



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

██████████
Docket No. 6268-24
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 father's 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 4 September 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 Navy on 16 May 1988. On 2 February 1989, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) totaling 25 days and missing ship's movement. On 10 July 1989, you commenced on a period of UA status that lasted three days. Your record also documents that you had an additional period of UA from 3 June 1991 to 5 January 1992. On 20 February 1992, a special court-martial (SPCM) convicted you of two specifications of UA totaling 437 days. As a result, you were sentenced to confinement for 120 days, forfeiture of pay, reduction to E-1, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). After completion of all levels of review, you were so discharged on 3 August 1993.

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, immature, and went UA due to your grandmother becoming ill and your desire to be by her side. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters describing post-service conduct and accomplishments.

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 NJP and SPCM, outweighed the mitigating evidence in your case. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and determined that it showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Unexpectedly absenting yourself from your command placed an undue burden on your chain of command and fellow service members, and likely negatively impacted mission accomplishment. The Board also felt that your record clearly reflected your willful misconduct and demonstrated you were unfit for further service. Finally, the Board noted you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; conduct that ultimately led to your 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 a BCD. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you provided 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 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,

9/24/2024

