



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

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 3170-25
Ref: Signature Date

[REDACTED]

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.

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, considered your application on 15 September 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 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) (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. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You previously applied, on three occasions, to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service. In your first application, you contended that your discharge was unjust because you were told your discharge would be upgraded after six months, it had been over twenty years, and you felt you had paid your debt long enough. The Board denied your request on 23 February 2012. In your second application, you contended that your discharge was unjust because you were young and careless, enough time had passed, and you were told your discharge would automatically upgrade after six months. Your second application was denied on 11 August 2015. Your third application was administratively closed, due to the lack of new evidence, on 18 May

2017. 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 change your discharge characterization of service and your contentions that you experienced behavioral issues prior to the military which worsened during service time and that you have been diagnosed with PTSD post-service. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149, your Department of Veterans Affairs identification card, and the hospitalization records that you provided.

As part of the Board's review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO on 15 July 2025. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner contends he incurred mental health issues (PTSD) during military service, which may have contributed to the circumstances of his separation from service.

Petitioner submitted the following items in support of his claim:

- Discharge Summary from [REDACTED] (2019) noting diagnoses of Cocaine Use Disorder, Cannabis Use Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, and Alcohol Use Disorder
- History and Physical exam from [REDACTED] (2019) noting voluntary admission for cocaine dependence.

There is no evidence that the Petitioner suffered from a mental health condition or any symptoms incurred by a mental health condition while in military service. He submitted evidence of Cocaine Use Disorder, Cannabis Use Disorder, Major Depressive Disorder, and Alcohol Use Disorder that are temporally remote to service. His personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to provide a nexus between his in-service misconduct and any mental health condition.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition or PTSD that existed in service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your three non-judicial punishments, 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. Therefore, after the application of the standards and principles contained in the Wilkie Memo, the Board found that your service fell well below the minimum standards for a General (Under Honorable Conditions) or Honorable characterization of service.

Further, the Board applied liberal consideration to your claim that you suffered from a mental health condition, and to the effect that this condition may have had upon the conduct for which you were discharged in accordance with the Hagel and Kurta Memos. Applying such liberal consideration, the Board found insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. This conclusion is supported by the AO and the fact your medical evidence is temporally remote to your service. Additionally, even applying liberal consideration, the Board found insufficient evidence to conclude that the misconduct for which you were discharged was excused or mitigated by your mental health condition. In this regard, the Board simply had insufficient information available upon which to make such a conclusion. 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.

Sincerely,

9/30/2025
[REDACTED]