



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

█  
Docket No. 7518-24  
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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. Your current request has been carefully examined by a three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session on 15 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (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 and your response to the AO.

You previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service and were denied relief on 27 October 2005 and 20 October 2016. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

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 was not limited, your request to upgrade your characterization of service and contention you understand you made a mistake while you were in the military, there

was an incident that you went through that led you to do drugs, and you went down the wrong path. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board review process, the BCNR Physician Advisor who is a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.), reviewed your contentions and the available records, and issued an AO dated 15 November 2024. The Ph.D. 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. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health concerns attributed to military service. However, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with his misconduct, given pre-service behavior that appears to have continued in 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 Ph.D. concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is post-service evidence from civilian providers of diagnoses of PTSD and 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."

In response to the AO, you submitted rebuttal evidence in support of your application. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

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 two non-judicial punishments and two summary courts-martial, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As explained in the AO, temporally remote to your military service, you received diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health concerns attributed to military service. However, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish a nexus with your misconduct; given pre-service behavior that appears to have continued in 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. Finally, the Board observed that you were provided multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies and chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge.

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 commends you for your post-discharge accomplishments, 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,

2/3/2025

