



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

██████████  
Docket No. 2510-25  
Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████  
████████████████  
████████████████

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 25 August 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). The Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional on 8 July 2025. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, 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 and began a period of active duty on 27 August 1991. After a period of continuous Honorable service, you immediately reenlisted and commenced your last period of

active duty on 13 July 1998. On 1 September 2001, you extended your enlistment. On 20 June 2002, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted 615 days. Upon your return, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. You decided to waive your procedural rights and your commanding officer recommended an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service. The separation authority approved the recommendation and you were so discharged on 26 March 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 contentions that: (a) you have over ten years of continuous service for which you were awarded two Good Conduct Medals, (b) you assert PTSD was not a condition that was discussed and counseling was not offered either at that time, (c) you could not leave your family alone again as this would have been your third six-month deployment, (d) you have maintained your family together and remained married since 1991, (e) you have two children who are married and also gainfully employed, and (f) you have maintained employment and have no interactions with law enforcement. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149 and your discharge certificate from your first enlistment.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO 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. He has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. Unfortunately, his personal statement is 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 AO concluded, "There is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD."

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 lengthy period of UA, 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. Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. As explained in the AO, there is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service, or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. 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 noted that, although one's service is generally characterized at the time of discharge based on performance and conduct throughout the entire enlistment, the conduct or performance of duty reflected by only a single incident of misconduct may provide the underlying basis for discharge characterization. There is no precedent within this Board's review, for minimizing the "one-time" isolated incident. As with each case before the Board, the seriousness of a single act must be judged on its own merit, it can neither be excused nor extenuated solely on its isolation.

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. 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. 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 the 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,

9/9/2025

