



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE RD
ARLINGTON, VA 2220

█
Docket No: 7173-25
Ref: Signature Date

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

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER █
XXX XX █ USMC

Ref: (a) 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 with attachments
(2) Case summary
(3) Advisory Opinion of 1 Dec 25

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 an upgrade to his discharge characterization of service.

2. The Board consisting of █, █, and █, reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 5 January 2026 and, pursuant to its regulations, determined that the corrective action indicated below should be taken on the available evidence of record. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of the enclosures, relevant portions of his naval service records, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies including references (b) through (e). Additionally, the Board considered enclosure (3), an advisory opinion from a qualified mental health professional, that was considered favorable to Petitioner.

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. Although Petitioner did not file his application in a timely manner, the statute of limitation was waived in accordance with the Kurta Memo.

b. Petitioner enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 25 February 2003. Between 27 May 2004 and 19 June 2006, Petitioner deployed in support of Operation Iraq Freedom and participated in combat operations. On 11 April 2007, Petitioner was evaluated by a medical officer as a result of him not been in compliance with Marine Corps body composition

standards. Subsequently, it was determined that Petitioner was not suffering from an underlying cause or associated disease. On 17 April 2017, Petitioner was notified that he was not in adherence with Marine Corps body composition standards and not eligible for Physical Performance Evaluation. Consequently, Petitioner was assigned to the Body Composition Program (BCP). On 6 August 2007, Petitioner was evaluated by a medical officer as a result of him not been in compliance with Marine Corps body composition standards. Subsequently, it was again determined that Petitioner was not suffering from an underlying cause or disease and that he should continue his participation in the BCP and remedial Physical Conditioning Program. On the same date, Petitioner was counseled concerning unsatisfactory performance while assigned to the BCP. Petitioner was advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation. On 16 October 2007, Petitioner was notified that he did not meet Marine Corps body composition standards but made satisfactory progress during his first months. Subsequently, Petitioner was granted a one-time extension for six months to meet body composition standards.

c. On 20 February 2008, Petitioner was evaluated by a medical officer as a result of combat stress related symptoms and diagnosed with Chronic PTSD and Major Depression. On 31 March 2008, Petitioner was evaluated by a medical officer who again determined that his body composition status was not due to an underlying cause or associated disease. Subsequently, Petitioner was recommended for administrative separation due to unsatisfactory performance while assigned to the BCP. On 23 July 2008, Petitioner was notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of unsatisfactory performance while assigned to the body composition program. On the same date, Petitioner waived his procedural rights. Petitioner's commanding officer recommended a General (Under Honorable Conditions) (GEN) discharge characterization of service by reason of unsatisfactory performance. After Petitioner's administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact, the separation authority approved a GEN discharge characterization by reason of unsatisfactory performance. On 4 September 2008, Petitioner was so discharged.

d. Petitioner contends he was diagnosed with combat PTSD only a few months prior to being separated from the Marine corps. Petitioner claims his PTSD symptoms have been on going even before his reenlistment and after his first deployment to Iraq. Petitioner asserts he did not know it at the time but it affected his ability to keep up with the physical standards of the Marine Corps. Petitioner states it got worse over time and he was prescribed some medication that did not help. Petitioner claims instead of being treated, he was forced to separate from the military. Petitioner states his goal was to serve at least 20 years; whether or not if that was ideal because of his conditions. Petitioner claims his weapon was taken away from him on the range because he had PTSD, and he was told that he was a danger to himself and others. Petitioner states he had it to work at the gym instead of continuing to coach on the range. Petitioner claims, before he got kicked out, he was told "well since you can't have a weapon, as you reenlisted for, you will be separated for been unable to perform duty." Petitioner states he needed help from the Marine Corps but instead he got kicked out with no guidance and a slap to his face with a GEN discharge. Petitioner claims he did not even know he could get VA disability until years later for combat PTSD (for which he is now 100 percent service connected).

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

e. In support of his application, Petitioner provided documentation copies of his Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) rated disabilities and combined ratings.

f. In connection with Petitioner's assertions that he incurred PTSD and other mental health concerns (MHCs) during military service, which might have contributed to his separation, the Board requested and reviewed an Advisory Opinion (AO) provided by a mental health professional. The AO stated in pertinent part:

Petitioner was appropriately referred for psychological evaluation during his enlistment and properly evaluated. He was diagnosed with PTSD attributed to combat exposure, for which the VA has granted service connection. There is some evidence in the service medical record that his failure to maintain physical standards could be conceptualized as behavioral indicators of avoidance and apathy associated with PTSD.

The AO concluded, "it is my considered clinical opinion that there is in-service evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD. There is in-service evidence that the circumstances of his separation may be attributed to PTSD."

CONCLUSION:

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

The Board found no error with Petitioner's reason for separation or assigned characterization of service and was not persuaded by his contention that he did not receive appropriate support from the Marine Corps. Based on the record, Petitioner was provide every opportunity to meet Marine Corps body composition standards and was unable to do so. While the Board considered Petitioner was diagnosed with PTSD in service, he was medically evaluated on multiple occasions and it was determined that his failure to meet body composition standards was not due to an underlying medical condition. This finding appears to have been supported by his initial positive progress once placed on the BCP. Based on the medical evaluations Petitioner received after failing to meet Marine Corps body composition standards, the Board determined his command acted reasonably and in accordance with applicable regulations in processing him for administrative separation.

Nevertheless, based on Petitioner's contention that he suffered from PTSD which negatively impacted his ability to meet Marine Corps body composition standards, the Board considered his case in light of references (b) through (e). After reviewing the record liberally and holistically, given the totality of the circumstances, and purely as a matter of clemency, the Board concluded Petitioner's discharge characterization of service should be upgraded to "Honorable." In making this finding, the Board substantially concurred with the AO that there is some evidence indicating that his failure to maintain physical standards could be conceptualized as behavioral indicators of avoidance and apathy associated with PTSD. In addition, based on the same rationale, the Board determined it was in the interests of justice to change Petitioner's basis for separation to reflect a Secretarial Authority discharge.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the above, the Board directs 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 4 September 2008, indicating he was discharged with an “Honorable,” characterization of service, narrative reason for separation of “Secretarial Authority,” SPD code of “JFF1,” separation authority of “MARCORPSEPMAN 6214,” and reentry code of “RE-1J.”

That Petitioner be issued an Honorable discharge certificate.

No further changes be made to Petitioner’s record.

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.

1/16/2026

