



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

■  
Docket No. 3601-24  
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 26 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).

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 29 May 1991. On 2 March 1992, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling warning documenting deficiencies in your conduct, you were provided recommendations for corrective action, and advised that failure to take corrective action may result in administrative separation or limitation of further service. On 3 March 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for larceny and entering another Marine's room without authority with intent to commit a larceny. On 24 July 1992, you were convicted by a special court-martial (SPCM) of absence from your appointed place of duty, two specifications of failure to go at the time prescribed to your appointed place of duty, unauthorized absence a period totaling three days, two specifications of insubordinate conduct, and failure to obey a lawful general order. As

punishment, you were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay, reduction in rank, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). Ultimately, the BCD was approved at all levels of review and, on 14 October 1994, 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 character of service to be considered as a veteran by the federal government and to restore some of your benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). The Board considered your contentions that: (1) you had one year of Honorable service in the "ARNG" prior to joining the Marine Corps and you had three years of Honorable service in the Marine Corps before making bad decisions that resulted in your BCD and (2) your crime of going AWOL twice does not fit the discharge character of service you received. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you did not provide supporting documentation describing post-service accomplishments or advocacy letters.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP and SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard of military authority and regulations. The Board also considered the negative impact your conduct likely had on the good order and discipline of your unit. Further, the Board found that the record clearly reflected that your active-duty misconduct was intentional and willful. Furthermore, the Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. Therefore, the Board concluded that the 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 BCD. Furthermore, the Board was not persuaded by your contentions and noted that you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. Finally, 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.

As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant a BCD. 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,

7/9/2024

