



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

█  
Docket No. 0909-24  
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.

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 26 February 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 Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 26 August 1986. On 18 August 1987, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct, specifically: failure to exhibit integrity during a land navigation exercise. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge.

On 26 December 1982, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) from 26 October 1987 to 29 October 1987 and dereliction of duty. On 6 December 1988, you received NJP for two specifications of disobeying a lawful order from a non-commissioned officer (NCO). On 30 January 1989, you received NJP for UA and disobeying a lawful order from an NCO. On 24 February 1989, you received page 11 counseling regarding your positive urinalysis for methamphetamine.

On 3 April 1989, you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for wrongfully using amphetamine/methamphetamine. Prior to submitting this request, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your request was granted, and your commanding officer was directed to issue you an under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge. On 5 May 1989, you were so discharged.

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 characterization of service and your contentions that you made some bad decisions, requested a hardship discharge to protect your mother from your abusive father, settled for an OTH so you could go home and protect your mother, are now a model citizen with a beautiful family and a son going to college, and you want to protect your family with benefits. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered your statement and the advocacy letter you provided but noted you did not provide 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 NJPs and request for discharge 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 fact it involved a drug offense. The Board determined that illegal drug use by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow service members. The Board also considered the likely negative impact your repeated misconduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. The Board noted that you were given multiple opportunities to address your conduct issues but you continued to commit misconduct, which ultimately led to your request for an undesirable discharge to avoid trial for your offenses. 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 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 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,

3/13/2024

