

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

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

> Docket No. 5392-24 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 28 October 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 provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 19 August 1992. On 11 January 1993, you were found guilty at Summary Court Martial (SCM) of stealing \$375.00 from another Marine. On 13 May 1993, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for willfully disobeying a lawful order from two different non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and five specifications of unauthorized absence (UA). On 10 June 1993, you received NJP for willfully disobeying a lawful order and making a false official statement to a third NCO. On 28 October 1993, at Special Court Martial (SPCM), you were found guilty of willfully disobeying a lawful order and pleaded guilty to being disrespectful in language to a fourth NCO. You were sentenced to forfeitures, confinement, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). After the

findings and sentence in your SPCM were affirmed, you were issued a BCD on or about 28 July 1995<sup>1</sup>.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request for an upgrade, on 31 January 2006, 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 Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to change your discharge characterization of service and your contentions that a specific Staff Sargeant in your command continually harassed you and made up stories about you to get you kicked out of the Marine Corps, and you need a discharge upgrade so you can go to the Police Academy. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 13 September 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner contends he incurred Post Traumatic Stress Disorder during military service, which may have contributed to the circumstances of his separation.

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. 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.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

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, SCM, and SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact your repeated misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board noted that you were given multiple opportunities to address your conduct issues but you continued to commit misconduct; which ultimately led to your SPCM and BCD. The Board further noted that your

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Board was unable to locate a Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) in your record. Your discharge date was based on Navy and Marine Corps Appellate Activity letter dated 28 July 1995 directing your BCD to be executed.

disciplinary issues involved four different NCOs, which is not consistent with your contentions that your discharge was due to the actions of an NCO. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service and insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD. The Board noted you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. 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. 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. 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.

