



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

TJR
Docket No: 2980-01
19 October 2001



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 16 October 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 Navy on 13 March 1972 at the age of 18. Your record reflects that during the period from 8 January to 30 May 1973 you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on five occasions for a six day period of unauthorized absence (UA) and four periods of absence from your appointed place of duty. On 25 October 1973 you began another period of UA. On 11 December 1973, while in a UA status, you were convicted by civil authorities of larceny and sentenced to confinement for 10 days. Although military authorities were notified that you should be picked up upon completion of the sentence to confinement, they did not do so and you remained UA until 30 April 1974 when you were apprehended by civil authorities after being in a UA status for 189 days.

Subsequently, on 7 June 1974, you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA. Your record shows that 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. 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 11 July 1974 you were issued an other than honorable discharge.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully considered all mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity, good post service conduct, and your contention that you would like your discharge changed because you are in dire need of assistance to care for your family. However, the Board found the evidence and materials submitted were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given the seriousness of your repetitive misconduct in both the military and civilian communities, your lengthy period of UA, and your request for discharge to avoid trial for this offense. 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 Navy when your request for discharge 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