



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

██████████
Docket No. 10884-24
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 28 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 provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Navy and commenced active duty on 22 December 1982. On 27 May 1984, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that ended with your surrender on 29 May 1984. On 10 September 1984, you commenced another period of UA that ended with your surrender on 10 October 1984. On 14 December 1984, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for UA.

On 2 January 1985, you commenced another period of UA that ended with your surrender on 6 January 1985. You commenced another period of UA on 11 February 1985, during which time you missed ship's movement, that ended with your surrender on 1 April 1985. Following your

return, you were convicted at Special Court-Martial (SPCM) of your UAs and missing ship's movement. You were sentenced to confinement for two months, forfeiture of \$413 pay per month for two months, reduction to E1, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). After completion of all levels of review, you were so discharged on 13 January 1986.

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 characterization of service and your contentions that you experienced mental health issues prior to your discharge and received inpatient treatment. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application that included documentation of post-discharge good character and 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 5 March 2025. The AO noted in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated during two inpatient hospitalizations. His personality disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. A personality disorder diagnosis is pre-existing to military service by definition, and indicates lifelong characterological traits unsuitable for military service, since they are not typically amenable to treatment within the operational requirements of Naval Service. Temporally remote to his military service, he has received another mental health diagnosis that appears unrelated to his service. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition other than personality disorder. 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, "there is insufficient evidence from of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition, other than personality disorder."

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 NJP and SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the likely negative impact 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 BCD. 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 to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As the AO noted, you were appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during your enlistment and properly evaluated during two inpatient hospitalizations. Your personality disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during your period of service, the information you chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. The post-discharge diagnosis is temporally remote to your service and appears unrelated. 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 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,

5/27/2025

