



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

■  
Docket No. 5871-24  
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 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 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). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from 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 United States Navy and began a period of active duty on 14 January 1991. On 15 January 1991, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling concerning your fraudulent enlistment into the naval service as evidenced by your failure to disclose preservice civil involvement and drug abuse. On 20 February 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of marijuana. Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of

misconduct due to drug abuse. You consulted with counsel and waived your right to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The separation authority accepted the recommendation, and you were so discharged on 10 April 1992.

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 Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that you: (1) were never offered any help for a mental condition you were suffering from, (2) what happened to you was very embarrassing and traumatic, and (3) you never spoke about it until now. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the documentation you provided in support of your application.

Because you contend that a mental health condition impacted your misconduct, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated and treated. He was evaluated for substance abuse and homicidal ideation, and it was determined that he was not substance dependent, nor did he continue to have homicidal ideation following assessment. He submitted evidence of a myriad of mental health conditions that are temporally remote to service; however, it is difficult to attribute his misconduct to prodromal symptoms of mood disorder, given his pre-service behavior as well as homicidal ideation noted in service. The post-service mental health records submitted to not reference link to active-duty service. 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 that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition, other than substance use disorder."

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 NJP, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included a drug 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 noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. Further, the Board concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Finally, 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, the post-service mental health records you submitted do not reference a link to your active-duty

service. 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.

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. 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 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,

1/8/2025

