



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

█  
Docket No. 7265-25  
Ref: Signature Date

█  
█  
█  
  
Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 the 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, 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 the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional, on 16 December 2025, and your response to the AO.

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 enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 24 June 1999.
2. On 29 March 2004, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for a period of unauthorized absence (UA) and wrongful use of a controlled substance-methamphetamine.

3. Consequently, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse, at which point, you decided to waive your procedural rights.

4. On 15 April 2004, you were evaluated by a medical officer due to pending separation from service. Consequently, an occupational problem was noted during the evaluation. On 20 April 2004, your commanding officer recommended you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service. The separation authority approved the recommendation and you were so discharged on 6 May 2004.

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, the Board considered the AO. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. During military service, he was seen by military mental health providers and received no mental health diagnosis. He has provided no medical evidence to support his claims. Although UA and substance can be considered behavioral indicators of PTSD, there is insufficient information in this case to make that determination. 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, "it is my considered clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of PTSD or another mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to PTSD or another mental health condition."

In response to the AO, you provided additional evidence in support of your application. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged after it was determined your medical evidence was temporally remote to your service.

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 insufficient evidence of a diagnosis of mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. This conclusion is supported by the AO and the fact your medical evidence is temporally remote to your service. Additionally, 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. Moreover, even if the Board assumed that your misconduct was somehow attributable to any mental health conditions, the Board unequivocally concluded that the severity of your serious misconduct more than outweighed the potential mitigation offered by any mental health conditions.

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 post-service record of accomplishments, your candor and remorse, your mental health issues, the personal family circumstances that you contend contributed to your misconduct, the character reference you provided for review, 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 acknowledged that a majority of your service was conducted without incidents, however, the Board noted the conduct or performance of duty reflected by only a single incident of misconduct may provide the underlying basis for discharge characterization. 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. While the Board commends you for your post-service rehabilitation efforts and 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 the 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

