



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

SMS  
Docket No: 10710-07  
5 September 2008

From: Chairman, Board for Correction of Naval Records  
To: Secretary of the Navy

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF [REDACTED]

Ref: (a) 10 U.S.C. 1552

Encl: (1) Case Summary

1. Pursuant to the provisions of reference (a), Petitioner, a former enlisted member of the Navy, applied to this Board requesting to change his RE-4 reenlistment code that was assigned on 29 September 2003, when he was honorably released from active duty.
2. The Board, consisting of Mr. [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] and Mr. [REDACTED] reviewed Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice on 3 September 2008, and pursuant to its regulations, determined that the limited corrective action indicated below should be taken on the available evidence of record. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of the enclosures, naval records, and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.
3. The Board, having reviewed all the facts of record pertaining to Petitioner's allegations of error and injustice finds as follows:
  - a. Before applying to this Board, Petitioner exhausted all administrative remedies available under existing law and regulations within the Department of the Navy.
  - b. On 30 September 1999, Petitioner enlisted in the Navy at age 20. On 15 July 2000 and 15 July 2001, he received performance evaluations in which he was recommended for retention and promotion and had an individual trait average (ITA) of 4.0 and 3.67, respectively. On 20 November 2001, he was awarded the Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (NMCAM). On 15 June 2002, he received another performance evaluation in which he was recommended for retention and

promotion and had an ITA of 3.71. On 16 June 2002, he was promoted to the pay grade of E-4. On 31 October 2002, he was awarded another NMCAM. On 29 September 2003, he was honorably released from active duty due to completion of required active service. At that time a DD Form 214 was issued showing that he was assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code. On 19 August 2007, he was honorably discharged due to the expiration of his obligated service.

c. In his application, Petitioner states that the RE-4 reenlistment code is incorrect and should be an RE-1 as evidenced by his overall service record and awards. He further states that he was not aware of the RE-4 reenlistment code until he spoke with a recruiter about reenlisting in the reserves.

d. Regulations authorize assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment when a service member is released from active duty due to completion of required active service and is ineligible or not recommended for retention. Regulations also authorize assignment of an RE-1 reenlistment code when a service member is eligible and recommended for retention.

#### CONCLUSION:

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board concludes that Petitioner's request warrants relief. Specifically, the Board finds that there is no evidence in the record to justify assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code. In this regard, he served without incident and his performance evaluations that are a matter of record all indicate that he was recommended for retention and promotion. The Board also considers his awards that include two NMCAM's, a Good Conduct Medal, Battle "E" Ribbon, Sea Service Deployment Ribbon, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal and more than 44 months of sea service that includes duty in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Accordingly, the Board concludes that Petitioner's record should be corrected to show that he was assigned an RE-1 reenlistment code.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

a. That Petitioner's naval record be corrected to show that he was assigned an RE-1 reenlistment code on 29 September 2003, vice the RE-4 actually assigned on that date.

b. That this Report of Proceedings be filed in Petitioner's naval record.