



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

SJN
Docket No: 01345-12
5 December 2012

[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 4 December 2012. 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 Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 23 September 1986. The Board found that you received three nonjudicial punishments (NJP's) for driving under the influence of alcohol, two instances of underage drinking, two instances of disobedience, and being incapacitated for the proper performance of duty. Additionally, you were counseled concerning your substandard conduct, alcohol dependence, being dropped from a Level III alcohol rehabilitation treatment, antisocial personality disorder, suicidal gestures, and pattern of misconduct. You were also warned that further misconduct could result in administrative discharge action. On 9 March 1989, you were convicted by summary court-martial (SCM) of drunk and disorderly conduct. On 2 May 1989, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that lasted 269 days, ending on 26 January 1990. On 20 March 1990, you submitted a written request for a good of the service discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for 269 days of UA. Prior to submitting this request for discharge, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, were advised of your rights, and were warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge.

Your request for discharge was granted and on 22 May 1990, you received an other than honorable discharge for the good of the service in lieu of trial by court-martial. 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 application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth, record of service, post service accomplishments, and current sobriety from drugs and alcohol. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given your misconduct that resulted in three NJP's for serious offenses, failure to adhere to your command's alcohol rehabilitation treatment program, numerous counselings, the fact that you were warned of the consequences of further misconduct, charges being preferred to a court-martial for a period of UA totaling over eight months, and request for discharge. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge was approved. The Board also concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Marine Corps 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.

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