



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

2 NAVY ANNEX

WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

SMC

Docket No: 08291-98

26 August 1999

[REDACTED] USN

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of title 10 of the United States Code, section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 26 August 1999. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinion furnished by the Navy Personnel Command dated 19 May 1999, a copy of which is attached.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinion. In view of the above, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official

8291-98

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,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER
Executive Director

Enclosure



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVY PERSONNEL COMMAND
5720 INTEGRITY DRIVE
MILLINGTON TN 38055-0000

1610
PERS-311
19 MAY 99

MEMORANDUM FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF
NAVAL RECORDS

Via: PERS/BCNR Coordinator [REDACTED]

Subj: HMCS [REDACTED]

Ref: (a) BUPERSINST 1610.10, EVAL Manual

Encl: (1) BCNR File

1. Enclosure (1) is returned. The member requests removal of her fitness report for the period of 16 September 1996 to 15 September 1997.

2. Based on our review of the material provided, we find the following:

a. A review of the member's digitized record revealed the report in question to be on file. The member signed the report indicating her desire to submit a statement. Per reference (a), Annex S, paragraph S-8, the member has two years from the ending date of the report to submit a statement if desired. The member includes with her petition a copy of the statement to the report; however, the statement is unacceptable for file due to the reporting senior's endorsement being missing. The statement was rejected and returned to the reporting senior, [REDACTED] on 14 May 1999, requesting an endorsement to the statement be submitted within 45 days upon receipt of the letter.

b. The member alleges that the report in question is unjust, due to not being counseled about her "intimidating and abusive leadership style." The member provides with her petition a copy of the mid-term counseling performed on 28 March 1997, which supports her allegation. However, since counseling can occur at anytime and in different ways (i.e., written or verbal), written documentation of counseling is not required; therefore, we are unable to determine if the member did or did not receive verbal counseling on her substandard leadership style.

c. The report represents the judgment and appraisal responsibility of the reporting senior for a specific period of

21 11

Subj: HMCS [REDACTED]

time. It is not required to be consistent with previous or subsequent reports, and is not routinely open to challenge.

d. The member does not prove the report to be unjust or in error.

3. We recommend retention of the report as written.

[REDACTED]

Head, Performance
Evaluation Branch