



Docket No. 6188-24
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 18 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) (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 afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 17 September 1990. On 28 February 1991, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for assault. Additionally, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) retention warning formally counseling you

concerning your NJP for violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative separation. On 11 March 1994, you were convicted by a special court-martial (SPCM) of two specifications of unauthorized absence totaling 276 days. As punishment, you were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay, reduction in rank, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). Ultimately, the BCD was approved at all levels of review, and you were so discharged on 10 August 1995.

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 character of service and contentions that, you were dealing with depression due to the passing of your grandmother and being separated from your family, since your discharge your coping skills have improved, and you have realized the error in your ways. 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 contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 25 October 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

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, particularly given pre-service behavior that appears to have continued. 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 PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard of military authority and regulations. The Board also considered the negative impact your conduct likely had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As the AO explained, your

personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct and you provided no medical evidence in support of your claim. Furthermore, throughout your disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD. The Board determined that the record clearly reflected that your active-duty misconduct was willful and that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions.

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.

Sincerely,

1/16/2025

