.

Finally, the Board determined there was insufficient evidence to conclude you were the victim of reprisal in violation of 10 USC 1034. 10 USC 1034 provides the right to request Secretary of Defense review of cases with substantiated reprisal allegations where the Secretary of the Navy's follow-on corrective or disciplinary actions are at issue. Additionally, in accordance with DoD policy you have the right to request review of the Secretary of the Navy's decision regardless of whether your reprisal allegation was substantiated or non-substantiated. Your written request must show by clear and convincing evidence that the Secretary of the Navy acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or contrary to law. This is not a de novo review and under 10 USC 1034(c) the Secretary of Defense cannot review issues that do not involve reprisal. You must file within 90 days of receipt of this letter to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)), Office of Legal Policy, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-4000. Your written request must contain your full name, grade/rank, duty status, duty title, organization, duty location, mailing address, and telephone number; a copy of your Board for Correction of Naval Records (BCNR) application and final decisional documents, and a statement of the specific reasons why you are not satisfied with this decision and the specific remedy or relief requested. Your request must be based on factual allegations or evidence previously presented to the BCNR, therefore please also include previously presented documentation that supports your statements.

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, 2/29/2024