



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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 6 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 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) and the 25 July 2018 guidance from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations (Wilkie Memo). In addition, the Board considered an advisory opinion (AO) from a qualified mental health professional. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

1. You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 11 December 2001.
2. On 3 September 2004, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for three specifications of the wrongful use of a controlled substance (amphetamines, methamphetamines, and ecstasy).
3. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You were informed that the least favorable

characterization of service you may receive is Under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions. You waived your rights to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The separation authority approved the Commanding Officer's recommendation and you were so discharged on 4 October 2004.

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

1. You were getting ready to have a baby and the mother of your child did not want to move to █ when the █ was relocating from █.
2. Your baby's mother told you if you went, she and the baby would never see you again, so being young and dumb you decided to get out of the Navy.
3. You did some illegal substance and told your division to drug test you.
4. You were honorable until that happened.
5. You wish you never did this, you were going to do 20 years like your grandpa did, now your daughter just joined the Navy.
6. You were eventually diagnosed with ADHD and depression, are sure you had these disorders when you were in the Navy, and think this could have been one of the reasons you made this error in judgement.

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 of mitigation, 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 requested an AO. As part of the Board's review process, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an advisory opinion (AO) on 29 December 2025. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of another diagnosable mental health condition. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms of a mental health condition or provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his statement that his

decision to engage in misconduct was to facilitate a separation from service so that he could be with his new family. Additional records may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, “Based on a review of all available evidence, it is my considered clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence that his misconduct may be attributed to a mental health condition.”

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 Kurta Memo. 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 you provided no medical evidence in support of your claim. 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 and recognized the same concerns raised in the AO. 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 Kurta Memo, 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 desire for an upgrade to your characterization of service, your contentions regarding the circumstances of your misconduct, 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 candor and remorse, your claimed mental health issues, the evidence you provided in support of your application, 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. Additionally, the Board noted that, although one’s service is generally characterized at the time of discharge based on performance and conduct throughout the entire enlistment, the conduct or performance of duty reflected by only a single incident of misconduct may provide the underlying basis for discharge characterization. There is no precedent within this Board’s review, for minimizing the “one-time” isolated incident. As with each case before the Board, the seriousness of a single act must be judged on its own merit, it can neither be excused nor

extenuated solely on its isolation. 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. 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.

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,

3/27/2026

