

## DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

REC

Docket No: 00449-10 22 September 2010



A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 22 September 2010. 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.

You enlisted in the Navy on 29 April 1969, at the age of \_\_\_\_\_\_. On 13 July 1970, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for failure to obey a lawful order by bringing alcoholic beverages onboard a ship. On 20 January 1971, you received NJP for striking a Shore Patrolman. On 31 March 1971, you received NJP for being in an unauthorized absence (UA) status and missing your ship's movement. On 14 April 1971, you were notified that administrative discharge procedures were initiated and that you would receive a reenlistment code of RE-4 upon your separation. However, on 15 April 1971, you received your fourth NJP for being in a UA status. The discharge authority directed a general discharge. You were so discharged on 22 April 1971.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth and immaturity. However, the Board found that these factors were not sufficient to warrant any change in your character of service, given your record of four NJP's for misconduct. The Board also noted that you were fortunate to receive a general discharge since a separation under other than

honorable conditions is often directed when an individual is found to have committed misconduct. 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 PREINT

Executive Director