



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

CRS  
Docket No: 4537-08  
3 June 2009

[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.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 28 May 2009. 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 that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you enlisted in the Navy on 21 May 1962. You received nonjudicial punishment and were convicted by three special courts-martial for offenses that included unauthorized absences, failure to obey a lawful order, and breaking restriction. On 28 August 1967 you were released from active duty and transferred to the Navy Reserve with a characterization of service of honorable. On 27 October 1969 you received a general discharge from the Navy Reserve upon the expiration of your enlistment.

The Board found that you received a general discharge because your conduct mark average of 2.65 was below the minimum average of 3.0 required for an honorable discharge. In addition, the Board concluded that an honorable characterization of service is not warranted in your case, given your extensive disciplinary record. The fact that your service was characterized as honorable in 1967 when you were released from active duty did not mandate that you be awarded an honorable discharge at the expiration of your enlistment in 1969. 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