

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL PECORDS 761 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 1001 ARLINGTON. VA 22204-2490

> TAL Docket No: 3364-13 24 November 2014



This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

Although your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 5 November 2014. The names and votes of the members of the panel 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, your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 28 August 1989. You served for seven months without disciplinary incident, but during the period from 4 April 1990 to 17 April 1992, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on two occasions. Your offenses were using disrespectful language toward a noncommissioned officer, failure to obey a lawful order, wrongful use of cocaine, and wrongful possession of two U.S. Armed Forces identification cards.

Subsequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense, at which time you waived your procedural rights to consult with legal counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board (ADB). Your commanding officer recommended discharge under other than honorable conditions by

reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. The discharge authority approved this recommendation and directed separation under other than honorable conditions by reason of misconduct, and on 17 August 1992, you were so discharged.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your desire to upgrade your discharge and assertion that you suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Nevertheless, suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant relief in your case because of the seriousness of your relief in your case because of the seriousness of your asconduct. Further, you were given an opportunity to defend misconduct. Further, you were given an opportunity to defend your actions but waived your procedural rights. Finally, there your actions but waived your procedural rights. Finally, there your assertion of suffering from PTSD. The Board noted that you your assertion of suffering from PTSD. The Board noted that you did not provide any supporting documentation and that the severity of your misconduct outweighed the mitigation of your possible diagnosis. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence within one year from the date of the Board's decision. New evidence is evidence not previously considered by the Board New evidence is evidence not previously considered by the Board prior to making its decision in your case. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying attaches to all official naval record, the burden is on 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,

ROBERT J. O'NEILL Executive Director