Application for the Correction of the Coast Guard Record of:

# FINAL DECISION BCMR Docket No. 2009-239

#### 

# SUMMARY OF THE RECORD

The applicant asked the Board to correct the signature dates on his March 14, 2009, 6year reenlistment contract and to pay him the selective reenlistment bonus (SRB) cited on the contract. He alleged that a yeoman told him to sign the contract on January 15, 2009, because he often deployed as part of a TACLET team and might be out of touch with the administrative office when his enlistment ended on March 13, 2009. However, the Coast Guard refused to pay him the SRB because the signature and effective dates do not match. The contract, which was entered in the applicant's record, reenlists him for 6 years as of March 14, 2009, but the signatures are dated January 15, 2009. Both the contract and a Page 7 in his record show that he was promised an SRB under ALCOAST 286/08 for the reenlistment.

The Judge Advocate General of the Coast Guard recommended that the Board grant the applicant's request because the record supports his allegations.

### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Under Article 3.C.3. of the Personnel Manual, members are entitled to accurate SRB counseling whenever they reenlist or extend their enlistments. Because reenlistment contracts go into effect on the day of signature, the applicant's yeoman should not have had him sign the contract in advance of the effective date. The Board is persuaded that had he known that signing a March 14, 2009, contract on January 15, 2009, would prevent him from receiving the SRB, the applicant would have waited to sign the contract. Accordingly, relief should be granted.

# [ORDER AND SIGNATURES APPEAR ON NEXT PAGE]

# ORDER

The military record of USCG, shall be corrected by changing the signature dates on his March 14, 2009, reenlistment contract to show that it was signed on March 14, 2009, rather than January 15, 2009. The Coast Guard shall pay him any amount due under ALCOAST 286/08 as a result of this correction.

June 8, 2010 Date



\*The third member of the Board was unavailable. However, pursuant to 33 C.F.R. § 52.11(b), two designated members constitute a quorum of the Board.