



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

██████████
Docket No. 3289-25
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 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 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 17 July 2025. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 28 October 1980. Prior to coming on to active duty, you received a waiver for wrongful use of a controlled substance-marijuana. On 5 August 1982, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for violation of a written lawful order – drug related. On 10 February 1983, you were counseled concerning the use of a controlled substance and advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation. On 16 March 1983 and 18 November 1983, you received NJP for two instances of wrongful use of a controlled substance-marijuana.

Consequently, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse; at which point, you decided to waive your procedural rights. Your commanding officer recommended an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service and the separation authority approved the recommendation. On 13 January 1984, you were so discharged.

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 experienced mental health trauma while in service, (b) while undergoing nuclear prototype training, you experienced severe anxiety, psychological distress, and fear of radiation exposure, (c) your mental health began deteriorating and you decided to seek self-relief by self-medicating with marijuana, (d) you did not understand the consequences of your actions or having access to the appropriate mental health care, (e) you have live a life of responsibility, contributed positively to society through civilian service, and uphold strong morals and ethic standards, (f) you are the proud spouse of a Navy veteran, raised your two daughters, and became the proud grand parent for eight children, (g) you have maintained a clean record, with no arrests or citations, demonstrating his dedication to being a law-abiding and productive citizen, and (h) you have maintained employment, obtained a bachelor's degree in business administration from ██████████, and worked as a teacher for Title one schools in his community. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149 and the evidence you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for a mental health assessment and properly evaluated during his military service. He was diagnosed with a personality disorder and denied experiencing clinically significant symptoms of another mental health condition that would warrant a diagnosis. His personality disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. A personality disorder diagnosis is pre-existing to military service by definition, and indicates lifelong characterological traits unsuitable for military service, since they are not typically amenable to treatment within the operational requirements of Naval Service. Petitioner has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his pre-service substance use that appears to have continued in service.

The AO concluded, "There is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to a mental health condition."

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 NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the

seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included drug related offenses. 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. 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. The Board also 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 you provided no medical evidence in support of your claim. 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 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,

9/30/2025

