



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

█
Docket No. 10871-23

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 12 July 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 this 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 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). Additionally, the Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health provider. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

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 U.S. Navy and began a period of active duty service on 4 May 1998. Your pre-enlistment physical examination on, 17 March 1998, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions or symptoms.

While still in your initial training pipeline, on 4 January 1999, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) from ██████████. Your UA terminated with your arrest by civilian authorities in ██████████ on 19 July 1999.

Following your return to military control, on 26 July 1999, you submitted a voluntary written request for an administrative discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for your long-term UA. You waived your right to consult with counsel prior to submitting the request. You expressly acknowledged that your voluntary request was submitted by you free from any duress or promises of any kind. You expressly indicated you understood the nature of a discharge under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) and the probable lifelong adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. You voluntarily admitted you were guilty of your charged offense, and you did not desire to make a statement in connection with your request. As a result of this course of action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction for your long-term UA, as well as the potential sentence of confinement and the negative ramifications of receiving a punitive discharge from a military judge. Ultimately, on 12 August 1999, you were separated from the Navy in lieu of a trial by court-martial with an OTH discharge characterization and were assigned an RE-4 reentry code.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you were promised your discharge characterization would automatically change to Honorable after six (6) months of separation, (b) your upgrade is warranted because the incidents surrounding your discharge minimally affected Navy operations, (c) you held a leadership role with your squadron and served honorably for most of the time you were in, and (d) you were offered reenlistment but declined due to fear of retaliation. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the entirety of the evidence you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board review process, a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed your contentions and the available records, and issued an AO dated 22 May 2024. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received a diagnosis of PTSD from a civilian provider that appears unrelated to his service. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service 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) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The Ph.D. concluded, “it is my clinical opinion there is post-service evidence from a civilian provider of a diagnosis of PTSD. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD.”

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. In accordance with the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos, the Board gave liberal and special consideration to your record of service, and your contentions about any traumatic or stressful events you experienced and their possible adverse impact on your service. However, the Board concluded that there was no convincing evidence of any nexus between any mental health conditions and/or related symptoms and your misconduct, and determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the argument that any such mental health conditions mitigated the misconduct forming the basis of your discharge. As a result, the Board concluded that your serious misconduct was not due to mental health-related conditions or symptoms. Moreover, even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed any and all mitigation offered by such mental health conditions. The Board determined the record reflected that your misconduct was intentional and willful and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. The Board also concluded that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions.

The Board determined your contention that you were promised a discharge upgrade after six (6) months to be without merit. The Board noted that the voluntary discharge request you submitted expressly stated, in part: “...I hereby voluntarily submit this request free from any duress or promises of any kind for an administrative discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial.” Further, the Board also noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy/Marine Corps regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years.

The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board concluded that significant negative aspects of your conduct and/or performance greatly outweighed any positive aspects of your military record. The Board determined that characterization under OTH conditions is appropriate when the basis for separation is the commission of an act or acts constituting a significant departure from the conduct expected of a Sailor. The simple fact remains is that you left the Navy while you were still contractually obligated to serve and you went into a UA status without any legal justification or excuse for no less than 196 days.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge and concluded that your misconduct and disregard for good order in discipline clearly merited your discharge. 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,

7/22/2024

