



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

BJG  
Docket No: 6317-13  
17 June 2014

[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 17 June 2014. 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 enlisted in the Navy and entered a period of active duty on 21 May 1989. You received nonjudicial punishment for an unauthorized absence (UA) totaling eight days. You then requested a discharge under other than honorable (OTH) conditions for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for a UA period totaling 47 days. Prior to submitting this request, you would have consulted with qualified military counsel and acknowledged the adverse consequences of receiving such a discharge. The separation authority approved your request for a discharge under OTH conditions. On 14 December

1990, you were separated with a discharge under OTH conditions for the good of the service to avoid 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 entire record, carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth, remorse, allegation that you were the victim of racism, and current desire to upgrade your discharge. Nevertheless, the Board concluded that these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge due to your UA periods totaling 55 days and request for discharge. Furthermore, the Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved. It was also clear to the Board 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. The Board was unable to find any evidence in your record to support your allegation, and you provide no such evidence. Finally, you are advised that no discharge is automatically upgraded due merely to post service good conduct or the passage of time. In view of the above, 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,



ROBERT D. ZSALMAN  
Acting Executive Director