



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

█
Docket No. 4994-22
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Section 1552 of Title 10, United States Code. After careful and conscientious consideration of relevant portions of your naval record and your application, the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) found the evidence submitted insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Consequently, your application has been denied.

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, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 27 February 2023. The names and votes of the panel members 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 the 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, to include the 25 July 2018 guidance from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness regarding equity, injustice or clemency determinations (Wilkie Memo).

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 29 August 1984. On 29 November 1984, you were counseled on your minor disciplinary infractions and a pattern of misconduct with military authorities. On 10 December 1984, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for three specifications of failure to obey a lawful regulation. On 11 March 1985, you received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 3 hours and 35 minutes and dereliction of duty. On 28 August 1986, you were counseled due to driving under the influence of alcohol. On 19 June 1987 and 16 October 1987, you received NJP for being UA from school and absence from appointed place of duty.

On 19 October 1987, you were counseled on making the following statement: “you were not attending Correction Custody and would rather accept an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge because you just wanted out of the Navy”. On 19 October 1987, you went into a UA status and remained for three days. On 26 October 1987, you received NJP for absence from appointed place of duty and willfully disobeying a lawful order. Subsequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of a pattern of misconduct. After you waived your rights, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct with an OTH characterization of service. The SA approved the CO’s recommendation and directed an OTH characterization of service by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct. On 27 November 1987, you were so discharged.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge and contentions that you made a mistake and your discharged involved racial indifferences, lack of guidance, lack of support, and immaturity. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters, a personal statement, and supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments.

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your five NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board determined that the evidence of record did not show you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions, which lead to your characterization of service. Additionally, the Board noted that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to support your contentions. Finally, the Board also noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy/Marine Corps regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. While the Board commends your post-discharge accomplishments and good character, even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants granting you the relief you requested or granting relief as a matter of clemency or equity. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence you provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of your misconduct. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that your request does not merit relief.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new matters, which will require you to complete and submit a new DD Form 149. New matters are those not previously presented to or 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

█