



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

██████████
Docket No. 5505-24
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 limitations 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 11 December 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)/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 an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional, dated 27 September 2024. Although you were provided an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to do so.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 24 October 1984. On 25 February 1986, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for 30 minutes of unauthorized absence (UA), disrespect toward a petty officer, and failure to obey a lawful order. On 11 September 1987, you received NJP for wrongful use of cocaine. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 1 October 1987, you received a drug abuse interview and admitted to using alcohol regularly and cocaine once while at a party. Later, a Substance Abuse Report determined you were not alcohol or drug dependent.

After you elected to waive your rights, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the CO's recommendation, and you were so discharged on 13 November 1987.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. On 15 March 1989, the NDRB denied your request after determining 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 upgrade your discharge. You contend that you incurred mental health concerns during military service and your misconduct was due to being depressed and not wanting to return to sea duty. 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, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The mental health professional stated in pertinent part:

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. He did not submit any medical evidence in support of his claim. 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 your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug related 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. The Board also concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence your misconduct could be attributed a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service, or that you exhibited any symptoms of a mental health condition. The Board agreed that 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.

