



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

█
Docket No. 9903-23
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 evidence 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 of the Board, sitting in executive session on 29 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, and 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) (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 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 previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade and were denied on 18 September 2017. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

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 was not limited, your request to upgrade your characterization of service and contentions that you served honorably, suffered from a mental health condition, and did not leave a Sailor behind. In addition, you argue that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has determined that a portion of your service is Honorable for their purposes. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you provided in support of your application.

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 1 May 2024. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

The Petitioner submitted VA letter noting service-connection for PTSD for treatment purposes only. He also submitted a Disability Benefits Questionnaire (DBQ) whereby the psychologist diagnosed him with PTSD and Alcohol Use Disorder, Moderate. The DBQ noted consistent anecdote regarding the Petitioner's cause of PTSD. There is no evidence contained within his service record that his friend drowned, nor did he mention this event in a previous (2016) petition. 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 submitted evidence of post-service diagnoses of PTSD and Alcohol Use Disorder that are temporally remote to service. 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."

In response to the AO, you provided a statement and documentation that supplied additional clarification of the circumstances of your case. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

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, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included 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. 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 your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health

condition. As explained in the AO, there is no evidence that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. More importantly, the Board noted you denied the drug related misconduct, which formed the basis for your discharge, that you now claim should be mitigated by your mental health condition. Finally, the Board noted that VA eligibility determinations for health care, disability compensation, and other VA-administered benefits are for internal VA purposes only. Such VA eligibility determinations, disability ratings, and/or discharge classifications are not binding on the Department of the Navy and have no bearing on previous active duty service discharge characterizations.

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 your post-discharge accomplishments, 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,

6/11/2024

