



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

■  
Docket No. 8409-24  
Ref: Signature Date

■■■■■■■■■■  
■■■■■■■■■■  
■■■■■■■■■■

Dear ■■■■■■■■■■

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. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 12 March 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 this 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.

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 based on the evidence of record.

You previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service and were denied relief on 15 May 2024. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in the Board's most recent decision.

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 to upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that: (1) you did not understand how to take the loss of your father's passing, (2) you spoke with the Chaplain and First Sergeant and received no help, (3) you were just discharged from the Marine Corps and never received a "command mast;" nor were you spoken to concerning your condition, and (4) you were in a "mental hospital" when your command brought to you your DD Form 214. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided documentation from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) but no documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 8 January 2025. The AO 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 Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) compensation rating paperwork noting temporally remote service-connection for some conditions; however, no supplemental paperwork was submitted pursuant to review. 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 AO 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."

In response to the AO, you submitted a personal statement that supplied additional clarification of the circumstance of your case. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your summary court-martial conviction for the wrongful use of marijuana, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved 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 noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. The Board also considered the likely negative effect your misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your unit. Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service and insufficient

evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As the AO explained, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with your request. Further, the Board agreed there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition during your military service or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a mental health condition. 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 otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. Furthermore, VA eligibility determinations for health care, disability compensation, and other VA administered benefits are for internal VA purposes only. Such VA eligibility determinations, disability ratings, and/or discharge classifications are not binding on the Department of the Navy and have no bearing on previous active-duty service discharge characterizations. Finally, the Board noted that you did not provide any evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies to your discharge processing.

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 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,

3/28/2025

