



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

█
Docket No. 8976-23
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.

Because your application was submitted with new contentions not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. Your current request has been carefully examined by a three-member panel, sitting in executive session on 10 June 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (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 and your response to the AO.

The Board determined your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade and were denied on 23 January 2008. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors for your present application 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 change your discharge characterization of service, and your contentions that you need an upgrade so you can receive benefits, that you were kicked out for testing positive for weed only, that you are about to be homeless, and that you have a mental illness. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 29 April 2024, which was previously provided to you. The AO noted in pertinent part:

Petitioner submitted post-service medical documents of conditions other than mental health. He also submitted a summary sheet from Social Services that notes a diagnosis of Schizoaffective Disorder. He submitted a diagnostic summary from Haven Behavioral Healthcare that notes diagnoses of Schizoaffective Disorder and Alcohol Dependence. There was no evidence Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition while in service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. The evidence of post-service diagnoses of Schizoaffective Disorder and Alcohol Dependence are temporally remote to service. His personal statement was not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records describing his 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 your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP for wrongful use of marijuana, 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. 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition while in the service, or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. The Board also agreed that your post-service diagnoses of Schizoaffective Disorder and Alcohol Dependence were temporally remote to your service, and that your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with your misconduct. Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits.

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.

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,

6/25/2024

