



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

█  
Docket No. 7185-22  
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 reconsideration application on 8 March 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 enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and entered active duty on 25 June 1980. On 19 March 1981 you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for the wrongful possession of a controlled substance (marijuana). You did not appeal your NJP.

On 17 February 1982, you received NJP for being absent from your appointed place of duty. You did not appeal your NJP. On 3 November 1982, you received NJP for failing to go at the time prescribed to your appointed place of duty. You did not appeal your NJP. On 9 May 1983,

you received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA). You did not appeal your NJP.

On 16 June 1983, you were notified of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct. You consulted with counsel and elected your right to request a hearing before an administrative separation board (Adsep Board).

On 14 July 1983, an Adsep Board convened in your case on board ██████████. At the Adsep Board you were represented by a Marine Corps Judge Advocate. Following the presentation of evidence and witness testimony, the Adsep Board members determined that the misconduct allegations were supported by a preponderance of the evidence. Subsequent to the misconduct finding, the Adsep Board members recommended that you be separated from the Marine Corps with an under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) characterization of service. Ultimately, on 19 September 1983, you were separated from the Marine Corps for misconduct with an OTH discharge characterization and assigned an RE-4 reentry code.

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: (a) you served in the Marine Corps for more than three years and even though you made a mistake as a young man you have changed, and (b) you are seeking a discharge upgrade in order to receive VA healthcare benefits. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board concluded that significant negative aspects of your conduct and/or performance greatly outweighed any positive aspects of your military record. The Board determined that characterization under OTH conditions is generally warranted for misconduct and is appropriate when the basis for separation is the commission of an act or acts constituting a significant departure from the conduct expected of a Marine. The Board determined that the record clearly reflected your misconduct was intentional and willful and indicated you were unfit for further service. Moreover, the Board noted that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not otherwise be held accountable for your actions.

The Board 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. Additionally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and the Board concluded that your pattern of misconduct clearly merited your receipt of an OTH, and that such discharge was in accordance with all Department of the Navy directives and policy at the time of your discharge.

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. 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,

3/15/2023

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

[REDACTED]