



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
2 NAVY ANNEX
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

CRS
Docket No: 4603-01
13 May 2002

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 1 May 2002. 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, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinion furnished by the Specialty Advisor to the Surgeon General for Psychiatry dated 21 August 2001, a copy of which is attached. The Board also considered the decisional document prepared by the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB), after your personal appearance before NDRB on 14 November 2000.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinion, and with the first four conclusions set forth on pages 7 and 8 of NDRB's decisional document. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously 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,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director

Enclosure

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHIATRY
NAVAL MEDICAL CENTER
PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA 23708-2197

6520
0506: SLB-0890
21 AUG 01

From: Case Reviewers
To: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records,
Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C. 20370-2179
Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE CASE
OF FORMER GMG3- [REDACTED] USN, [REDACTED]
Ref: (a) Your letter of 03 JUL 01
Encl: (1) BCNR file
(2) Service Record
(3) Medical Record

1. Pursuant to reference (a), a review of enclosures (1) through (3) was conducted to form opinions about subject petitioner's claim that he suffered with a bipolar disorder during his period of military service, and that it significantly contributed to the misconduct which led to his discharge.

2. Facts of the case:

(a) The service member did not endorse any depression or excessive worry, loss of memory or amnesia, frequent trouble sleeping, or nervous trouble of any sort on the SF-93 during his enlistment physical on 26 Feb 81 or during his re-enlistment physical on 29 Jan 85.

(b) The service member did report "depression or excessive worry" and "nervous trouble of any sort" on the SF-93 during his discharge physical on 01 APR 86. This was ascribed by the examiner, LT [REDACTED], MC, USNR, to being overly concerned with family and work issues in the past. A psychiatric evaluation was not recommended, and no psychiatric diagnosis was made.

(c) In a Narrative Summary dated 06 Jun 84 from the Alcohol Rehabilitation Center, Norfolk, Dr. [REDACTED], the General Medical Officer assigned to ARC, diagnosed the member with Alcohol Dependence, in remission.

(d) The member failed to adhere to aftercare as recommended by Dr Moreci at his discharge from ARD, and did not participate in treatment with Antabuse, as recommended by Dr Moreci.

(e) The member had multiple NJP's, dating to the very earliest days of his enlistment (the first in September, 1981) for unauthorized absence, disobeying orders, failure to complete

SEP 21

assigned maintenance, and drunk and disorderly conduct, among others.

(f) The member was found to be emotionally stable and fit to handle explosives on three separate evaluations from August, 1982 to July, 1985.

(g) In Dr. [REDACTED]'s letter dated 12 Dec 00, he described the member as having been exposed to a disruptive home environment and to maladaptive behavioral patterns in his youth. He also reported that the member had significant academic and disciplinary problems during high school. He described a family history of depression and drug abuse and a pattern of drug and alcohol use by the patient in high school to control mood swings and behavioral problems. After his separation from the navy, the member experienced recurrent psychiatric problems leading to hospitalization, and required multiple medications to manage his psychiatric symptoms. He also reported that the member's family described a pattern of behavior consistent with bipolar disorder prior to entry into the Navy. Psychological testing of the member performed by Dr. Madsen supported diagnoses of schizoaffective disorder, substance abuse, and a personality disorder.

3. The following opinions are submitted:

(a) The available documentation, which does not include any psychiatric evaluations from prior to or during his enlistment, is not sufficient to support conclusively that the member suffered from bipolar disorder during his enlistment. While the history supplied by Dr. [REDACTED] is strongly suggestive of a Major Mood Disorder, the patient's behavioral patterns prior to and during enlistment, and his disruptive upbringing, strongly suggest that a personality disorder may have been a major contributor to his symptomatology.

(b) There is no evidence that the member was unduly influenced by his mental state at the time he engaged in the misconduct which led to his discharge.

4. Recommendation: Based on review of the provided documentation, there is insufficient evidence to justify a change in the character of the member's discharge from the United States Navy.

5. This review was conducted by LT [REDACTED] MC USNR under the supervision of CDR [REDACTED] MC USN, staff psychiatrist.

[REDACTED]
LT MC USNR

[REDACTED]
CDR MC USN

[REDACTED]
LCDR MC USN