



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

██████████
Docket No. 9094-25
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 application 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), 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.

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 commenced period of active duty on 17 July 1991.
2. On 6 December 1991, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for failure to obey a lawful order.

3. On 7 April 1992, you received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA) totaling one hour and 40 minutes, failure to obey a lawful order, and wrongfully altering a liberty card.

4. On 31 March 1993, your urinalysis sampled was reported as positive for marijuana. A drug dependency evaluation determined you were not drug dependent.

5. On 15 April 1993, you received NJP for larceny of \$500.00 and wrongful use of marijuana.

6. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse and commission of a serious offense. After you elected to waive your rights, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the CO's recommendation for the basis of drug abuse and you were so discharged on 11 August 1993.

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

1. You were suffering from undiagnosed PTSD due to parental death while you were at sea and used marijuana to cope.

2. The root cause of your mental health condition was discovered through therapy.

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 for 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 did not 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 a 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 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 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 claimed mental health issues, 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. 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. In making this finding, the Board noted you provided no evidence in support of your application. 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. 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 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,

4/6/2026

