



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

██████████  
Docket No. 9913-23  
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 5 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 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 and your response to the AO.

You enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 15 March 1983. You completed this enlistment with an Honorable characterization of service on 27 September 1989. You immediately reenlisted and also completed this enlistment on 24 September 1992 with an Honorable characterization of service. You immediately reenlisted again and began your third period of service on 25 September 1992.

On 21 April 1998, you were found guilty at general court-martial (GCM), for two specifications of distributing cocaine, larceny of government property, wrongfully receiving government

property, and attempted receipt of stolen property. You were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay, reduction in rank and a Dishonorable Discharge (DD). After completion all levels of review, on 8 June 2000, you were discharged with a DD.

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 in order to qualify for veterans' benefits and a change to your active duty status. You contend that you accepted responsibility for your misconduct. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided Department of Veterans affairs medical documentation but no 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 5 April 2024. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Post-service, the VA has granted service connection for PTSD attributed to Iraq service. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with his misconduct, as cocaine distribution and theft are not typical symptoms of PTSD. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The Ph.D. concluded, "it is my clinical opinion there is post-service evidence from the VA of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

In response to the AO, you provided a statement that you had previously supplied with your application. 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 GCM, 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 distribution 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 to attribute your misconduct to PTSD. As explained in the AO, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with your misconduct, as cocaine distribution and larceny are not typical symptoms of PTSD. 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 a DD. 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,

6/17/2024

