

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

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

> Docket No. 11757-24 Ref: Signature Date




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 23 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, 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). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional and your response to the AO.

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 U.S. Navy and began a period of active duty on 28 September 2001. On 20 August 2002, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA). You were issued a counseling warning and advised that subsequent violations of the UCMJ or conduct resulting in civilian conviction could result in an administrative separation under Other



than Honorable (OTH) discharge. You received your second NJP, on 18 February 2003, for UA and insubordinate conduct toward a petty officer. On 12 April 2004 you began a period of UA that ended on 7 May 2004. On 18 May 2004, you received your third NJP for the period of UA and missing ship's movement.

On 13 July 2004, you began another period of UA that ended on 20 September 2004; during which you missed ship's movement. On 9 October 2004, you were found guilty at summary court-martial (SCM) for your 69 day UA and missing ship's movement. You were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay and reduction in rank. Consequently, you were notified of administrative separation processing for misconduct commission of a serious offense and pattern of misconduct. After you waived your rights, the Commanding Officer (CO) made his recommendation to the Separation Authority (SA) that you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization. The SA accepted the recommendation, and you were so discharged for pattern of misconduct on 8 December 2004.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contention that you believe your undiagnosed and untreated mental health issues caused you to behave in ways you didn't want to and you didn't know how to deal with it at the time. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you provided in support of your application.

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 17 March 2025. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. He has provided limited medical evidence that is temporally remote to his military service and appears unrelated. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct. 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 diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health concern that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that the Petitioner's misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health concern."

In response to the AO, you provided additional evidence documenting your treatment for a diagnosis of major depressive disorder. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

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 NJPs and SCM 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. Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health concern. As explained in the AO, the limited medical evidence you provided is temporally remote to your military service and appears unrelated. The Board further agreed that the available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct. 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 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.

