



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

JRE
Docket No: 7685-00
16 January 2001

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 11 January 2000. 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 that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you served on active duty in the Marine Corps during World War II and the Korean Conflict. You underwent a pre-separation physical examination on 6 June 1951, and were found qualified for discharge. You were discharged by reason of dependency on 11 June 1951. The Veterans Administration (VA) awarded you a 0% rating for residuals of a broken tibia from 12 June 1951, and added ratings of 30% for post traumatic stress disorder from 23 January 1992, and 20% for Raynaud's disease from 3 March 1994. Several other conditions and ratings were added over the next eight years, and your current VA rating is 90%, with a finding of individual unemployability from 11 June 1998.

The fact that you have been awarded substantial disability ratings by the VA was not considered probative of error or injustice in your case. In this regard, the Board noted that the VA awards disability ratings without regard to the issue of fitness for military duty, whereas the military departments may assign ratings only in those cases where the service member has been found unfit for duty. In addition, the Board noted that although the VA