



Docket No. 7334-25
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 23 March 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) (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 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 Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 1 July 2002.
2. You deployed from 9 January 2003 to 22 June 2003 and earned the Combat Action Ribbon and Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal during that deployment.
3. On 18 November 2003, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that ended in your surrender on 20 November 2003.

4. You deployed again from 29 November 2003 to 22 May 2004.

5. On 5 April 2005, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of cocaine.

6. 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 (ADB). Ultimately, the separation authority directed your discharge with an OTH characterization of service and you were so discharged on 23 May 2005.

In your application to this Board, you express a desire for your discharge character of service be upgraded and contend that:

1. You were still an immature teenager when you first served your country in combat.

2. You experienced the horrors of war, including seeing the dead and fearing your own mortality.

3. You struggled post discharge, but ultimately overcame your challenges and have achieved success.

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. The Board noted you admitted to committing the misconduct that formed the basis of 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.

However, because you raised the issue of mental health, the Board also 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 fact you provided no medical evidence in support of your claim and chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence. 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.

In addition to applying 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, 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, your desire for an upgrade to your characterization of service, your contentions, the totality of your service to include service highlights, 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 claimed mental health issues, the evidence you provided in support of your application, the character references 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 found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Your conduct was sufficiently serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. Therefore, even taking into consideration all the mitigation factors in your case, the Board found that your misconduct while on active duty outweighed the mitigation evidence offered. While the Board commends you for your post-service rehabilitation efforts and acknowledged the personal difficulties you have endured, ultimately, the Board concluded an upgrade of your discharge characterization of service is not warranted in the interests of justice.

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,

4/9/2026

