



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 14 April 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 Board also considered the advisory opinion (AO) furnished by a qualified mental health professional and your response to the AO.

- You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 17 June 1983.
- On 29 March 1985, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful use of methamphetamines.
- On 31 December 1985, you were arrested by civilian authorities for possession of cocaine.

- On 4 June 1986, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You were informed of the basis for this recommendation and that the least favorable characterization of service you may receive is Under Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions. You elected your right to consult with counsel but waived your right to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer (CO) forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an OTH characterization of service. The separation authority approved the recommendation and directed your administrative discharge from the Navy. You were so discharged on 3 July 1986.

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

- You were unaware that you were struggling with PTSD and the effects of PTSD caught up with you. You made mistakes that you will regret for the rest of your life.
- You endured high-stress, hazardous working conditions and exposure to traumatic incidents. You now recognize that you were experiencing symptoms consistent with PTSD.
- You were experiencing persistent hypervigilance and exaggerated startle response, nightmares and intrusive recollections, emotional detachment and difficulty maintaining trust, and episodes of anxiety and irritability that impaired your judgment.
- Your untreated symptoms directly contributed to your difficulty coping and to the behaviors that led to your separation.
- Your symptoms were present during your military service and materially contributed to the circumstances of your discharge.
- You take full responsibility for what happened and you are deeply sorry.
- Since your discharge, you have worked every day to be a better man. You have volunteered at your local fire department and try to give back.
- Your service, your struggles, and the life you have built since your discharge deserves to be recognized.

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 OTH discharge 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, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 4 February 2026. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with or suffered from PTSD or any mental health condition/symptoms while in service. He submitted evidence of diagnoses of anxiety, depression, alcohol use and PTSD that are temporally remote to service. Furthermore, the letter provided by his treating psychiatrist does not cite the rationale for/etiology of his claimed PTSD. Additional records (e.g., active-duty medical records, post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his separation) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "Based on the available evidence, it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of PTSD or any other mental health condition that existed in service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to PTSD or any other mental health condition."

In response to the AO, you submitted additional evidence in support of your application. After reviewing your rebuttal evidence, the AO remained unchanged.

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 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 AO and the fact your medical evidence is temporally remote and fails to provide an etiology for your diagnosis. 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. 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 included two separate drug offenses nine months apart, 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 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, your rehabilitation efforts, your post-service record of accomplishments, your candor and remorse, your service to your

community, your current mental health issues, the evidence you provided in support of your application, your advanced age, 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 and possession 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 also found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board observed you were given an opportunity 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 also considered the discrediting effect your civil arrest for cocaine possession had on the Navy. 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 commends you for your post-service accomplishments and rehabilitation efforts, 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,

4/27/2026

