

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 834-24 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 24 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 24 March 2003. On 21 July 2003, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. Specifically, disorderly conduct by participating in a physical altercation with another Marine. The Page 11 expressly advised you that any further disciplinary infractions or continuation of deficient performance may result in disciplinary action and/or processing for administrative discharge. On 15 October 2003, you were issued a Page 11 counseling for driving on base without wearing a seatbelt. On

2 November 2004, you were issued a Page 11 counseling concerning your lack of financial responsibility that resulted in your unit receiving negative official correspondence and phone calls from bill collectors.

On 19 January 2005, you were issued a Page 11 counseling concerning your financial responsibilities and preparedness. On 28 January 2005, you were issued a Page 11 counseling concerning your disrespect toward a noncommissioned officer (NCO) and your failure to exhibit honesty and integrity. On 14 October 2005, you were convicted by a summary court-martial (SCM) of 13 specifications of making and uttering worthless checks by dishonorably failing to maintain sufficient funds.

Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Marine Corps by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You waived your right to consult with 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 Marine Corps with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA directed your OTH discharge from the Marine Corps by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and, on 14 April 2006, 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 Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that you were having issues with your wife's health, your command was not supportive, you had a few issues, and you served with honor. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the documentation you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 7 June 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given chronic difficulties with honesty and financial mismanagement that began prior to his deployment and are not typical symptoms of a mental health condition. 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 AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another 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 multiple Page 11 counselings and SCM conviction, 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. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that, there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service or your misconduct. As the AO explained, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct, particularly given your chronic difficulties with honesty and financial mismanagement that began prior to your deployment and are not typical symptoms of a mental health condition. Additionally, you have provided no medical evidence in support of your claims and there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Therefore, the Board determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, the Board noted that you were provided multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies during your service: however, you continued to commit additional misconduct.

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.

