



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

MEH:ddj  
Docket No: 4-01  
24 April 2001



This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the 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 24 April 2001. 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 CMC memorandum 1000 MMEA-6 of 11 April 2001, a copy of which is attached.

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. 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 THE NAVY  
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS  
3280 RUSSELL ROAD  
QUANTICO, VIRGINIA 22134-5103

IN REPLY REFER TO:

1000  
MMEA-6  
13 APR 2001

MEMORANDUM FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF  
NAVAL RECORDS

Subj: BCNR DOCKET NO. 08599-00 CASE OF [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] USMC

1. We have reviewed all documents pertaining to Sergeant [REDACTED] request for reenlistment of four years and payment of Zone A SRB. Due to a combination of factors, we do not recommend Sergeant [REDACTED] request be approved.

2. On 4 August 2000, Sergeant [REDACTED] requested a 36 month reenlistment. On 14 September 2000, he was approved for a 36 month reenlistment and executed this reenlistment on 12 October 2000.

3. In addition to a statement from Sergeant [REDACTED] Career Planner, notes obtained by MMEA from Sergeant [REDACTED] reenlistment counseling session show that Sergeant [REDACTED] and his Career Planner discussed his desire to submit for a 36 month reenlistment, not a 48 month reenlistment. The actual reenlistment request for 36 months supports these documents as well. Finally, had the typographical error on the reenlistment contract actually been in section 8a as Sergeant [REDACTED] contends, the reenlistment incentive portion of the contract in section 8b should have read, "reenlisted for Zone A SRB multiple x1." The fact that the contract does not have a SRB incentive statement in section 8b leads MMEA to believe the real typographical error is the "4" in section 8b which should in actuality be a "3".

4. Point of contact is Capt [REDACTED] at ext [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

ASSISTANT HEAD, ENLISTED ASSIGNMENT [REDACTED]