



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

TJR  
Docket No: 4489-01  
19 October 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 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 February 1989 at the age of 19. Your record reflects that during the period from 5 to 17 May 1989, after undergoing drug and alcohol evaluations, you were diagnosed as alcohol dependent.

Your record contains a letter from your commanding officer which notes that you required further treatment for your alcohol dependency. The letter noted, in part, as follows:

As per (Member's) drug and alcohol evaluation of 11 May 1989; self referral due to relapse after completion of an alcohol treatment program she claims occurred prior to active duty; alcohol dependent; requires further treatment.

Your record also contains a Drug and Alcohol Abuse Report (DAAR) dated 2 June 1989 which notes that on 5 May 1989 you were recommended for an administrative separation. The report noted, in part, the following:

Alcohol related incident of 5 May 1989; (Member) alcohol dependent; this incident with a clinical psychologist for suicidal ideation; diagnosed alcohol dependent with less than 180 days of active duty; no potential for future Naval Service; process for administrative separation.

On 13 June 1989 you were notified of proposed actions for an administrative separation by reason of erroneous enlistment due to alcohol dependency. You waived the right to respond to the notification and did not object to the separation. At that time you also declined inpatient treatment at a Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) hospital for your alcohol dependency.

On 20 June 1989 you were separated from the Navy with an uncharacterized entry level separation by reason of defective enlistment and induction/erroneous enlistment due to alcohol dependence, and were assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity. The Board also considered your contentions that you abused alcohol but were not alcohol dependent, and that you completed an alcohol rehabilitation program after separation. However, the Board concluded these factors and contention were not sufficient to warrant a change in your reenlistment code. The Board concluded that the diagnosis of alcohol dependency, failure to participate in the DVA inpatient treatment program, and type of discharge were sufficient to support the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code. Further, such a code is authorized and normally assigned when individuals are separated due to alcohol dependency and their failure to participated in an impatience treatment program. Given all the circumstances of your case, the Board concluded the assigned reenlistment code was proper and no change is warranted. 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