

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

> Docket No. 7050-24 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 Board waived the statute of limitation 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 13 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, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include to 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) of a qualified mental health provider, which was previously provided to you. 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 the understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on evidence of record.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 25 August 2008. On 16 March 2010, when you were subject to nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for a violation of Article 92 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) due to failure to obey a lawful order. Subsequently, on 31 October 2011, you were tried before Special Court-Martial (SPCM) and convicted on four specifications under Article 112a for the wrongful use and possession of marijuana. As a result,

you were sentenced to six months confinement and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). Following completion of the appellate review and affirmation of the findings and sentence of your SPCM, your BCD was executed on 22 January 2013.

You previously applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) contending that your service connected diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) warranted an upgraded discharge under policies of liberal consideration of mental health conditions. You also submitted clemency evidence for consideration and alleged that your Article 112a violations were due to reprisal. Your request was considered on 26 April 2022 and denied. The mental health provisional advising the NDRB noted during its review that all of your in-service diagnoses were made either around the time of or after your misconduct had already occurred.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie, Kurta, and Hagel Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge and your contentions that you are remorseful for your actions, regret that you caused disruption or disappointment, and have taken steps toward personal growth and rehabilitation since your discharge; to include becoming actively involved in community service as a contributing member of society. In support of your contentions and for clemency and equity consideration, you submitted an employer appraisal of your performance, certificates of accomplishment, three character letters, and your veteran health records.

Because you also contend that PTSD or another mental health condition affected the circumstances of the misconduct which resulted in your punitive discharge, the Board also considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated on multiple occasions over a period of several months. His adjustment disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluations performed by the mental health clinicians. Postservice, the VA has apparently provided treatment for a number of mental health concerns. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. More weight has been given to inservice reports that his misconduct preceded the onset of his mental health concerns and in-service evaluations that he was psychologically fit for duty and aware if his actions over post-service evidence of VA treatment. Additional records (e.g., postservice 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 post-service evidence that VA clinicians have provided treatment for diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health concerns. 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 SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board

considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included multiple drug offenses onboard a naval vessel. 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. Further, the Board concurred with the clinical opinion that, although there is post-service evidence that Department of Veterans Affairs clinicians have provided treatment for diagnosis of PTSD and other mental health concerns, there is insufficient information to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. In this regard, the Board noted that this assessment is consistent with that rendered by the NDRB with respect to the timing of your misconduct; which was documented as having preceded the onset of your mental health concerns. 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 you were provided an opportunity to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your BCD.

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. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and appreciates your expression of remorse, 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,