



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE RD  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204

█  
Docket No. 3538-25  
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 was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Consequently, your application has been denied.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 9 January 2026. 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. The Board also considered a 21 July 2025 advisory opinion (AO) from a Licensed Clinical Psychologist. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, 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.

A review of your naval record reveals that you enlisted in the Navy and commenced active duty on 13 August 2015. Your last day of active duty was 17 May 2024; at which time you received your final performance evaluation covering the period 23 November 2016 through 17 May 2024. According to the evaluation, you were described as an irreplaceable analyst on the watch floor and an unrivaled lead analyst. It further described you as being instrumental in ensuring mission success and described significant metrics of your accomplishments. It stated that you were a sustained superior trainer, and you were recommended for early promotion. According to your Certificate of Discharge or Release from Active Duty (DD Form 214), you were discharged due to completion of your required service with an Honorable characterization of service. You were also assigned a reentry code of RE-R1; which meant that you were eligible for reenlistment.

In your application to this Board, you request to have your discharge corrected to reflect that you received a service disability retirement due to post-traumatic stress disorder. In support of your request, you provided a statement in which you described that, while you were on active duty, a service member that worked for your wife committed suicide and you were heavily involved in assisting the family of the Sailor. You assert this caused you to use alcohol and resulted in your diagnosis of PTSD. In further support of your request, you provided a variety of medical records which, along with your entire petition, were reviewed by the preparer of the AO for specialized assistance in reviewing those documents.

As noted, in order to assist it in reviewing your application, the Board obtained an AO from a Licensed Clinical Psychologist. According to the AO, there is evidence in the medical records that you provided that you were diagnosed with Alcohol Use Disorder, Depressive Disorder, and Adjustment Disorder while in service. Further, according to the AO:

His diagnosis of Depressive Disorder was later removed and was more likely Adjustment Disorder with Depressed Mood. There is no evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD contained within the Petitioner's service record, nor did he submit any evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD. Both his in-service and post-service records depict a very severe Alcohol Use Disorder that was documented to have likely worsened his reported symptoms of depression. Furthermore, it was documented that he did not meet criteria for any "major psychiatric disorders."

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that there is sufficient evidence of diagnoses of Adjustment Disorder and Alcohol Use Disorder in service. There is insufficient evidence that his narrative reason for separation is in error.

The Board carefully reviewed your contentions and the material that you submitted in support of your request and it disagreed with your rationale for relief. The Board analyzed whether you should have been placed into the Disability Evaluation System (DES) and reviewed by the PEB while you were in service. Here, the Board determined that you provided insufficient evidence that there was an error or injustice in the fact that you were not so referred to the DES while in service. In reviewing evidence of errors or injustice with respect to disability retirements, the Board observed that, in order to qualify for military disability benefits through the DES with a finding of unfitness, a service member must be unable to perform the duties of their office, grade, rank or rating as a result of a qualifying disability condition. Alternatively, a member may be found unfit if their disability represents a decided medical risk to the health or the member or to the welfare or safety of other members; the member's disability imposes unreasonable requirements on the military to maintain or protect the member; or the member possesses two or more disability conditions which have an overall effect of causing unfitness even though, standing alone, are not separately unfitting. In addition, as noted above, the Board also applies a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties.

In light of the foregoing standards, the Board observed that your naval records do not reflect any indication that, while you were in service, there was any error in the fact that you were allowed

to separate at your end of obligated active service and you received a favorable DD Form 214. In that regard, the Board noted that your available naval records do not contain, nor have you provided, any evidence to suggest you were unfit for further service. In fact, the available records demonstrate that you were fit for service at the time of your separation and assigned a reentry code that allowed you to reenlist; which is inconsistent with being unfit for further service. In addition, the Board noted that your records do not contain, nor did you provide, any evidence that any of your treating physicians while you were in service recommended that you be reviewed by a Medical Evaluation Board (MEB) for potential referral into the DES. Further, your records do not contain, nor did you provide, any evidence that anyone in your chain of command believed you were unfit. To the contrary, your final performance evaluation was highly laudatory and recommended you for early promotion. All of this information is inconsistent with a service member that was unfit for continued service. Further, the Board also considered that, prior to your separation, you would have undergone a Separation Physical Examination (SPE). The Board did not have a copy of the SPE, nor did you provide it, but the Board presumed that such SPE would have found you fit for separation based on the fact that you were, in fact, separated, and you were found eligible for reenlistment. Finally, the Board substantially concurred with the findings of the AO, which explained that you did not have a PTSD diagnosis while you were in service, you did not provide evidence of a PTSD diagnosis, and opined that there was insufficient evidence that your narrative reason for separation was in error. Accordingly, the Board found that you provided insufficient evidence to overcome the presumption of regularity that you were fit to serve through the end of your obligated service. In conclusion, in its review of all of the evidence, the Board did not observe any error or injustice in your naval records. 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,

1/20/2026

