



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

TJR
Docket No: 3946-14
15 May 2015

[REDACTED]

Dear [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.

Although your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 20 April 2015. 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 16 June 1982. During the period from 13 May 1983 to 19 April 1985, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on four occasions for disobedience, making a false official statement, uttering seven bad checks, failure to go to your appointed place of duty, sleeping on post, being drunk on duty, and larceny.

On 29 April 1986, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that was not terminated until 2 May 1989. During this period you were declared a deserter, however, only the offense of UA was referred for trial.

As a result of this action, you submitted a written request for an other than honorable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing 1,098 day 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. Subsequently, your request was granted and the commanding officer was directed to issue you an other than honorable discharge by reason of the good of the service. 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. On 9 June 1989, you were issued an other than honorable discharge.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your desire to upgrade your discharge and assertion that your period of UA was due to issues with your first sergeant and being abused. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant relief in your case because of the seriousness of your misconduct and lengthy period of UA, which resulted in four NJPs and your 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. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. Finally, the Board determine that your assertion was not enough to outweigh the significant misconduct you committed while serving on active duty. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

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 within one year from the date of the Board's decision. 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 J. O'NEILL
Executive Director