



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

██████████  
Docket No. 9919-25  
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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. Your current request has been carefully examined by a three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session on 5 May 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, 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) 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. Although you were provided an opportunity to respond to the AO, you chose not to do so.

You previously applied to this Board for a discharge upgrade and were denied relief on 25 June 2014. Prior to applying to this Board, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. The NDRB denied your request, on 3 January 1991, after determining your discharge was proper as issued. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in this Board's previous decision.

In your current application to this Board, you express a desire for your discharge character of service be upgraded and contend that you just moved out of severe physical/mental abuse from a family member, you turned to alcohol, and that was the cause of your behavior during your enlistment.

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 did 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 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 review process, a licensed clinical psychologist (Ph.D.) reviewed your contentions and the available records and issued an AO on 24 February 2026. The Ph.D. stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that the Petitioner was diagnosed with or suffered from any mental health condition or symptoms while in service. He submitted one letter from a nurse indicating treatment for alcohol dependence secondary to anxiety and depression; however, the letter submitted does not contain any indication that his post-service diagnoses are related to his time in service. Furthermore, assault and writing checks with insufficient funds are not typical behaviors that can be said to have been caused by a mental health condition. His personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to provide a nexus between his misconduct and any mental health condition. 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 Ph.D. concluded, "Based on the available evidence, it is my clinical opinion that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that existed in service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to any 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 your post-service medical evidence does not indicate your current diagnosis is related to your service. 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. Additionally, the Board took into consideration you did not raise a mental health issue with your previous application despite having every incentive to do so. Therefore, the Board questioned your candor and/or reliability of recall in this matter. 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 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 current 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 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. The Board also considered the likely discrediting effect your civilian conviction had on the Navy. 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. 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,

5/28/2026

Executive Director

Signed by: