DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

Application for Correction of the Coast Guard Record of:

BCMR Docket No. 2010-035

FINAL DECISION

This is a proceeding under the provisions of section 1552 of title 10 and section 425 of title 14 of the United States Code. The Chair docketed the case after receiving the applicant's completed application on November 18, 2009, and assigned it to staff member J. Andrews to prepare the decision for the Board as required by 33 C.F.R. § 52.61(c).

This final decision, dated August 26, 2010, is approved and signed by the three duly appointed members who were designated to serve as the Board in this case.

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

The applicant asked the Board to correct his record by voiding a 9-month extension of enlistment contract that he signed on to obligate sufficient service to attend "A" School to become an The applicant alleged that the extension contract should be voided because he voluntarily withdrew and never attended "A" School for personal reasons.

SUMMARY OF THE RECORD

On July 11, 2006, the applicant enlisted in the Coast Guard for 4 years, through the Personnel Command issued orders for the applicant to transfer to an one of the participate in the and to attend "A" School for 20 weeks between the following the Coast Guard's Performance, Training, and Education Manual, states the following:

Members are obligated to serve 24 months for the first 12 weeks of instruction, and one month for every additional week of instruction thereafter. The period of obligated service will commence on the date of graduation from course of instruction. Members who do not have the necessary active duty obligated service requirement for Class "A" school remaining on the present contract must reenlist or agree to extend enlistment to cover the required period prior to departing the unit for

school. Personnel disenrolled from course of instruction due to own request, lack of application, or misconduct will be required to fulfill the full obligated service requirement.

The PSC alleged that the applicant's nine-month extension was required for him to comply with the obligated service requirements for attending a 20-week "A" School in COMDT-INST M1500.10C. The PSC noted that the applicant enlisted on that the would have graduated from "A" School on that the obligated service requirement for "A" School is 32 months. However, the PSC concluded that because the applicant "upon graduation, would have had only 23 months remaining on his con-

The PSC noted that under Chapter 7.F.13. of COMDTINST M1500.10C, the applicant was required to complete his full "A" School obligated service requirement when he voluntarily disenrolled from the program. Therefore, the PSC concluded, the applicant's 9-month extension should remain in effect.

tract, he was obligated to extend his enlistment by 9 months."¹

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO THE VIEWS OF THE COAST GUARD

On March 15, 2010, the Chair sent the applicant a copy of the views of the Coast Guard and invited him to submit a response within 30 days. No response was received.

¹ However, the period	between the applicant's expected graduation	n date,	, and the end of his o	origina
enlistment,	is not 23 months but 27 months.			

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Board makes the following findings and conclusions on the basis of the applicant's military record and submissions, the Coast Guard's submission, and applicable law:

1. The Board has jurisdiction concerning this matter pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 1552. The application was timely.			
2. The applicant asked the Board to void an extension contract that he signed on to accept orders to join the and attend "A" School. He alleged that it is unjust for the extension to remain in his record because he never attended "A" School for personal reasons. The Board begins its analysis in every case by presuming that the disputed information in the applicant's military record is correct as it appears in his record, and the applicant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the disputed information is erroneous or unjust. ²			
3. The applicant's "A" School orders show that his expected graduation date was . Under Chapter 7.F.13. of COMDTINST M1500.10C, he had to have at least 32 months of obligated service past that date to accept his orders. Adding 32 months to brings one to The applicant's original enlistment ran through Thus, he needed only 6 months of newly obligated service, extending his enlistment from , through, to accept the orders. Therefore, the Board finds that the applicant was erroneously advised to sign a 9-month extension contract on because he needed only a 6-month extension to accept his orders.			
4. The applicant asked the Board to void the extension contract altogether. However, the extension already went into effect on			
5. Accordingly, because the term of the extension is erroneous, it should be corrected to reflect an obligation of just 6 months—i.e., to			
[ORDER AND SIGNATURES APPEAR ON NEXT PAGE]			

 $^{^2}$ 33 C.F.R. \S 52.24(b). 3 Under Chapter 1.G.15. of the Personnel Manual, extension contracts may be written only in whole-month increments.

ORDER

The application of	, USCG, for correction of his
military record is granted in part as follows:	
The Coast Guard shall correct the term of his	, extension contract to show
that he extended his enlistment for just 6 months	

