



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

██████████
Docket No. 3408-23
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 31 May 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).

Regarding your request for a personal appearance, the Board determined that a personal appearance with or without counsel will not materially add to their understanding of the issue(s) involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You completed an honorable period of active service in the Marine Corps Reserves from 20 November 1972 to 20 February 1973. During this period, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) on 21 December 1972 for two specifications of failure to obey a lawful order, and disrespect.

You reenlisted and commenced a second period of active duty on 21 February 1973. During the month of October 1973, you were counseled on three occasions as a result of your continued misconduct. Between 25 October 1973 and 3 February 1975, you received NJP on six occasions

for using profane language, multiple UAs, disobeying a lawful order, and breaking restriction. During the aforementioned period you were also counseled on two occasions regarding your frequent involvement with military authorities, and potential reduction in rank if your misconduct continued.

Subsequently, you commenced a period of UA from 5 August 1975 until your apprehension by civil authorities on 19 January 1976. As a result of the foregoing misconduct, you requested a separation in lieu of trial (SILT) by court martial. Your SILT request was approved and you were discharged, on 10 March 1976, with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) character of service.

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 characterization of service and contentions that you have had positive post service conduct and required veterans' benefits to access health care for medical conditions related to contaminated water in Camp Lejeune.

For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided medical documents but no documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

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 NJPs and SILT request, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board also noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and, more likely than not, would have resulted in a punitive discharge and extensive punishment at a court-martial. Therefore, the Board determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and likely punitive discharge. Finally, 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 concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant an OTH characterization. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation, even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record liberally and 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.

In regard to your Camp Lejeune water contamination contention, Public Law 112-154, Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012, requires the Veterans Administration to provide health care to Veterans with one or more of 15 specified illnesses or conditions. You should contact the nearest office of the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) concerning your right to apply for benefits or appeal an earlier unfavorable determination.

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,

6/15/2023

