



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

TJR  
Docket No: 1220-00  
27 June 2000

[REDACTED]

Dear [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 13 June 2000. 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.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found you enlisted in the Navy on 30 April 1969 at the age of 20. Your record reflects that on 30 June 1970 you were convicted by summary court-martial (SCM) of a 110 day period of unauthorized absence (UA) and were sentenced to a \$200 forfeiture of pay.

Your record also reflects that on 30 April 1971 you began a 1,314 day period of UA that was not terminated until you were apprehended on 4 December 1974. On 13 February 1975 you were convicted by civil authorities of possession of controlled substances and stolen property and were sentenced to confinement for a year. On 22 October 1975 you began a 217 day period of UA that was not terminated until 26 May 1976.

Subsequently, you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge for good of the service in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing two periods of UA totalling 1,531. Prior to submitting this request, you consulted with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of

accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted and your commanding officer was directed to issue you an other than honorable discharge by reason of the good of the service. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor. On 16 July 1976 you were so discharged.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application considered all mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity and your contention that you would like your discharge upgraded. The Board further considered your contention that it has been over 20 years since you were discharged. However, the Board found the evidence and materials submitted were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given the serious nature of your misconduct in both the military and civilian communities, your lengthy periods of UA, and your request for discharge to avoid trial for your misconduct. Further, the Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved since, by this action, you escaped the possibility of confinement at hard labor and a punitive discharge. The Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy when your request was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. 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