



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

TAL  
Docket No: 5754-10  
18 February 2011

[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 February 2011. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request. 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.

You enlisted in the Navy and began a period of active duty on 19 January 2000 at age 27. On 15 March 2000, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) from your unit for a period of 21 days. On 16 March 2000, you were UA from your unit until you surrendered on 20 January 2001, a period of 310 days. On 23 January 2001, you submitted a written request for an other than honorable (OTH) discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA. 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. On 24 January 2001, your request was granted and you were separated with an OTH discharge and an RE-4 (not recommended for retention) reentry code. 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.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth, overall record of service, and desire to upgrade your discharge. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant a change of your reentry code given the seriousness of your misconduct that resulted in a period of UA that totaled over 10 months and request for discharge. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved. The Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy when your request for discharge was granted and 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.

Each branch of the Armed Forces established its own criteria for enlistment within the provisions of federal law. The reentry code assigned by the Navy is not binding upon the other services, which are free to accept or reject an application on the basis of their own standards. If another branch of service decides to waive your reentry code and accept you for enlistment, the Navy will not object.

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 PFENNER  
Executive Director