



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

██████████  
Docket No. 10804-24  
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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence 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 of the Board, sitting in executive session 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 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.

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 a discharge upgrade and were denied relief on 22 April 2014 and 14 May 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 was not limited, your request to upgrade your characterization of service so you can obtain Department of Veterans Affairs benefits and your contentions that you were attacked on 11 October 1989, never had mental health issues prior, the attack caused you to change, and this led to your discharge. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board further noted you provided a request for medical opinion but did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

As part of the Board review process, a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed your contentions and the available records, and issued an AO dated 27 February 2025. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. There is behavioral evidence of a possible alcohol use disorder, existing prior to enlistment and continuing throughout his military service. He has provided evidence of another mental health diagnosis that is temporally remote to his military service and appears unrelated. Unfortunately, it is difficult to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military service, given pre-service alcohol and substance use that appears to have continued in service. 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 Ph.D. concluded, "There is insufficient evidence of a mental health diagnosis that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to a mental health condition, other than a possible alcohol use disorder."

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your five non-judicial punishments, 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.

Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct may be attributed to a mental health condition, other than a possible alcohol use disorder. As explained in the AO, there is behavioral evidence of a possible alcohol use disorder that existed prior to enlistment and continued throughout your military service. While you have

provided evidence of another mental health diagnosis, the Board agreed that it is temporally remote to your military service and appears unrelated. The Board further agreed that it is difficult to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military service; given pre-service alcohol and substance use that appears to have continued in service. 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.

Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits or enhancing educational or employment opportunities.

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 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,

5/12/2025

