



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

██████████  
Docket No. 9516-24  
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 contentions 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, sitting in executive session on 24 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 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. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade and were denied on 16 January 2019. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in the Board's previous 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 characterization of service and your contentions that you have suffered from PTSD since

bootcamp, at the time of your misconduct you suffered from the effects of PTSD, depression, and anxiety resulting from the experience of your initial swim qualification, every year after that experience, when you had to return to the pool for swim qualifications, you suffered anxiety attacks and would be so nervous you started doing drugs and drinking alcohol to help cope. You additionally contend you were chased by a pack of dogs at ██████████, suffer from anxiety and nightmares from that occurrences, and you have since gotten help with mental health and have been a model citizen. Lastly, you state you are now free of mind and mood altering substances. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the materials you provided in support of your application; which included your letter to the Board and two advocacy letters.

As part of the Board's review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO, dated 6 February 2025, which was previously provided to you. The AO noted 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. He has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Inconsistencies in his statements regarding his substance use raise doubt regarding the reliability of his recall. 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 PTSD or another mental health concern that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another 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 evidenced by your non-judicial punishment for provoking speech and positive urinalysis for drug abuse, 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. Further, the Board observed you were given an opportunity to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your Other Than Honorable 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence that you suffered from PTSD or another mental health concern while in military service and insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to PTSD or another mental health condition. As explained in the AO, The inconsistencies in your statements regarding your substance abuse raised serious questions regarding your reliability 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 Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record 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,

4/2/2025

\_\_\_\_\_