

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 12349-24 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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session on 21 May 2025, has carefully examined your current request. 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 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)/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). The Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) provided by a qualified mental health professional on 18 April 2025 and your response to the AO.

You also previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade but were denied on 27 April 2010 and 28 November 2022. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in the Board's previous decisions.

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 discharge and contentions that you incurred a mental health condition (PTSD) during military service and your



discharge should be changed to a medical discharge due to you having PTSD. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the evidence you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The mental health professional stated in pertinent part:


There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition during his military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a mental health condition. He submitted evidence of mental health diagnoses that are temporally remote to service. Furthermore, the nature of his misconduct is not typical behavior that can be said to be caused by PTSD; Repetitive larceny is not a common behavior associated with symptoms of PTSD. He did not cite any traumatic events or mental health issues during his separation proceedings or during prior BCNR petition. His personal statement lacks sufficient detail to provide a nexus between his misconduct and any mental health condition. Additional records (e.g., active duty medical records, post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his separation) would aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

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."

In response to the AO, you submitted a personal statement that provided additional information regarding the circumstances of your case. 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 your misconduct, as evidenced by your non-judicial punishment and special court-martial, outweighed the potential 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 an opportunity to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct, which led to your Other Than Honorable (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 AO there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As pointed out in the AO, there is no evidence you were diagnosed with a mental health condition during your military service or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a mental health condition. The AO also noted that although you submitted evidence of mental health diagnoses, they are temporally remote to your service and the nature of your misconduct is not typical behavior that can be said to be caused by



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.

Finally, the Board found insufficient evidence to support a change to your narrative reason for separation to a medical discharge. First, the Board found no evidence to support a finding that you were unfit for continue naval service at the time of your discharge. As pointed out in the AO, you were never diagnosed for PTSD while in service and you did not exhibit any behavior that would indicate you were symptomatic of a mental health condition. Other than your misconduct, the Board found no evidence you were unable to perform the duties of your office, grade, rank, or rating due to a qualifying disability condition. Second, even if there was evidence of unfitness, the Board determined you were ineligible for a disability discharge based on your misconduct based administrative separation that resulted in an OTH discharge.

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.

