



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

Docket No. 4102-25
Ref: Signature Date

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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 29 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 11 August 2025. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit an AO rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 20 March 1974. Upon your enlistment, you admitted preservice arrest and charges for assault and battery, possession of a stolen auto, and disorderly conduct. On 3 September 1974, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted two days and resulted in nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on 5 September 1974. Between 9 September 1974 and 14 November 1975, you had two periods of UA totaling 385 days and resulting in your apprehension by civil authorities. On 19 November 1975, you were arrested and charged with grand theft auto and placed in civil confinement. On 2 January 1976, you requested to be administratively separated from service with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service in lieu of trial by court martial. . After your administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact,

the separation authority approved your discharge request and you were so discharged on 9 February 1976.

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 became fearful of things while going through bootcamp, (b) you began having nightmares of people chasing you and hearing voices in your head, (c) you informed your drill instructor about these matters and were told to shape up, (d) while in a training exercise, you were forced to crawl on the mud while tracer rounds were shot overhead, (e) you were not able to sleep because you would see people coming after you, (f) upon returning home from bootcamp, you began showing signs of anger, you were not able to trust anyone, and lost your wife and son as a result of your dreams and fights, (g) you tried again to tell someone about these issues but nothing was done, (h) you got into a fight with someone because of your thoughts that someone was trying to kill you, so you decided to take off and seek safety, and (i) post discharge, you were able to see a doctor and were diagnosed with Paranoia and Schizophrenia. 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:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition while in military service or that he suffered from any symptoms incurred by a mental health condition. He submitted one document indicating a diagnosis of Mental Health Disorder NOS that is temporally remote to service. Neither his personal statement nor the evidence submitted contains sufficient detail to provide a nexus between a mental health condition and his in-service misconduct. Additional records (e.g., active duty medical records, post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his separation) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion that 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 that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP, civil arrest and charge, lengthy periods of UA, and request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court martial, 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. The Board also noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in

lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and possible punitive discharge.

Finally, the Board concurred with the AO that there is insufficient evidence that your misconduct could be attributed to a mental health condition. 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 and agreed with the AO that your medical evidence and personal statement lacked the necessary detail to provide a nexus between your misconduct and a 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.

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,

12/8/2025

█