



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

[REDACTED]
Docket No. 6044-25
Ref: Signature Date

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

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

Ref: (a) 10 U.S.C. § 1552
(b) 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 her naval record be corrected to upgrade her characterization of service and to make other conforming changes to her DD Form 214.

2. The Board, consisting of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 1 August 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, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include reference (b).

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 originally enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active service on 9 May 2005. Petitioner's pre-enlistment physical examination, on 9 April 2005, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic conditions, history, or symptoms.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

d. On 9 August 2005, Petitioner underwent a psychiatric evaluation. The Medical Officer (MO) diagnosed Petitioner with a borderline personality disorder. The MO recommended Petitioner's administrative separation.

e. Petitioner's command counseled her and documented such counseling in a memorandum, dated 15 August 2005, entitled "Written Notice of Deficiencies" (Memo). The Memo noted that Petitioner's performance and/or conduct was unsatisfactory because she was not showing the ability to successfully complete recruit training. The Memo noted that Petitioner was being recommended for a convenience of the government discharge due to having a borderline personality disorder.

f. On 16 August 2005, Petitioner's command initiated administrative separation proceedings by reason of convenience of the government on the basis of being unqualified due to a physical condition, not a disability. Petitioner waived, in writing, her rights to consult with counsel and submit written statements. Petitioner acknowledged and understood that her discharge would be an uncharacterized entry level separation ("ELS").

g. On 23 August 2005, the Separation Authority (SA) approved and directed Petitioner's separation from the Marine Corps with an ELS discharge. On the same day, Petitioner was discharged from the Marine Corps with an uncharacterized ELS and assigned an RE-3P reentry code. Petitioner's DD Form 214 blocks 25, 26, and 28 (separation authority, separation code, and narrative reason for separation, respectively) corresponded with an ELS discharge for a personality disorder.

h. In short, Petitioner contended, in part, she was injured and pulled out of her platoon two days before graduation with a stress fracture in her pelvis. She stated she underwent a bone scan, refused surgery, and was purportedly was told it would result in a discharge. Petitioner stated that she was also told that the injury was common among women of her body type, she could wait six months, and if she was not better she would be discharged as a Marine. Petitioner contended that she talked to someone at medical that asked if she wanted to be there anymore and she said "no." Petitioner further contended that the doctor said she could be discharged but it would make her ineligible for Department of Veterans Affairs services as it would be an ELS. Petitioner stated she accepted that, and took the ELS, but contended she didn't realize it would be characterized as a "personality disorder" on her DD214. Petitioner also checked the "Other Mental Health" box on her application but did not respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of her claim.

CONCLUSION:

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board concluded that Petitioner's request warrants partial relief. Specifically, 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, behavior, and/or adjustment 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

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER [REDACTED]
XXX XX [REDACTED] USMC

Petitioner's discharge should not be labeled as being for a mental health-related condition and that certain remedial administrative changes are warranted to the DD Form 214.

Notwithstanding the recommended corrective action below, the Board determined Petitioner's uncharacterized ELS discharge remains appropriate. The Board noted that separations initiated within the first 180 days of continuous active duty will be described as ELS except in certain limited cases involving unusual circumstances not applicable in Petitioner's case. Additionally, 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 her circumstances, and that such notation was proper and in compliance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of her discharge.

Even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants granting Petitioner the relief she requested or granting the requested relief as a matter of clemency or equity. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that Petitioner's request does not merit relief.

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) indicating that, for the period ending 23 August 2005, she was discharged with a separation authority of "MARCORSEPMAN par. 6214," separation code of "JFF1," and narrative reason for separation of "Secretarial Authority."

That no further changes be made to Petitioner's record.

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.

8/5/2025

