



Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and commission of a serious offense. 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 Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense and, on 29 January 1990, you were so discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request for an upgrade, on 15 June 1999, based on their determination that your discharge was proper as issued.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that your mental health was affected by PTSD and alcoholism, and your time spent in the Persian Gulf caused you to become an alcoholic. Additionally, the Board noted you checked the "PTSD" and "Other Mental Health" boxes on your application but chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claims. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

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 NJPs, 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. The Board also considered the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board found that your misconduct was intentional and made you unsuitable for continued naval service. Furthermore, the Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. The Board noted that you were provided multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies during your service; however, you continued to commit additional misconduct. Finally, the Board noted that you did not provide any evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions.

As a result, the Board determined your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record 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. 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,

8/7/2024

