



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

█
Docket No. 5522-24
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 14 August 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 Navy and began a period of active duty on 15 August 1989. On 18 January 1990, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for insubordinate conduct, failure to obey a lawful order, and failure to shave prior to reporting to school. Additionally, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 13) retention warning formally counseling you concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. The Page 13 expressly advised you that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative separation. On 28 March 1990, you received your second NJP for three specifications of unauthorized absence (UA) totaling five days, absence from your appointed place of duty, failure to go at the time prescribed to your appointed place of duty, eight specifications of failure to obey a lawful order/regulation, false official statement, and malingering. On 5 July 1990, you received your third NJP for UA, a period totaling three days.

Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and commission of a serious offense. You waived your right to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA directed your OTH discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and, on 14 August 1990, you were so discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request for an upgrade, on 20 April 2000, based on their determination that your discharge was proper as issued. Additionally, based on the DD Form 214 you provided, you served in the U.S. Army Reserve, including an Honorable period of active duty.

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 and assertion that since leaving the Navy, you served in the U.S. Army and received an Honorable discharge after being wounded. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the documentation you provided in support of your application.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board found that your misconduct was intentional and made you unsuitable for continued naval service. 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. The Board noted that you were provided opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies during your service; however, you continued to commit additional misconduct. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. Finally, the Board in its review discerned no impropriety or inequity in your discharge.

As a result, the Board determined 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 service in the U.S. Army, 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 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,

9/4/2024

