



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

█
Docket No. 2552-24

Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 16 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 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, 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)/mental health condition (MHC) (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, dated 1 August 2024. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 26 September 1990. Upon your enlistment, you admitted preservice use of marijuana.

Unfortunately, the documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your 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. Your Certificate

of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Marine Corps on 26 September 1990 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is "In Lieu of Trial by Court Martial" your separation code is "KFS," and your reenlistment code is "RE-4." Your separation code is consistent with a discharge in lieu of trial by court martial.

Based on the information contained on your DD Form 214, it appears that you submitted a voluntary written request for an OTH discharge for separation in lieu of trial (SILT) by court-martial. In the absence of evidence to contrary, it is presumed that prior to submitting this voluntary discharge request, you would have conferred with a qualified military lawyer, been advised of your rights, and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. As part of this discharge request, you would have acknowledged that your characterization of service upon discharge would be an OTH.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that you were suffering from mental health conditions, including PTSD and two ankle injuries. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did provide a copy of your Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) decision documents.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

The Petitioner submitted VA compensation and rating paperwork indicating 30% service connection for PTSD. There are no additional details regarding the rationale for, or etiology of the PTSD diagnosis. The Petitioner did not submit any additional medical evidence in support of claim. There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service, or that he exhibited any symptoms of a mental health condition. His statement is not sufficiently detailed to provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your SILT discharge, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the likely seriousness of your misconduct and the potential negative impact it had on the good order and discipline of your unit. The Board also noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was likely substantial and, more likely than not, would have resulted in a punitive discharge and/or extensive punishment at a court-martial. Therefore, the Board determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by

court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and possible punitive discharge. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, you did not submit any additional medical evidence in support of your claim and your statement is not sufficiently detailed to provide a nexus with your misconduct. 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 not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies in your case and concluded the evidence you provided was insufficient to overcome it.

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 the 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,

10/4/2024

