



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

██████████
Docket No. 10575-24
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 limitations 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 30 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)/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). The Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional; dated 7 March 2025. Although you were provided with an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to do so.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 3 September 1991. On 7 May 1993, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for two specifications of making a false official statement. On 23 July 1993, you received NJP for using provoking speeches and gestures and assault consummated by a battery upon a Petty Officer. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. You elected to consult with legal counsel and requested an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB found that you committed misconduct due to commission of a serious

offense and recommended you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge. The separation authority concurred with the ADB and you were so discharged on 30 November 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 and contentions you incurred PTSD or a mental health condition during military service due to racial discrimination and mistreatment by fellow shipmates, racial injustice and mistreatment was the culture onboard the ship, and you were not considered or identified as needing mental health treatment after experiencing racial injustice. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The mental health professional 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 did not submit any medical evidence in support of his claim. Furthermore, his description of events do not meet criteria for PTSD as per DSM-V-TR guidelines. 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 existed in 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 your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, outweighed the potential 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 an opportunity 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.

Further, the Board concurred with AO that there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As pointed out in the AO, 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. The AO also noted you failed submit any medical evidence in support of your claim and agreed with the assessment that your description of events do not meet the criteria for PTSD under the DSM-V-TR guidelines. 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. Moreover, even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your serious misconduct more than outweighed the potential mitigation offered by any mental health conditions.

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 provided 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,

5/14/2025

