



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

█
Docket No. 9789-24
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 an executive session, considered your application on 4 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, 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.

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 6 March 1990. On 6 February 1992, you received administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling for failing to pay just debts. On 25 March 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence and false official statements. On 8 July 1992, you received your second NJP for

unauthorized absence. On 23 October 1992, you received your third NJP for failing to pay just debts and disobeying a lawful order. That same day, you received a Page 13 counseling for failing to pay just debts and failure to maintain funds. On 31 January 1993, you received a Page 13 counseling withdrawing your advancement to E-4 due to deficiencies in personal and military behavior. On 25 March 1993, you a summary court-martial (SCM) convicted you of three specifications of unauthorized absence. Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and misconduct commission of a serious offense. You waived your right to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The separation authority directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense and you were so discharged on 4 June 1993.

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 change your separation code. You contend that: (1) corrections to your record should be made due to undiagnosed to service-connected mental disorder adjustment disorder/anxiety, (2) you didn't know you could get help for your condition due to the discharge you received, (3) During Operation Desert Shield/Storm, the anxiety and stress of not knowing if you would survive became overwhelming, (4) you developed insomnia due to fear of imminent attacks, (5) your anxiety and stress heightened due to pilot being shot down and killed, (6) your grandmother and grandfather that raised you fell ill and you asked for leave to be with them but was denied so you lashed out, and (7) you were depressed, stressed and suicidal and you just wanted out, in hindsight wish you had just stayed in and finished your time, and you felt you let family and friends down. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the documentation you provided in support of your application.

Because you contend that an other mental health condition impacted your misconduct, the Board considered the AO. 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 submitted VA DBQ noting a diagnosis of adjustment disorder that is temporally remote to 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 AO concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct could be attributed 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 evidenced by your NJPs and SCM, 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. The Board observed you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit 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. Finally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service or that you exhibited any symptoms 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, 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 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,

4/28/2025

