



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

█  
Docket No. 7239-23  
Ref: Signature Date



Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 case on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 16 October 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, 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 Navy and began a period of active duty on 19 September 1989. Between 28 October 1990 to 6 November 1990, you entered into a period of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 9 days and resulting in nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on 21 November 1990. The suspended portion of the NJP that was later vacated for continued misconduct. On 10 April 1991, you received a second NJP for an instance of assault. On the same date, you were counseled for violating the UCMJ by committing assault. You were advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation. On 1 May 1991, punishment that was suspended during your 10 April 1991 NJP was vacated due to continued misconduct. On the same date, you received a third NJP for two instances of assault and assault with a deadly weapon. Subsequently, you were evaluated by a medical officer and diagnosed with Occupational Problem, Personality Disorder with Antisocial and Passive Aggressive Features.

Unfortunately, some documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), reveals that you were separated from the Navy on 26 June 1991 with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service, your narrative reason for separation is "Separation in Lieu of Trial by Court Martial," your separation code is "KFS," and your reenlistment code is "RE-4."

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: (a) you are seeking qualify and apply for veterans' benefits and (b) you were never given the opportunity to explain yourself about the nature of the kitchen incident and instead you were given instructions to sign a paper and go home with an OTH discharge. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided character letters of support.

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 request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court martial, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact it had on the good order and discipline of your unit. 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. Further, the Board noted you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct issues but you continued to commit misconduct. The Board was not persuaded by your contentions that you were somehow treated unfairly and noted that you submitted your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial with the assistance of legal counsel. 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 Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos 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.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon the 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,

10/26/2023

