



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

TJR
Docket No: 1378-01
16 August 2001

[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 14 August 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.

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 Marine Corps on 11 July 1972 at the age of 18. Your record reflects that on 5 February 1973 you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for a four day period of unauthorized absence (UA). The punishment imposed was a \$125 forfeiture of pay and restriction for seven days. On 5 September 1973 you were convicted by special court-martial (SPCM) of a 75 day period of UA and were sentenced to confinement at hard labor for two months and a \$400 forfeiture of pay. Shortly thereafter, on 20 November 1973, you received NJP for disrespect and were awarded a \$50 forfeiture of pay.

Your record further reflects that on 21 November 1973 you began a 111 day period of UA that was not terminated until you were apprehended on 12 March 1974. On 20 March 1974 you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred 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. Subsequently, your request was granted and your

commanding officer was directed to issue you an other than honorable discharge for 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 29 March 1974 you were so discharged.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully considered all mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity and your contention that you were unfairly treated and that you did not understand the long term effects of an other than honorable discharge. However, the Board found the evidence and materials submitted were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given your repetitive misconduct, lengthy and frequent periods of UA, and your request for discharge to avoid trial for a lengthy period of UA. 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. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Marine Corps when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. Finally, the Board noted that there is no evidence in the record, and you submitted none, to support your contention of unfair treatment. 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