



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

BJG
Docket No: 2082-01
28 June 2001

MAJ [REDACTED] USMCR
[REDACTED] DR
[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

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. You requested promotion reconsideration for the Fiscal Year (FY) 1997 and 1998 Marine Corps Reserve Lieutenant Colonel Selection Boards.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 27 June 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 Headquarters Marine Corps, dated 4 May 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 concerning the FY 1997 selection board, and they found this opinion equally applicable to the FY 1998 board. 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:

1600
CMT
4 May 01

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

Subj: RESERVE AFFAIRS ADVISORY OPINION ON BCNR APPLICATION; CASE
[REDACTED] USMCR

Ref: (a) Memo from MAG-42 dtd 3/7/01

1. Recommend [REDACTED] request to remove his failure of selection be denied. The following justification is provided.
2. [REDACTED] request to remove his failure of selection is based on the fact that the FY97 promotion board did not have access to his accurate Career Retirement Credit Record (CRCR). Specifically, at the time of the FY97 board [REDACTED] CRCR showed four unsatisfactory years from 1994-1997. Per the reference, the CRCR was in error and has been corrected.
3. Although [REDACTED] CRCR was inaccurate at the time of the FY97 promotion board, it must be noted that the CRCR is not the only tool used by the promotion board. The officer's Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) and Master Brief Sheet are the primary sources of information used in the selection process. A review of [REDACTED] military record shows complete fitness reports that cover the entire four-year period in question. It is unlikely that [REDACTED] failure of selection was a result of an inaccurate CRCR since his record clearly shows his performance during the four-year period.
4. [REDACTED] fitness reports are competitive. However, his record does show significant trends in the areas of additional duties, force and economy of management. In addition, there are date gaps in his record that total 3 years and 10 months. These date gaps occurred during 1982, 1986-1988 and 1993. These factors could cause his record to appear less than competitive to a promotion board.
5. Based on the above information, there is no compelling reason to remove [REDACTED] of selection.
6. Point of contact [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
By direction