



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

█  
Docket No. 7654-23  
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 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 1 May 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). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the U.S. Navy and entered active duty on 27 June 1984. Upon entry onto active duty, you admitted to illegal use of a controlled substance while in the Delayed Entry Program, but a waiver was not required. On 21 March 1985, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP), for wrongful use of cocaine, assault and disobey a lawful order. Subsequently, on 15 April 1985, you were found guilty at summary court-martial (SCM) for wrongful use of cocaine, and assault. You were sentence to confinement and forfeiture of pay. You received a medical evaluation on 18 April 1985 and, during the evaluation, you admitted to using drugs at age 14 and cocaine at

age 16. The evaluation report also annotated you had previously been seen at Counseling and Assistance Center (CAAC). As a result, the Commanding Officer (CO) made his recommendation to the Separation Authority (SA) that you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization for drug abuse. The SA accepted the recommendation and directed you be discharged. You were so discharged on 8 July 1985.

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 you were not given the proper mental health assessment, you should have been diagnosed with PTSD, Bipolar, Depression and Schizophrenia, you were neglected, overlooked and just discharged with no treatment offered, and bullied and discriminated against because of being black. You also contended that your mother passed away 27 days after your discharge and you received no help on how to deal with the loss. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a personal statement but did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board review process, the BCNR Physician Advisor who is a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.), reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 15 March 2024. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition 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 Ph.D. 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 NJP and SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included 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. Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, you did not submit any medical evidence in support of your claims and your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with your misconduct. Finally, 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 separation with an OTH.

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. 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,

5/13/2024

