



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

[REDACTED]
Docket No: 6568-16
OCT 30 2017

[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 9 August 2017. 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, relevant portions of your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

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.


You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 27 November 1974. You served for six months without disciplinary incident, but on 9 May 1975, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) from your unit for a period of two days. On 20 May 1975, you escaped from the correction custody unit, you were apprehended on 19 June 1975, a period of 30 days, and charged with breach of restraint and wrongful use of marijuana. On 26 June 1975, you made a written request for discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA and charges. 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. Your request was granted and the commanding officer directed your other than honorable (OTH) discharge. 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 15 July 1975, you were discharged under OTH conditions.

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. The

Board carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors and your contention that you were legally still a minor and had no authority to make such a life altering decision without first getting counsel and approval from appropriate adult authority. The Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant relief in your case because of the seriousness of your misconduct 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. In regard to your contention, as stated previously, prior to submitting your request for discharge you conferred with a qualified military lawyer and were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken at this time. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon the submission of new and material evidence. New evidence is evidence 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,


Executive Director