



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

█
Docket No. 3467-24
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

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 12 June 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 enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and entered active duty on 8 August 1989. On 18 January 1990, you were issued a counseling warning concerning your violations of the UCMJ which showed contempt for discipline, which is required of all Marines. You were further advised further deficiencies in performance or conduct may result in disciplinary action or processing for administrative separation. On 19 January 1990, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for three days unauthorized absence (UA). You were issued a second counseling warning, on 28 March 1990, again warning you that further deficiencies in performance or conduct may result in disciplinary action or processing for separation. You received your second NJP, on 29 March 1990, for four days UA. On 18 July 1990, you received your third NJP for six days UA. On 6 March 1991, you received your fourth NJP, for failure to go to your appointed place of duty.

On 23 May 1991, you were found guilty at summary court-martial (SCM) for ten days UA. Consequently, you were notified of administrative separation processing for pattern of misconduct. After you elected to speak with counsel, you waived your rights to an administrative

discharge board. The Commanding Officer (CO) made his recommendation to the Separation Authority (SA) that you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization. The SA accepted the recommendation, and you were so discharged on 13 September 1991.

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 for a discharge upgrade and contention that, at the time of your military service, you were young and made the mistake of not coming back from leave on time, you have learned from your mistakes, and you have been a productive member of society. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided a certificate describing post-service accomplishments but no 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 SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board noted you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies and chose to continue to commit misconduct. Finally, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your separation with an OTH.

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. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and commends you for your post-discharge accomplishments, 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. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence you provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of your misconduct. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined that 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,

6/25/2024

