

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

> Docket No. 2406-24 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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 4 September 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (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 and your response to the AO.

You twice previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service. You were denied relief on 31 January 2019 and 30 August 2023. Before this Board's denial, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request for an upgrade, on 6 August 2007, based on their determination that your discharge was proper as issued. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

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: (1) your military records contain inconsistencies indicative of cognitive impairments associated with major depressive disorder and psychiatric issues, (2) your undiagnosed mental health struggles were inadequately addressed by military medical personnel, (3) your multiple coinciding mental health disorders and the interaction of these conditions have resulted in significant challenges for you functioning both during and after your service, (4) you have been formally diagnosed with "psychiatric issues and major depressive disorder" which have been directly connected to your military service, (5) the Department of Veterans Affairs have cleared you of the desertion charges based on an understanding of your mental health circumstances, and (6) given the clear link between your mental health challenges and your service, BCNR should reconsider its prior decisions and correct your military records and upgrade your discharge status. 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 26 July 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner's mental health concerns were considered during his enlistment and deemed not disabling. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health concerns that are attributed to military service. Unfortunately, there are inconsistencies in the record that raise doubt regarding the reliability of the Petitioner's recall and report during post-service evaluations. More weight has been given to earlier statements that his UA was due to family stressors over later statements that his UA was due to avoidance due to PTSD symptoms. 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 post-service evidence from civilian providers of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition."

In response to the AO, you submitted additional supporting documentation that provided additional clarification of the circumstances of your case. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct as evidenced by your SPCM 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 and determined that while there is post-service evidence from civilian providers of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service, there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As the AO explained,

your mental health concerns were considered during your enlistment and were deemed not disabling. 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, 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 BCD. 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 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,

