



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

██████████  
Docket No. 7734-24  
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.

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 5 February 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, 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). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the U.S. Navy and began a period of active duty on 6 September 2003. On 21 June 2004, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP), for 10 days of unauthorized absence (UA). Following your NJP, you were issued a counseling warning and advised subsequent violations of the UCMJ, conduct resulting in civilian conviction, or deficient conduct, or performance of duty could result in administrative separation with an Other than Honorable (OTH). On 2 August 2004, you received your second NJP for theft of uniform items.

Consequently, you were notified of administrative separation processing for pattern of misconduct. After you waived your rights, the Commanding Officer (CO) made his recommendation to the Separation Authority (SA) that you be discharged with an OTH. The SA accepted the recommendation and directed you be discharged. You were so discharged on 8 October 2004.

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 you could not get the mental health help you needed while serving, this led you on a spiral of depression and anxiety, when you got to the ship that the hazing started and you realized you were being bullied, you reported it to the command and was told to keep your mouth shut, while at sea you saw black smoke and bodies in the ocean at one point, some were dead and some screaming for help, and you were told to keep your mouth shut. 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, a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed your contentions and the available records, and issued an AO dated 20 December 2024. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition during his military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a mental health condition. He has provided one post-service mental health assessment whereby he complained of PTSD symptoms and nightmares of “bodies floating in the water and bombs going off; however, it does not appear that he deployed or that his ship ever left national waters. One administrative record notes 4 days of sea service. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his requested change for narrative reason for separation. Additional records (e.g., active duty medical records, post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner’s diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his separation) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The Ph.D. concluded, “it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a 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 NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, you provided one post-service mental health assessment whereby you complained of PTSD symptoms and nightmares of “bodies floating in the water and bombs going

off;” however, it does not appear that you deployed or that your ship ever left national waters. Consequently, this raised serious doubts regarding your credibility as a historian. 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.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge and concluded that your misconduct and disregard for good order and discipline clearly merited your discharge. 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 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,

2/26/2025

