



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

█
Docket No. 6030-23
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 10 January 2024. 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).

You enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 17 September 1986. On 22 January 1988, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for uttering a check and failing to maintain sufficient funds in your bank account. You received your second NJP, on 24 March 1988, for 8 days unauthorized absence (UA). You received your third NJP, on 6 April 1988, for a one-day UA. Then, on 20 May 1988, you received your fourth NJP, for 13 days of UA. Afterwards, you began another UA from 9 June 1988 to 28 August 1988, a period of 80 days. Subsequently, a charge was preferred to SPCM for the 80 days UA. On 27 September 1988, through military counsel, you requested a separation in lieu of trial (SILT) with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization for the earlier described misconduct. Your SILT request was approved by the separation authority and you were so discharged on 1 November 1988.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that you were discharge for being UA because civilian criminal charges kept you in county jail, you always followed orders, and never had disciplinary issues while on duty. The Board noted you checked the “Other Mental Health” box on your application but chose not to respond to the Board’s 20 July 2023 letter requesting supporting evidence of your claim. 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. 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. Additionally, unexpectedly absenting yourself from your command placed an undue burden on your chain of command and fellow service members, and likely negatively impacted mission accomplishment. Further, the Board 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, the Board noted you provided no evidence to substantiate your contentions. 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. 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,

1/23/2024

█