

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

> Docket No. 6649-24 Ref: Signature Date



Dear

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 9 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, dated 30 October 2024, which was previously provided to you. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 17 July 2001. On 4 March 2004, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted 26 days. On 30 March 2004, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of a controlled substance and desertion. On 31 March 2004, you began a second period of UA which lasted 17 days and resulted in your conviction by summary court martial (SCM) on 17 April 2004. Consequently, you were processed for administrative separation.

Unfortunately, the documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Navy on 12 May 2004 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is "Misconduct" your separation code is "HKK," and your reenlistment code is "RE-4." Your separation code is consistent with a discharge due to drug abuse.

Post discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. The NDRB denied your request, on 21 October 2014, after determining 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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you experienced a significant abrupt change in your military career when you transitioned from an undesignated airman to an operations specialist, (b) such change had an immediate and severe impact on your financial stability as it resulted in the cessation of your BAH and BAS, (c) your paychecks were insufficient to cover the bills and debts that these allowances previously addressed, (d) you did not received assistance from your chain of command during such challenging times, (e) the stress of your financial strain led you to a severe mental health decline untimely resulting on a PTSD diagnosis, (f) the lack of financial help and support exacerbated your PTSD symptoms, which ultimately led to bad decisions made, and (g) you have made significant efforts to rebuilt your life and maintain honorable conduct as a civilian. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a personal statement.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. 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 to support his claims. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) may aid in 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 these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SCM, 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to PTSD or a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, you provided no medical evidence to support your claim. 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. Finally, the Board observed that you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions.

As a result, the Board concluded 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 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 the 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,