

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

> Docket No. 10338-23 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 your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 12 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, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include 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 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 enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 14 March 2001. On 7 March 2002, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA), moving out of the Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (BEQ) without proper authority, exceeding curfew, and wrongfully wearing civilian clothes. On 4 April 2002, you were evaluated and diagnosed with alcohol dependence with physiological dependence and personality disorder with borderline and antisocial traits. On 25 April 2002, you received your second NJP for two specifications of UA, disrespect in language, and escaping from correctional custody unit.

Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense, and convenience of the government - personality disorder. You waived your right to consult with military counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. On 22 May 2002, 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 Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that you were diagnosed with a borderline personality disorder and the behaviors that warranted your dismissal were benign in nature and grossly attributed to your diagnosed borderline personality disorder. You assert that you are a good citizen, in good standing with no criminal infractions or desires to re-engage with the services. Additionally, the Board noted you checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

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 NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board also considered the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board found that your misconduct was intentional and made you unsuitable for continued naval service. Furthermore, the Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, the Board noted that you did not provide any evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions.

As a result, the Board determined 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 Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record 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 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,

6/26/2024

