

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY NAVAL SUPPLY SYSTEMS COMMAND 5450 CARLISLE PIKE PO BOX 2050 MECHANICSBURG PA 17055-0791

TELEPHONE NUMBER COMMERCIAL AUTOVON IN REPLY REFER TO: 4050 53C/122

JUN 1 1999

Commander, Naval Supply Systems Command From: Board for Correction of Naval Records To:

Subj: ADVISORY OPINION IN THE CASE OF

(a) BCNR memo PAY:ga of 6 May 99 Ref:

BCNR File Encl: (1) (2) Subject's Microfiche File

In response to reference (a), we have reviewed enclosure (1). 1. Enclosures (1) and (2) are returned.

Our review concluded that the Personal Property Office in 2. Ingleside, Texas did not miscounsel B about his storage options. Notes and documents in his file clearly show that he was counseled about his entitlement to nontemporary storage but instead chose to ship household goods to Pensacola, Florida. He signed a statement that he understood that his decision to move to Pensacola would preclude further transportation of the property at Government expense. Petty Officer Hollendoner should be liable for any excess costs resulting from his subsequent request to long deliver the shipment to Panama City, Florida.

3. We do not recommend favorable Board action.

Martha J. S. I. Ence. MARTHA J. IRONS

By direction

WH 225



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS 2 NAVY ANNEX WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

> LCC:tj Docket No: 2158-99 13 July 1999



Dear

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 13 July 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 BUPERS Memorandum 4050 53C/122 of 15 June 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. Accordingly, 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 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