



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

█
Docket No. 9063-25
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 26 January 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 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 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.

You previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service and were denied relief on 25 August 2010. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in the Board's most recent decision.

After careful review, the Board reached the following conclusions and denied your current 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 you did not abuse cocaine, the Board noted that you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contention. The Board was unwilling to re-litigate findings that occurred over 20 years prior; especially when you chose not to appeal your NJP or contest your administrative separation processing. 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 were properly separated for misconduct with an OTH characterization of service.

The Board applied liberal consideration to your claim that you suffered from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, and to the effect that this condition may have had upon the conduct for which you were discharged in accordance with the Hagel 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 fact you provided no medical evidence in support of your claim even after the Board specifically requested such 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 and questioned how your mental health condition could excuse or mitigate misconduct that you deny committing. 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 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, the totality of your service, the relatively 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 claimed mental health condition, 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. 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. 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. In your case, it was misconduct that lasted your final two years of service.

While the Board noted that flawless service is not required to receive an Honorable characterization of service, the nature and gravity of your misconduct led them to conclude that your service was not Honorable. 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. In their opinion, it would also create an unwarranted and inaccurate assessment of your period of service that could potentially undermine the integrity of the Department of the Navy's personnel system. 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,

2/18/2026

