



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

█
Docket No. 6963-25
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 your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your case on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 10 February 2026. 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 25 August 2017 guidance from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (Kurta Memo), the 3 September 2014 guidance from the Secretary of Defense regarding discharge upgrade requests by Veterans claiming post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)/mental health condition (MHC) (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 an advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional on 9 December 2025. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

The following is the relevant factual background of your case based upon review of your naval record and/or the matters provided with your application:

1. You entered active duty with the Marine Corps on 13 February 1989.

2. On 26 February 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of marijuana.

3. On 29 June 1992, you tested positive for marijuana and cocaine. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You elected to consult with legal counsel and requested an administrative discharge board (ADB).

4. The ADB found that you committed misconduct due to drug abuse and recommended you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge. Subsequently, a drug evaluation recommended Level II treatment, a medical evaluation, you be placed on the urinary surveillance, and administrative separation. The separation authority concurred with the ADB and directed your discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. On 20 October 1992, you were so discharged.

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. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies to the finding that you committed the misconduct that formed the basis of your administrative separation and no error exists with your OTH characterization of service.

However, because you raised the issue of mental health, the Board requested an AO. As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your request and provided the Board with an AO. The mental health professional stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was evaluated and diagnosed with a substance use disorder. Temporally remote to his military service, the VA has granted service connection for PTSD and other mental health concerns. Although substance use may be a behavioral indicator of self-medication of undiagnosed mental health symptoms, it is difficult to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or another mental health concern, particularly given pre-service use resulting in a waiver and his denial of substance use in service. Additional records (e.g., post service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "there is post-service evidence from the VA of diagnoses of PTSD and other mental health concerns 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 substance use disorder."

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 sufficient evidence of a diagnosis of mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. This conclusion is supported by the AO and your post-service diagnosis from the VA. However, 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 and recognized the same concerns raised in the AO.

In addition to applying liberal consideration to your claimed mental health condition and its potential effect upon your conduct in accordance with the Hagel and Kurta Memos, the Board also considered the totality of the circumstances to determine whether equitable relief is warranted in the interests of justice in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. In this regard, the Board considered, amongst other factors, your contentions, the totality of your service, your need for veterans' benefits, 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 candor and remorse, your mental health issues, 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. The Board also observed you were given an opportunity 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. Finally, the Board believed that it would be unjust to characterize your less than honorable service in the same manner as the service of the thousands of service members who, unlike you, honorably completed their enlistments without engaging in misconduct warranting the early curtailment of their service. Therefore, the Board did not find an upgrade of your discharge to General (Under Honorable Conditions) or Honorable to be warranted in the interests of justice. 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 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,

2/22/2026

