



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

█
Docket No. 5264-25
Ref: Signature Date

From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records
To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER █, USN,
XXX-XX-█

Ref: (a) Title 10 U.S.C. §1552
(b) SECDEF Memo of 3 Sep 14 (Hagel Memo)
(c) PDUSD Memo of 24 Feb 16 (Carson Memo)
(d) USD Memo of 25 Aug 17 (Kurta Memo)
(e) USECDEF Memo of 25 Jul 18 (Wilkie Memo)

Encl: (1) DD Form 149 w/attachments
(2) Naval record (excerpts)
(3) Advisory opinion

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Subject, hereinafter referred to as Petitioner, filed enclosure (1) with the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) requesting for an upgrade of her characterization of service.

2. The Board, consisting of █, █, and █, reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 12 December 2025 and, pursuant to its regulations, determined that the corrective action indicated below should be taken. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of Petitioner's application together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of Petitioner's naval record, applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include references (b) through (e). In addition, the Board considered enclosure (3), an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although Petitioner was provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, she chose not to do so.

3. The Board, having reviewed all the facts of record pertaining to Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice, finds as follows:

a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under existing law and regulation within the Department of the Navy.

b. Although enclosure (1) was not filed in a timely manner, the statute of limitation was waived in accordance with the Kurta Memo.

c. Petitioner enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 13 May 1985.

d. On 25 October 1985, Petitioner reported to █ for duty.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER [REDACTED], USN,
XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

e. Petitioner had a period of unauthorized absence (UA), from 14 December 1985 – 13 January 1986, for which she received Summary Court-Martial (SCM) on 30 January 1986.

f. Consequently, Petitioner was notified that she was being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. Petitioner was advised of her procedural rights and submitted a conditional waiver in which she agreed to waive her right to an administrative discharge board, provided she be recommended for at least a General (Under Honorable Conditions) character of service.

g. The Separation Authority (SA) disapproved the conditional waiver, and directed Petitioner be offered an opportunity to execute a new statement of awareness and election of privileges. Petitioner elected an hearing before an administrative discharge board (ADB).

h. On 27 May 1986, the ADB was convened and found Petitioner had committed misconduct. The ADB recommended Petitioner be administrative discharges with a General (Under Honorable Conditions) (GEN) characterization of service.

i. The SA accepted the ADB's recommendation and the Petitioner was so discharged on 28 July 1986.

j. Petitioner contends the following injustices warranting relief:

(1) She left base due to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) after a serious incident at the hospital during [REDACTED].

(2) She was assigned to Labor & Delivery during her rotation when a hysterical pregnant woman came into the Hospital and delivered a stillborn baby. She was not informed or equipped for what happen when she was handed the stillborn baby and asked to footprint and photograph. She disassociated and left the base.

(3) She asked to change to a different military occupational specialty (MOS) but was told she could not.

(4) She was told she would receive an upgrade automatically.

(5) She has not been in any legal or other trouble since the Navy.

k. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of Petitioner's application; which included her DD Form 149, personal statement, copies of her post-service medical records, and pages from her service and medical records.

l. As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed Petitioner's contentions and the available records and provided the Board with enclosure (3). The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that Petitioner was diagnosed with a mental health condition during military service. Temporally remote to her military service,

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER ██████████, USN,
XXX-XX-██████

she has received a diagnosis of PTSD from a civilian provider. This diagnosis is attributed to a traumatic precipitant during corpsman training. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to attribute her misconduct to a mental health condition. More weight has been given to the in-service report of UA due to family stressors and the death of her father. The post-service diagnosis of PTSD notes a delayed onset, which indicates that full-diagnosed criteria were not met until at least six months after the traumatic event.

The AO concluded, "It is my considered clinical opinion that there is post-service evidence from a civilian provider of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that her misconduct may be attributed to PTSD."

CONCLUSION

Upon careful review and consideration of all of the evidence of record, the Board determined that Petitioner's request warrants relief.

The Board found no error in Petitioner's administrative separation or assigned GEN characterization of service. However, because Petitioner based her claim for relief in whole or in part upon her PTSD, the Board reviewed her application in accordance with the guidance of references (b) through (c).

The Board applied liberal consideration to Petitioner's experience and the effect that it may have had upon her misconduct. Ultimately, the Board agreed with the AO conclusion that there is post-service evidence of PTSD but insufficient evidence that her misconduct could be attributed to PTSD. Nevertheless, the Board determined it was in the interests of justice, purely as a matter of clemency, to upgrade Petitioner's characterization of service to Honorable and change her reason for separation to reflect a Secretarial Authority discharge. In making this finding, the Board determined the severity of Petitioner's misconduct, in light of the circumstances of her UA and the brevity of her service, was insufficient to justify a GEN discharge. While the Board was not persuaded by her current contentions regarding the reason for her UA, they noted that her misconduct would not normally result in an administrative separation and Petitioner was not afforded an opportunity to correct her deficiencies.

Notwithstanding the recommended corrective action below, the Board determined Petitioner's assigned reentry code remains appropriate in light of her unsuitability for further military service. Ultimately, the Board concluded that any injustice in Petitioner's record is adequately addressed by the recommended corrective action below.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the above, the Board recommends that the following corrective action be taken on Petitioner's naval record in the interests of justice:

That Petitioner be issued a new Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) reflecting that, for the period ending 28 July 1986, she was discharged with an "Honorable"

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER [REDACTED], USN,
XXX-XX-[REDACTED]

characterization of service, narrative reason for separation of "Secretarial Authority," SPD code of "JFF," and separation authority of "MILPERSMAN 3630900."

That Petitioner be issued an Honorable discharge certificate.

That no further corrective action be taken on Petitioner's naval record.

That a copy of this record of proceedings be filed in Petitioner's naval record.

4. It is certified that quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above entitled matter.

5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 723.6(e)), and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing corrective action, taken under the authority of reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

1/16/2026

