



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

■
Docket No. 8502-23
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 22 November 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).

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 28 July 1976. On 16 January 1977, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) that subsequently concluded upon your surrender to military authorities on 1 April 1977, a period totaling 75 days. On 18 April 1977, you commenced another period of UA that subsequently concluded upon your surrender to military authorities on 12 April 1978, a period totaling 359 days.

On 13 April 1978, you submitted a written request for separation for the good of the service (GOS) in lieu of trial by court-martial for the forgoing periods of UA. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. As part of this discharge request, you admitted your guilt to the foregoing offenses and acknowledged that your characterization of service upon discharge would be Other Than Honorable (OTH) conditions. The separation authority approved your request and directed your commanding officer to

discharge you with an OTH characterization of service. On 28 April 1978, you were so discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request, on 3 January 1989, after determining your discharge was proper as issued.

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 change your discharge character of service and contention that you were suffering from problems with the loss of your father. You assert that you have lung cancer and you are not well enough to be able to go out, you are seeking “Camp Lejeune benefits.” Additionally, the Board noted you checked the “Other Mental Health” box on your application and responded to the 16 October 2023 letter from the Board, however, you did not provide evidence or documentation in support of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided an advocacy letter and health care documents but no supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your multiple periods of UA, and GOS request, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard of 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. 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 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.

Regarding your assertion, 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 (VA) 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,

12/6/2023

█

Executive Director

Signed by: █