



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

■  
Docket No. 139-24  
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.

Because your application was submitted with new contentions not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. Your current request has been carefully examined by a three-member panel, sitting in executive session on 29 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).

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You previously applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request for an upgrade, on 5 May 1983, based on their determination that your discharge was proper as issued.

Additionally, you previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service where you stated your desire to change your discharge characterization of service to qualify for veterans' benefits, and you contended that you should have received a medical discharge because you lost your hearing due to your service, that your extended period of UA in 1980 was committed due to fear of retaliation from four Marines, whom you turned in for

dealing drugs, who then stole your car, jumped you, and threatened to kill you, that your two periods of UA in 1981 were a result of erroneously being charged UA after being detained by civil authorities for an unpaid speeding ticket and an erroneous charge of UA after you called to extend your leave after your car broke down, and that, since discharge, you have been driving a tractor trailer for thirty years, have been a Teamster for twenty-six years, and have had no trouble with the law. The Board denied your request on 30 October 2023. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

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 new contention that you should have been protected under the whistleblower act and, if you had been protected and transferred to Camp Lejeune, you would not have committed UA and would have received a good discharge. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters 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 NJPs and SPCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact your repeated misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board further noted that there was no evidence of you submitting a whistleblower complaint, no evidence of any retaliatory actions committed against you, that you were advised by medical to seek legal assistance if you believed you were in danger, and that you received three non-judicial punishments for misconduct prior to the alleged incident with the four Marines. Therefore, the Board was not persuaded by your contentions that your misconduct was due to lack of leadership support or due to you remaining at your assigned base.

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 and commends you for your post-discharge accomplishments, 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.

As explained above, the Board determined there was insufficient evidence to conclude you were the victim of reprisal in violation of 10 USC 1034. 10 USC 1034 provides the right to request Secretary of Defense review of cases with substantiated reprisal allegations where the Secretary of the Navy's follow-on corrective or disciplinary actions are at issue. Additionally, in accordance with DoD policy you have the right to request review of the Secretary of the Navy's decision regardless of whether your reprisal allegation was substantiated or non-substantiated. Your written request must show by clear and convincing evidence that the Secretary of the Navy acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or contrary to law. This is not a de novo review and under 10

USC 1034(c) the Secretary of Defense cannot review issues that do not involve reprisal. You must file within 90 days of receipt of this letter to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)), Office of Legal Policy, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-4000. Your written request must contain your full name, grade/rank, duty status, duty title, organization, duty location, mailing address, and telephone number; a copy of your BCNR application and final decisional documents; and, a statement of the specific reasons why you are not satisfied with this decision and the specific remedy or relief requested. Your request must be based on factual allegations or evidence previously presented to the BCNR, therefore, please also include previously presented documentation that supports your statements.

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,

2/27/2024

