



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

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 2342-25
Ref: Signature Date

From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records
To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], USN, XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

Ref: (a) 10 U.S.C. § 1552
(b) USECDEF Memo of 25 July 2018 (Wilkie Memo)

Encl: (1) DD Form 149 with attachments
(2) Case summary

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Subject, hereinafter referred to as Petitioner, filed enclosure (1) with the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board), requesting that his naval record be corrected to upgrade his characterization of service and to make other conforming changes to his DD Form 214.

2. The Board, consisting of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 21 March 2025 and, pursuant to its regulations, determined that the corrective action indicated below should be taken. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of Petitioner's application together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of Petitioner's naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include reference (b).

3. The Board, having reviewed all the facts of record pertaining to Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice finds as follows:

a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under existing law and regulations within the Department of the Navy.

b. Although enclosure (1) was not filed in a timely manner, it is in the interests of justice to review the application on its merits.

c. The Petitioner originally enlisted in the U.S. Navy and began a period of active service on 4 August 1992. Petitioner's pre-enlistment physical examination, on 22 October 1991, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions, history, or symptoms.

d. On 18 August 1992, Petitioner, was diagnosed with personality disorder while still in initial recruit training. The Medical Officer (MO) specifically noted that Petitioner was not

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], USN, XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

considered mentally ill but manifested a longstanding disorder of character and behavior which was of such severity as to render him incapable of serving adequately in the Navy. The MO noted that Petitioner did not require, and would not benefit from, further hospitalization or psychiatric treatment. The MO deemed Petitioner fit for return to duty for immediate processing for administrative separation, which the MO recommended should be initiated expeditiously.

e. On 19 August 1992, Petitioner's command initiated administrative separation proceedings by reason of convenience of the government due to a personality disorder; as evidenced by a lack of motivation and improper behavior. On the same day, Petitioner waived his rights in writing to both consult with counsel and to include written rebuttal statements. Petitioner did not object to his separation.

f. On 21 August 1992, Petitioner's commanding officer (CO) recommended Petitioner's administrative separation. In his endorsement, the CO stated:

Subject member was referred for medical evaluation due to exhibiting abnormal behavior during recruit training. After appropriate counseling and warning he continued with unsatisfactory behavior in a military environment. Subject member has been diagnosed as suffering from a personality disorder which renders him incapable of providing useful military service...He is not recommended for reenlistment.

g. Ultimately, after serving for only twenty-three (23) days on active duty, Petitioner was discharged from the Navy with an uncharacterized entry level separation (ELS) and assigned an RE-4 reentry code on 26 August 1992. As noted on Petitioner's DD Form 214, blocks 25, 26, and 28 listed entries that corresponded with an ELS discharge for a personality disorder.

h. Petitioner contends that he was not discharged as dishonorable and that his discharge characterization of service should be changed to match the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) characterization of his service as Honorable. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of the evidence Petitioner provided in support of his application.

CONCLUSION:

Upon review and liberal consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board concluded that Petitioner's request warrants partial relief. Specifically, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Wilkie Memo, the Board determined that it would be an injustice to label one's discharge as being for a diagnosed character and behavior disorder. Describing Petitioner's service in this manner attaches a considerable negative and unnecessary stigma, and fundamental fairness and medical privacy concerns dictate a change. Accordingly, the Board concluded that Petitioner's discharge should not be labeled as being for a mental health-related condition and that certain remedial administrative changes are warranted to the DD Form 214.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], USN, XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

The Board initially determined that Petitioner's administrative separation for a personality disorder was legally and factually sufficient, and in accordance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of his discharge. The Board noted that personality disorders are characterized by a longstanding pattern of unhealthy behaviors, dysfunctional relationships, and maladaptive thinking patterns. They are not conditions considered unfitting, disabling, or impair one's ability to be accountable for their actions or behaviors, but render service members unsuitable for military service and consideration for administrative separation. The Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that Petitioner was not mentally responsible for his conduct or that he should otherwise not be held accountable for his actions.

Additionally, the Board noted that separations initiated within the first 180 days of continuous active duty will be described as ELS except in those limited Navy cases: (a) when an Honorable discharge is approved by the Secretary of the Navy in cases involving unusual circumstances not applicable in Petitioner's case, or (b) where processing under a more serious basis is appropriate and where characterization of service under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) upon discharge is warranted.

Additionally, the Board also noted that VA discharge characterizations and eligibility determinations for health care, disability compensation, and other VA-administered benefits are for internal VA purposes only. Such VA eligibility determinations are not binding on the Department of the Navy and have no bearing on previous active duty service discharge characterizations. Thus, while the VA may have described Petitioner's service as Honorable in certain correspondence, such a VA determination was irrelevant in relation to the ELS discharge characterization assigned to Petitioner by the U.S. Navy.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in Petitioner's ELS discharge/characterization, and concluded that Petitioner's conduct and behavior clearly merited his discharge. Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants granting Petitioner the relief he requested or granting the requested relief as a matter of clemency or equity.

Lastly, the Board did not find a material error or injustice with the Petitioner's original "RE-4" reentry code. The Board concluded the Petitioner was assigned the correct reentry/reenlistment code based on the totality of his circumstances, and that such notation was proper and in compliance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of his discharge.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing, the Board finds the existence of material errors warranting the following corrective action.

That Petitioner be issued a new Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), for the period ending 26 August 1992, indicating his narrative reason for separation as "Secretarial Authority," separation authority as "MILPERSMAN 3630900," and separation code as "JFF."

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], USN, XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

That all other information currently listed on such DD-214 remain the same.

That a copy of this report of proceedings be filed in Petitioner's naval record.

4. It is certified that a quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above entitled matter.

5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 723.6(e)), and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing corrective action, taken under the authority of reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

3/31/2025

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

Signed by: [REDACTED]