



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

██████████
Docket No. 2047-24
Ref: Signature Date

██
██
██

Dear ██████████

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Section 1552 of Title 10, United States Code. After careful and conscientious consideration of relevant portions of your naval record and your application, the Board for Correction of Naval Records (Board) found the evidence submitted insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice. Consequently, your application has been denied.

Although your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 17 April 2024. The names and votes of the panel members will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of the Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, to include the 25 July 2018 guidance from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness regarding equity, injustice or clemency determinations (Wilkie Memo).

You entered active duty with the Marine Corps on 14 March 1979. On 9 July 1979, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for dereliction in the performance of duty. On 1 November 1979, you received NJP for two specifications of willfully disobeyed a lawful order and two specifications of disrespectful in language toward a non-commissioned officer (NCO). On 8 May 1980, you again received NJP for disrespect. You subsequently started several periods of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 614 days. Upon your return, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial for three specifications 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 accepted and your commanding officer (CO) was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the GOS. On 2 July 1982, you were so discharged.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These

included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge and contentions that you were young when you enlisted, you worked in construction after your discharge until you retired, and you need Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to assist with your medical care. In addition, you checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a personal statement but no supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs and request for GOS discharge, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your unit. Further, the Board noted that the evidence of record did not show that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions. Additionally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits or enhancing educational or employment opportunities. Finally, the Board noted that the misconduct which led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and, more likely than not, would have resulted in a punitive discharge and extensive punishment at a court-martial. Therefore, the Board determined you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you for the GOS; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and likely punitive discharge. As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant an OTH characterization of service. While the Board carefully considered the statement you provided in mitigation, even in light of the Wilkie Memo and reviewing the record holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants granting you the relief you requested or granting relief as a matter of clemency or equity. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined your request does not merit relief.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new matters, which will require you to complete and submit a new DD Form 149. New matters are those not previously presented to or 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,

5/1/2024

█