



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

█
Docket No. 5685-25
Ref: Signature Date

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

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF █
█ USMC

Ref: (a) 10 U.S.C. § 1552
(b) SECDEF Memo of 13 Sep 14 (Hagel Memo)
(c) USD Memo of 25 August 2017 (Kurta Memo)
(d) USECDEF Memo of 25 July 2018 (Wilkie Memo)

Encl: (1) DD Form 149 with attachments
(2) Case summary

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 that his naval record be corrected to upgrade his characterization of service and to make other conforming changes to his DD Form 214.

2. The Board, consisting of █ reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 27 February 2026 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, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include references (b) through (d). Additionally, the Board also considered an advisory opinion (AO) furnished by qualified mental health provider. Although Petitioner was provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, he 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 regulations within the Department of the Navy.

b. Although enclosure (1) was not filed in a timely manner, it is in the interests of justice to review the application on its merits.

c. The Petitioner enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active service on 25 March 2003. Petitioner's pre-enlistment physical examination, on 30 January 2002, and self-

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] USMC

reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions, history, or symptoms.

d. On 27 February 2004, Petitioner underwent a psychiatric evaluation. The Medical Officer (MO) diagnosed Petitioner with an "Occupational Problem / Personality Disorder NOS." The MO determined that Petitioner's personality disorder rendered him unsuitable for continued military service. The MO also recommended Petitioner's expeditious administrative separation.

e. On 1 March 2004, Petitioner's command issued him a "Page 11" counseling entry (Page 11) concerning Petitioner's diagnosed personality disorder. The Page 11 also noted that Petitioner was charged with violating Articles 90 and 92 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice when he left the limits of [REDACTED] without a liberty buddy after his curfew.

f. On the same day, Petitioner received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for disobeying a superior commissioned officer and violation of a lawful written order. Petitioner did not appeal his NJP. On 23 March 2004, Petitioner received NJP for insubordinate conduct. Petitioner did not appeal his NJP.

g. On 25 March 2004, Petitioner's command initiated administrative separation proceedings by reason of convenience of the government due to his diagnosed personality disorder. On 31 March 2004, the Petitioner's commanding officer recommended to the Separation Authority (SA) that he should receive an Honorable discharge characterization.

h. However, on 19 April 2004, the SA approved and directed Petitioner's separation with a "General (Under Honorable Conditions)" discharge characterization ("GEN"). Ultimately, on 5 May 2004, Petitioner was discharged from the Marine Corps with a GEN characterization of service and was assigned an RE-3P reentry code. Petitioner's DD Form 214 that blocks 25, 26, and 28 (separation authority, separation code, and narrative reason for separation, respectively), corresponded with a discharge for a personality disorder.

i. In short, Petitioner contended that a discharge upgrade is necessary "to get my life back in order." Petitioner was requesting the discharge upgrade, in part, to make it easier for getting employment and to make it so he was not ashamed or embarrassed when needing to show his DD 214.

j. A licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed Petitioner's contentions and the available records and issued an AO dated 12 September 2025. As part of the Board's review, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated, in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated on multiple occasions. His personality disorder diagnosis was based on observed behaviors and performance during his period of service, the information he chose to disclose, and the psychological evaluation performed by the mental health clinician. A personality disorder diagnosis is pre-existing to military service by definition, and indicates lifelong characterological traits unsuitable for military service, since they are not typically amenable to

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] USMC

treatment within the operational requirements of Naval Service. Unfortunately, he has provided no medical evidence to support his claims of PTSD. His in-service misconduct appears to be consistent with his diagnosed personality disorder, rather than evidence of PTSD or another mental health condition incurred in or exacerbated by military service.

The Ph.D. concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition, other than personality disorder."

CONCLUSION:

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

The Board initially determined that Petitioner's administrative separation for a personality disorder was legally and factually sufficient, and in accordance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of his discharge. The Board noted that personality disorders are characterized by a longstanding pattern of unhealthy behaviors, dysfunctional relationships, and maladaptive thinking patterns. They are not conditions considered unfitting, disabling, or impair one's ability to be accountable for their actions or behaviors, but do render service members unsuitable for military service and consideration for administrative separation.

However, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Hagel, Kurta, and Wilkie Memos, the Board determined that Petitioner's mental health-related experiences mitigated the misconduct used to characterize his discharge. The Board concluded that Petitioner's mental health-related conditions and/or symptoms as possible causative factors in the misconduct underlying his discharge and characterization were not outweighed by the severity of Petitioner's misconduct. With that being determined, and while not condoning Petitioner's cumulative misconduct, the Board determined that flawless service is not required for discharge upgrade consideration under these particular circumstances. Thus, the Board concluded that no useful purpose is served by continuing to characterize the Petitioner's service as having been under GEN conditions, and that a discharge upgrade to "Honorable" (HON) is appropriate at this time. Additionally, in light of the Wilkie Memo, the Board still similarly concluded after reviewing the record holistically, and while not necessarily excusing or endorsing Petitioner's misconduct, and given the totality of the circumstances and purely as a matter of leniency and clemency, that a discharge upgrade to HON is warranted.

Additionally, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Wilkie Memo, the Board determined that it would be an injustice to label one's discharge as being for a diagnosed character and behavior disorder. Describing Petitioner's service in this manner attaches a considerable negative and unnecessary stigma, and fundamental fairness and medical privacy concerns dictate a change. Accordingly, the Board concluded that Petitioner's discharge should not be labeled as being for a mental health-related condition and that certain remedial administrative changes are also warranted to the DD Form 214.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] USMC

Notwithstanding the recommended corrective action below, the Board did not find a material error or injustice with the Petitioner's original "RE-3P" reentry code. The Board concluded the Petitioner was assigned the correct reentry/reenlistment code based on the totality of his circumstances, and that such notation was proper and in compliance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of his discharge.

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing, the Board finds the existence of material errors warranting the following corrective action.

That Petitioner be issued a new Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), for the period ending 5 May 2004, indicating he was discharged with an "Honorable" characterization of service, narrative reason for separation of "Secretarial Authority," separation authority of "MARCORSEPMAN par. 6214," and separation code of "JFF1."

That Petitioner be issued an Honorable Discharge Certificate.

That no other changes to Petitioner's record is merited.

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

4. It is certified that a 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.

3/6/2026

