



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

█
Docket No. 5907-23
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 11 March 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 the 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, 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 the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, dated 28 December 2023. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

Regarding your request for a personal appearance, the Board determined that a personal appearance with or without counsel will not materially add to their understanding of the issue(s) 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 5 September 1989. On 25 May 1990, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted five-days and resulted in

nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on 28 June 1990. Subsequently, you were counseled concerning poor performance, specifically UA. You were advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation.

On 24 May 1992, you received a second NJP for violation of a lawful order. On 6 April 1993, you received a third NJP for damage, sale, loss, destruction, or wrongful disposition of military equipment. On 20 April 1993, you were counseled concerning lack of poor attention. You were advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation.

On 14 September 1993, you received a fourth NJP for three instances of UA from appointed place of duty. Consequently, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct, at which point you decided to waive your procedural rights. On the same date, your commanding officer recommended an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. On 30 September 1993, the separation authority approved and ordered an OTH discharge characterization by reason misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. On 4 October 1993, 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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you are requesting this upgrade so that you may be eligible for compensation through the Department of Veterans Affairs for PTSD and other medical conditions, (b) you served during the Gulf War and you developed adverse effects on your mental health condition, which led you to make bad choices in 1991, (c) you worked with the Army overseas providing assistance and support with their UH-60 helicopters, and (d) you were 18 years of age and served your country both domestic and abroad during a time where your life was in danger. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you submitted copies of two letters of recommendation, three certificates of completion, and the U.S. Army Aviation Logistic School Diploma.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition or suffered from PTSD while in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. He did not submit any medical evidence in support of his claim. His personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct could be attributed 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, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact it had on the good order and discipline of your unit. The Board noted that you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but continued to commit misconduct. Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. 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 and commends you for your post-discharge good character, 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.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon the 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,

3/26/2024

