



Docket No. 4273-25
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 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 18 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) (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 enlisted in the Marine Corps Reserve and commenced initial active duty for training (IADT) on 10 June 1998. As part of your enlistment processing, you signed a statement of understanding requiring you to attend forty-eight scheduled drills and no less than fourteen days of active duty for training (ADT) per year after completing IADT. You completed IADT on 5 September 1998.

On 23 April 1999, you were selected for the Platoon Leaders Course (PLC) with orders to report no later than 6 June 1999. When applying for the program, you signed a statement of understanding indicating that if you were disenrolled from the program, you would be returned

to your unit to fulfill your service obligation. On 13 January 2000, the Officer Selection Office recommended your disenrollment from the PLC due to unauthorized absence from drill and insufficient academic performance, with a fall semester grade point average (GPA) of 0.6 and a cumulative GPA of 1.8. On 3 February 2000, you were notified of your disenrollment from the PLC. On 30 June 2000, you joined your reserve unit for duty. Your OMPF contains administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling entries indicating you were unauthorized absent (UA) from multiple drills between 5 January 2001 and 21 September 2003.

Unfortunately, most of the documents pertinent to your administrative separation processing are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on 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. Your OMPF includes a copy of the separation authority approval letter, dated 25 September 2003, directing your discharge Under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions due to unsatisfactory participation in the ready reserves. You were so discharged on the same day.

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 your commanding officer tried to interfere with your education, you were subjected to reprisals after you attempted to stand up for yourself, and that you now suffer from PTSD from that treatment. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149, your statement, and the letter from a behavioral health specialist 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 13 August 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:

- Letter from Behavioral Health and Addiction Specialist noting diagnosis of PTSD

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition during his military service or that he suffered from any symptoms incurred by a mental health condition. He submitted post-service evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD, however the description of events do not meet criterion A as per DSM V-TR guidelines.

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 (PTSD).”

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 repeated UAs from required drills, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board noted you provided no evidence, other than your personal statement, to substantiate your contention of mistreatment or a reprisal from your commanding officer.

Additionally, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service and insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct 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 description of events do not meet criterion A as per DSM V-TR guidelines. 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,

12/12/2025

■

Executive Director

Signed by: ■