



Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER [REDACTED],  
USN, [REDACTED]

d. On 8 November 1985, Petitioner received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA) and dereliction in the performance of duty.

e. On 5 August 1987, Petitioner received NJP for absence from his appointed place of duty.

f. The record shows on 10 March 1988, Petitioner reenlisted into the Navy.

g. On 1 November 1988, the Board reviewed Petitioner's application requesting that his naval record be corrected to show that his 1988 reenlistment is null and void so that he may participate in Basic Underwater Demolition (BUD/S) training. The Board recommended that Petitioner's naval record be corrected, where appropriate, to show that: (1) both his 1988 discharge and his six year reenlistment of 10 March 1988 are null and void and expunged from his naval record, (2) that the extension agreement of 8 December 1987 on his four year reenlistment of 13 March 1984 is for a period of 36 months vice four months, (3) that said extension agreement is for the purpose of BUDS and SEAL training, and (4) that said extension agreement was not canceled but was made operative on 13 March 1988 and is in effect.

h. On 16 November 1988, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (ASN (M&RA)) approved the Board's recommendation.

i. On 19 December 1988, Commander, Naval Military Personnel Command directed the Commanding Officer, Naval Station [REDACTED], to make the following corrections to Petitioner's naval record:

(1) That both Petitioner's 1988 discharge and his six year reenlistment of 10 March 1988 are null and void and expunged from his naval record;

(2) That the extension agreement for 8 December 1987 on his four year reenlistment of 13 March 1984 is for a period of 36 months instead of four months; and

(3) That the extension agreement was not cancelled but was made operative on 13 March 1988 is in effect.

j. On 13 April 1990, Petitioner received NJP for UA and failure to obey other lawful written order.

k. On 26 February 1991, Petitioner issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) informing him that he was not eligible for reenlistment, and that an entry to that effect has been made in his service record.

l. On 12 March 1991, at the completion of Petitioner's required active service, Petitioner was discharged from active duty, Petitioner was issued a Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214) that annotated his characterization of service as Honorable and assigned a reentry code of RE-4.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER [REDACTED],  
USN, [REDACTED]

m. Petitioner contends that he believes he deserves a RE-1 reentry code because he was a hardworking, dedicated Sailor, and an asset to the Navy, he received the RE-4 because he got into a fight with the ship's master-at-arms (MAA), who was in the wrong, but he was the Captain's right hand guy.

n. The Board noted Petitioner provided supporting documentation in the form of excerpts from his official military personnel file (OMPF).

#### CONCLUSION:

Upon review and consideration of all the evidence of record, the Board concludes that, given the totality of his circumstances, Petitioner's request merits relief. The Board reviewed Petitioner's application under the guidance provided in reference (b). Specifically, the Board considered whether his application was the type that was intended to be covered by this policy.

In reviewing Petitioner's record, the Board noted Petitioner's documented misconduct for which he received appropriate punishment. In addition, the Board noted no aggravating circumstances in relation to Petitioner's misconduct. Accordingly, in light of reference (b), the Board concludes that no useful purpose is served by having Petitioner's reentry code reflected as "RE-4" and changing the reentry code to "RE-1" is appropriate in the interest of justice.

Regarding Petitioner's request for the designation of his ESWS qualification, the Board noted that Block 18 of the DD Form 214 does not show Petitioner's qualification. In this regard, the Board determined that the error was administrative and concluded that Block 18 of the DD Form 214 should accurately reflect his qualification as Enlisted Surface Warfare Specialist.

#### RECOMMENDATION:

In view of the foregoing, the Board finds the existence of an injustice warranting the following corrective action:

That Petitioner be issued a Correction to DD Form 214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 215) indicating for the period ending 12 March 1991 that:

1. Petitioner's reentry code was "RE-1;" and
2. Petitioner earned the Enlisted Surface Warfare Specialist qualification.

That no further changes be made to Petitioner's record.

That a copy of this report of proceedings be filed in Petitioner's naval record.

4. It is certified that a quorum was present at the Board's review and deliberations, and that the foregoing is a true and complete record of the Board's proceedings in the above entitled matter.

Subj: REVIEW OF NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBER [REDACTED],  
USN, [REDACTED]

5. Pursuant to the delegation of authority set out in Section 6(e) of the revised Procedures of the Board for Correction of Naval Records (32 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 723.6(e)), and having assured compliance with its provisions, it is hereby announced that the foregoing corrective action, taken under the authority of reference (a), has been approved by the Board on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy.

6/1/2023

[REDACTED]

Executive Director

[REDACTED]