

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 11035-24 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 12 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 after disclosing pre-service marijuana use and commenced active duty on 10 June 1990. On 6 March 1992, you were found guilty at Summary Court Martial (SCM) of violation of Navy Regulations by unlawfully possessing a .380 caliber revolver on ...

On 2 April 1993, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for

disrespect toward a superior commissioned officer. Additionally, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge. On 8 July 1993, you received NJP for two specifications of unauthorized absence from your appointed place of duty.

Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation processing with an Under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You waived your rights to consult counsel, submit a statement, or have your case heard by an administrative discharge board. The separation authority subsequently directed your discharge with an OTH characterization of service and you were so discharged on 13 September 1993.

You previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service where you contended that your discharge unjust because you suffered from undiagnosed and untreated PTSD. The Board denied your request on 21 March 2022.

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 your contentions that your discharge unjust because you suffered from undiagnosed and untreated PTSD, you regret your actions, and you have worked hard to rebuild your life post-discharge. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which included your statement, VA rating decision, and psychology notes 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 20 March 2025. 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:

One psychology office visit (February 2022) whereby he was diagnosed with PTSD and Anxiety

VA compensation and pension rating noting 50% service-connection for PTSD

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition during his military service. He submitted one record indicating diagnoses of PTSD and Anxiety that are temporally remote to service. Furthermore, the majority of his misconduct is not typically caused by symptoms of PTSD.


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 SCM and NJPs, 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 and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service and insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. As explained in the AO, your post-discharge diagnoses are temporally remote your service and the majority of your misconduct is not typically caused by symptoms of PTSD. 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, 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,

5/30/2025