



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

██████████
Docket No. 6685-24
Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████
██
████████████████████

Dear Petitioner:

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 6 January 2025. 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, 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). As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an Advisory Opinion (AO). Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a 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 on the evidence of record.

You were granted enlistment waivers for trespassing, underage drinking, and failure to report an accident. You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 11 February 1985. On 29 October 1986, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for two specifications of

unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 178 days and for missing ship's movement. Consequently, you were notified of your pending administrative processing by reason of commission of a serious offense; at which time you waived your rights to consult with counsel and present your case to an administrative discharge board. Ultimately, the separation authority directed you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service and you were so discharged on 17 December 1986.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interest 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 and your contentions that: (1) you incurred PTSD from childhood trauma that was exacerbated by military stressors, including separation from your new wife, and (2) you were young and naïve and made poor decisions trying to accommodate your new wife. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you submitted in support of your application.

Based on your assertions that you incurred Post Traumatic Stress Disorder during military service, which may have contributed to the circumstances of your separation, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request for correction to your record and provided the Board with an AO on 30 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. 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. 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 diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

After a thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard for military authorities and regulations. Regarding your contention that your misconduct was the result of your youth, the Board felt that your record clearly reflected your willful misconduct and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD. As the AO explained, you provided no medical evidence in support of your claims and your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct. 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.

Therefore, 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 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 is attached 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,

1/23/2025

