



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

█  
Docket No. 6304-23  
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 27 February 1996. On 26 September 1996, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for contributing to the delinquency of a minor. On 11 October 1996, you received a second NJP for wrongful use of a

controlled substance. On 21 August 1997, you were convicted by a special court-martial (SPCM) of a period unauthorized absence totaling 147 days, wrongful use of marijuana, and breaking restriction. As punishment, you were sentenced to confinement, reduction in rank, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). The BCD was subsequently approved at all levels of review and, on 4 November 1998, 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 to Honorable so you may be able to have military and educational benefits. The Board considered your contentions that you: (1) understand what happened was not an indication of the character and the man you are today, (2) understand that your bad decisions caused you to be discharged, however, you feel that with help you would have been able to cope, (3) felt abandoned and did not know how to receive the consequences, (4) were coping with your illness and childhood trauma, and allowed stress, peer pressure, and hanging with the wrong crowd lead you down a wrong path, and (5) continue to have nightmares and restless nights since leaving the Navy. You assert that you have since changed your life and have been employed as a truck driver for 13 years. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided health care documents but no supporting documentation describing post service accomplishments.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO on 28 December 2023. The AO 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. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Post-service, he has received mental health diagnoses from civilian providers that are temporally remote to his military service and appear unrelated. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus all his misconduct, particularly given pre-service behavior that appears to have continued in service. Additional records (e.g., in-service or 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 diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct as evidenced by your NJPs and SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved multiple 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. 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 and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As the AO explained, the available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with all of your misconduct, particularly given your pre-service behavior that appears to have continued in service. Additionally, 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. Furthermore, 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. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD.

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. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and commends you for your post-discharge employment, 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.

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

█