

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 341-25 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 10 June 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 and your response to the AO.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 27 March 1990. On 28 August 1991, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for a period of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling two days. Additionally, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) retention warning counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct as evident by your misconduct for which you were awarded NJP. On 27 February 1992, you were found guilty by a summary court-martial of a period of UA totaling 54 days. On 2 June 1992, you received your second NJP for a period of UA totaling two days. On 12 January 1993, you received your third NJP for UA and wrongful use of marijuana.

Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct, commission of a serious offense, and drug abuse. You were informed that the least favorable characterization of service you may receive is Under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions. You waived your right to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer (CO) forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an OTH characterization of service. The separation authority approved the recommendation and you were so discharged on 27 January 1993.

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 character of service and contentions that you are older now, you are employed in a supervisory position, and you are an active member in your community and church. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which included your DD Form 149 and the evidence you provided in support of it.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 23 April 2025. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. He was evaluated and denied a substance use disorder during military service. However, there is behavioral evidence of a possible alcohol use disorder. Temporally remote to his military service, a civilian provider has diagnosed him with chronic PTSD that may be attributed to military service, particularly given the lapse in time from his military service and his referral for treatment. 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 post-service evidence from a civilian provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition."

In response to the AO, you submitted additional supporting documentation. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evident by your NJPs and SCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug offense. 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 noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use

while serving in the military. Further, 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 that while there is post-service evidence from a civilian provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service, there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition. As the AO explained, there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Finally, the Board determined your diagnosis from a civilian provider is too temporally remote from your military service. 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.

