

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

Docket No. 9225-24
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 9 April 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 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. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

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 enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 21 August 1989. On 19 April 1990, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) retention warning counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. Specifically, underage drinking in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). On 10 July 1990, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) and failure to go to your

assigned place of duty. On 27 November 1990, you received your second NJP for willful disobedience of a commissioned officer and underage consumption of alcohol. On 5 April 1991, you received a medical evaluation to determine your fitness for duty. The medical provider found that you met the criteria for alcohol dependence and recommended Level III treatment. On 25 April 1991, you received your third NJP for willful disobedience of a superior commissioned officer, willful disobedience of a Petty Officer, and drunkenness - incapacitation for performance of duties through prior wrongful overindulgence in intoxicating liquor.

Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You were informed that the least favorable characterization of service you may receive is Under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions. You waived your right to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer (CO) forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an OTH characterization of service. As part of the CO's recommendation, he stated in pertinent part:

[Petitioner] has been repeatedly counseled at Captain's Mast for misconduct. [Petitioner] has been counseled at all levels of the chain of command concerning his behavior. However, his performance continues to decline. [Petitioner] does not desire to continue to serve in the Navy. He is an administrative burden and has no potential for further service.

The separation authority approved the recommendation and you were so discharged on 10 June 1991.

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 so that you can afford a home for your spouse and grandchildren. You contend that: (1) your mother was suffering from physical abuse by your father, (2) the abuse your mother was suffering from caused you anger issues and mental [health] issues, (3) you reached out to your Chief, but nothing was done, and (4) you made bad choices but love the Navy and your country. You assert that you have maintained constant employment and are currently working for the Department of Defense. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the documentation you provided in support of your application.

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 7 February 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. There is evidence that he suffered from Alcohol Dependence, which appeared to be problematic prior to service based on substance abuse evaluation. He was provided with retention warnings and recommendations following every NJP, but

unfortunately continued to engage in underage drinking. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. 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 diagnosed mental health condition. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evident by your counseling and NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board noted that you were provided multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies during your service but you continued to commit additional misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently pervasive and serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command.

Further, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of diagnosed mental health condition and there is 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. 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 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 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,

4/16/2025

■

Executive Director

Signed by: ■