



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

██████████
Docket No. 8059-25
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 24 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.

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 enlisted in the U.S. Navy and entered active duty on 11 August 1997.

2. On 9 October 1997, you acknowledged that you were disqualified from your enlistment option guaranteed of aircrew program due to being medically disqualified. However, on 7 November 1997, you refused to sign administrative remarks advising you that you are not eligible for guaranteed assignment due to medical disqualification.

3. On 17 February 1998, you received non-judicial punishment for unauthorized absence (UA). You were subsequently issued a counseling warning and advised any further deficiencies in your performance and or conduct could result in administrative separation with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service.

4. On 15 March 1999 you began a period of UA that ended on 21 December 2000.

5. On 2 January 2001, through military counsel, you requested a separation in lieu of trial by court-martial (SILT) with an OTH characterization for your 647 days of UA.

6. Ultimately, your request was approved by the separation authority, and you were so discharged on 25 January 2001.

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

1. During your enlistment you underwent evaluations which ultimately resulted in you being medically disqualified due to a heart murmur and possible anxiety, but no further testing or treatment was performed or offered.

2. You were struggling with a serious mental health condition that was affecting all aspects of your life including your performance and behavior.

3. You repeatedly reached out for help but your appeals were denied or dismissed.

4. With nowhere else to turn and your condition continuing to decline, you made the decision to seek treatment outside of your chain of command.

After careful review, the Board reached the following conclusions and denied your application for relief.

The Board initially concluded you were appropriately discharged based on your misconduct and SILT request. The Board noted you do not deny 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 review process, a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO on 29 December 2025. The Ph.D. 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 a diagnosable mental health condition. Although there is evidence that the Petitioner was very disappointed with his medical disqualification, there is no evidence that he received a formal mental health diagnosis. He has provided no medical evidence in support of his claims. Unfortunately, available records are not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct, particularly given his expressed desire for separation prior to his periods of UA. 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 Ph.D. 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 were not diagnosed in-service and 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, which involved a period of UA lasting 647 days, more than outweighed the potential mitigation offered by any mental health conditions.

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 Kurta Memo, 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, 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 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 found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board observed you were given multiple opportunities 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. 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. Further, the Board noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and determined that you already received significant clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and possible punitive discharge. Additionally, 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. Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. While the Board considered your possible need for benefits to address your health concerns, they determined the severity of your misconduct outweighed any mitigation resulting from that factor. While the Board 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,

4/10/2026
