

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

> Docket No. 7710-24 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 13 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.

You enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 22 October 2006. During your service, you were diagnosed with alcohol abuse and participated in outpatient treatment; however, you did not comply with your treatment aftercare plan. Additionally, you were diagnosed with adjustment disorder with mixed anxiety and depressed mood. While later recommended for Level II outpatient treatment, you declined treatment on two occasions. On 11 September 2007, you were convicted by a Summary Court-Martial (SCM) of two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA), failure to obey a lawful order by wrongfully consuming alcohol under the legal age of 21, and wrongfully using marijuana. You were sentenced to be reduced in rank to E-1 and to be confined for 30 days. On 11 October 2007, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for a three-day period of UA. Consequently, you were notified of your pending administrative processing by reason of pattern of misconduct and drug abuse, at which time you elected your right to consult with counsel and waived your right to 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 by reason of drug abuse and you were so discharged on 15 February 2008.

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 you were diagnosed with multiple health conditions, to include PTSD, and self-medicated while on active duty due to your mental health disorder. 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 PTSD and other mental health concerns during military service, which may have contributed to the circumstances of your discharge, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request for correction to your record and provided the Board with an AO on 20 November 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated on multiple occasions. His alcohol and substance use disorder diagnoses were 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. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health conditions that appear unrelated to his military service. His inservice misconduct appears to be consistent with his alcohol and substance use disorders, rather than evidence of PTSD or another mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military 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 AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis 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, other than alcohol or substance use disorder."

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 and SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact that 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 of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to your military service or misconduct, other than alcohol or substance use disorder. As the AO explained, your post-service diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health conditions are temporally remote to your military service and appear unrelated. 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. 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.

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,