



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

TJR
Docket No: 828-01
25 June 2001

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, 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 19 June 2001. 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.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found you enlisted in the Marine Corps on 3 September 1971 at the age of 17. Your record reflects that on 4 October 1972 you were convicted by special court-martial (SPCM) of a 182 day period of unauthorized absence (UA). You were sentenced to hard labor for three months, a \$450 forfeiture of pay, and reduction to paygrade E-1.

Your record further reflects that on 2 January 1973 you began a 792 day period of UA that was not terminated until 5 March 1975. Subsequently, you submitted a written request for an undesirable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA. 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 other than honorable discharge for the good of the service. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor. On 6 March 1975 you

received an other than honorable discharged. At that time you enrolled in the Reconciliation Service Program with the understanding that if you perform 24 months of alternate service a clemency discharge would be substituted for the undesirable discharge. However, on 20 October 1975, you were terminated from this program due to failure to complete the required period of alternate service.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully considered all mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity. The Board also considered your character reference letters. However, the Board found the evidence and materials submitted were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given your continued misconduct, your request for discharge to avoid trial for a lengthy period of UA, and your failure to complete the required period of alternate service for a clemency discharge. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your requests for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved since, by this action, you escaped the possibility of confinement at hard labor and a punitive discharge. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Marine Corps when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. 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