



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

Docket No. 10896-24
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 5 May 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.

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 commenced active duty on 24 June 2005. On 13 June 2006, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) and two specifications of wrongful use of cocaine. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation processing with an Under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge by reason of

misconduct due to drug abuse. You elected to consult with legal counsel and requested an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB found that you had committed misconduct and recommended that you be discharged under OTH conditions by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. The separation authority concurred with the ADB, approved and directed an OTH characterization of service, and you were so discharged on 1 December 2006.

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 change your discharge characterization of service and restoration to paygrade E-3. You contend that your misconduct was mitigated by PTSD you incurred in service from bullying because you joined the Navy in your mid-thirties, you subsequently developed alcoholism and addiction, and that your command should have offered you treatment instead of disciplining and discharging you. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your petitioner that included your statement, Memorial Hospital Records of May 2006, Service treatment records, and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) PTSD questionnaire you provided.

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 17 March 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner contends he incurred mental health issues (PTSD) during military service, which may have contributed to the circumstances of his separation from service.

Petitioner submitted the following items in support of his claim:

- Records from Memorial Hospital (May 2006) noting, "[Petitioner] found in wooded area and does not know how he got there. Last day he remembers is Saturday...Pt refusing to give urine for lab at this time."
- Partial active duty records
- VA Disability and Benefits Questionnaire (DBQ) May 2024 noting diagnosis of PTSD

There is no evidence that the Petitioner suffered from a mental health condition or that he exhibited any symptoms of a mental health condition while in military service. Review of records note an ER visit in May 2006 whereby he refused a urinalysis; this behavior is unfortunately indicative of a lack of candor.

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 your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved drug offenses. 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service and insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, there is no evidence that you suffered from a mental health condition or that you exhibited any symptoms of a mental health condition while in military service. Additionally, the Board noted inconsistencies between your in-service denial of drug use and assertion of innocent ingestion and your current contentions that you should have received treatment for alcoholism and addiction, and that your drug abuse was due to your mental health issues. 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 discharge¹. 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,

5/22/2025



¹ Based on this finding, the Board found that your discharge paygrade remains appropriate.