



4. On 10 June 1983, you were issued Page 11 counseling for past convictions by civil authorities. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge.

5. On 30 June 1983, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of marijuana.

6. On 13 December 1983, you received another NJP for wrongful use of marijuana.

7. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation processing with an Under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You waived your rights to consult counsel, submit a statement, or have your case heard by an administrative discharge board. Ultimately, the separation authority directed your discharge with an OTH characterization of service, and you were so discharged on 10 February 1984.

After careful review, the Board reached the following conclusions and denied your application for relief.

The Board initially concluded you were appropriately processed for administrative separation based on your record of misconduct. While the Board carefully considered your contention for mitigation, the Board noted you did not deny committing the misconduct that formed the basis for your administrative separation and OTH discharge. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies to your administrative separation and no error exists with your record.

The Board also considered the totality of the circumstances to determine whether equitable relief was warranted in the interests of justice in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. In this regard, the Board considered, amongst other factors, the totality of your service, the non-violent nature of your misconduct, your relative youth and immaturity at the time of your misconduct, the negative effect your discharge has had on your life, your rehabilitation efforts, your post-service record of accomplishments, your advanced age, and the passage of time since your discharge.

The Board found that the mitigating factors were not nearly sufficient to justify any equitable relief. Specifically, the Board found that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed all of the mitigating factors combined. In particular, the Board determined that illegal drug use by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow service members. Further, the Board 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. Additionally, the Board noted that you provided no evidence in support of your application. However, even taking into consideration your youth at the time, the passage of time, and your post-service employment history, the Board found that your two civilian convictions and two incidents of wrongful use of

a controlled substance while on active duty outweighed the mitigation evidence offered. While the Board commends you for your post-service accomplishments, 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,

3/18/2026

