



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

██████████
Docket No. 3968-25
Ref: Signature Date

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

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.

Although you did not file your application in a timely manner, the statute of limitations 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 November 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 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 an advisory opinion (AO) provided by a qualified mental health professional on 25 July 2025. Although you were provided with an opportunity to comment on the AO, you chose not to do so.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 19 January 1994. On 2 October 1995, a summary court-martial (SCM) convicted you of seven specifications of failure to go to appointed place of duty and two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 14 days. On 12 November 1995, you commenced on a period of UA that lasted two days. On 22 February 1996, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for being in a UA status for one day. On 23 December 1996, you received NJP for wrongful use of marijuana. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You elected to consult with legal counsel and requested an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB

found that you committed misconduct due to drug abuse and recommended you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge. In the meantime, you received an additional NJP for seven specifications of UA from restricted muster. Ultimately, the separation authority concurred with the ADB's recommendation and you were so discharged on 6 February 1997.

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 upgrade your discharge and contentions that you incurred mental health issues (PTSD) during military service resulting from being exposed to bombs and explosions, your misconduct was due to coping with undiagnosed PTSD, you used marijuana to cope with your PTSD, and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) diagnosed you with PTSD and determined your substance abuse was directly related to the trauma you endured while serving. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which included your DD Form 149 and the evidence you provided in support of it.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service. He submitted minimal outpatient records that note diagnoses of PTSD, Alcohol Use Disorder, Cocaine Use Disorder, Cannabis Use Disorder, and ADHD that are temporally remote to service. Furthermore, the notes do not provide a rationale for/history of the diagnosis and how it might relate to his time in service. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., active duty medical records, post-service mental health record describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his separation) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "There is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs and SCM, outweighed the potential mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug related offense. 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 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.

The Board also concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct may be attributed to a mental health condition that existed in service. 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,

12/5/2025

█