

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

Docket No. 1457-24 Ref: Signature Date

- From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records
- To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER USMC

- Ref: (a) Title 10 U.S.C. §1552
 - (b) SECDEF Memo of 13 Sep 14 (Hagel Memo)
 - (c) PDUSD Memo of 24 Feb 16 (Carson Memo)
 - (d) USECDEF Memo of 25 Aug 2017 (Kurta Memo)
 - (e) USECDEF Memo of 25 Jul 18 (Wilkie Memo)
- Encl: (1) DD Form 149 w/attachments
 - (2) Naval record (excerpts)
 - (3) Advisory opinion of 12 Jun 24

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Subject, hereinafter referred to as Petitioner, filed enclosure (1) with the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) requesting for an upgrade of his characterization of service and correct the spelling of his last name on his Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214).

2. The Board, consisting of **and the second second**, **and and the second second**, reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 31 July 2024 and, pursuant to its regulations, determined the corrective action indicated below should be taken on the available evidence of record. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of the enclosures, relevant portions of Petitioner's naval service records, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies to include references (b) through (e). In addition, the Board considered enclosure (3), an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although Petitioner was provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, he chose not to do so.

3. The Board, having reviewed all the facts of record pertaining to Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice, finds as follows:

a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under existing law and regulation within the Department of the Navy.

b. Although enclosure (1) was not filed in a timely manner, the statute of limitation was waived in accordance with the Kurta Memo.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER

c. Petitioner enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 11 July 2005. On 13 June 2007, he received summary court-martial (SCM) for two specifications of Article 92, one specification of Article 111 and one specification of Article 112a.

d. Petitioner terminated his participation in substance abuse rehabilitation program on 19 June 2007 and, in doing so, understood that he was doing it against the advice of the staff.

e. Unfortunately, documents pertinent to Petitioner's administrative separation are not in the official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. The Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that he was separated from the Marine Corps on 2 October 2007 with a Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct: Drug Abuse," separation code is "HKK1," and reenlistment code is "RE-4B." His DD Form 214 erroneously spells his last name.

f. As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed Petitioner's request and provided the Board with enclosure (3), an advisory opinion (AO). The AO 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. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received mental health treatment that appears unrelated to his service. Unfortunately, his personal statement is 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 AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition."

g. Petitioner contends that he suffered from mental anguish due to a family tragedy while on active duty. He has required treatment for his mental health condition. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted Petitioner provided advocacy letters describing post-service accomplishments.

CONCLUSION

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board concludes that Petitioner's request warrants partial relief. In light of reference (e), the Board concluded Petitioner should be issued DD Form 214 with the correct spelling of his last name.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER USMC

Notwithstanding the below recommended corrective action, the Board concluded insufficient evidence exists to support Petitioner's request for an upgrade in his characterization of service.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in Petitioner's case in accordance with the Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos. After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that Petitioner's misconduct, as evidenced by his SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of his 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. Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, throughout Petitioner's disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Additionally, the medical evidence provided is temporally remote to his military service.

As a result, the Board concluded Petitioner's 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 Petitioner submitted in mitigation and commends him for his 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 Petitioner a discharge upgrade or granting him a discharge upgrade as a matter of clemency or equity. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence Petitioner provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of his misconduct.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the above, the Board recommends that the following corrective action be taken on Petitioner's naval record in the interests of justice:

In view of the above, the Board directs the following corrective action:

That Petitioner be issued a "Correction to DD Form 214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty" (DD Form 215), for the period ending 2 October 2007, to reflect his name as " vice " vice " vice "."

No further changes be made to Petitioner's record.

A copy of this report of proceedings be filed in Petitioner's naval record.

4. It is certified that a quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above entitled matter.

5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulation, Section 723.6(e)) and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER USMC

corrective action, taken under the authority of reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

8/21/2024

