



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

TRG
Docket No: 7417-08
11 February 2009

[REDACTED]

[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 10 February 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.

You reenlisted in the Marine Corps on 6 November 1973 at age 23. On 21 December 1973 you were recommended for discharge because it was discovered that you had fraudulently enlisted. On 22 January 1974 the separation authority approved a general discharge which was suspended for 12 months of probation.

On 18 April 1974 you began a period of unauthorized absence which lasted until you surrendered on 15 July 1975, a period of about 453 days. On 28 August 1975, the separation authority denied your request for an administrative discharge and ordered that you be tried by court-martial for your unauthorized absence. On 8 September 1975 you began another period of unauthorized absence which lasted until you were apprehended on 8 January 1976, a period of about 122 days.

Your military record shows that you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge (UD) in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the two periods of unauthorized absence totaling about 575 days. Your record also 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. The Board found that your request was granted on 11

March 1976 and, 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. You received a UD on 17 March 1976.

In its review of your application, the Board carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as the indication in the record showing that you were having personal problems and your contention that you were sick while in the Marine Corps. The Board found that these factors and contention were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given your record of misconduct and especially your request for discharge to avoid trial for the offenses. 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 when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. The Board concluded that your discharge was proper as issued 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,



For W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director