

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 6435-24 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 24 July 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 entered active duty with the Navy on 28 June 1994. On 30 August 1994, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence (UA) status that lasted until your apprehension and return to military authorities on 7 April 1996. Consequently, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial for the aforementioned period 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 was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the GOS. On 13 May 1996, 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 your UA was the result of being confined for two months in ______ for a charge you believed was cleared up prior to your enlistment, you informed the recruiter of the pending charge and your recruiter stated you had no charges pending, you attempted to contact your command but never received a return call, and you were told your OTH discharge would be upgraded after six months. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provide advocacy letters that describe post-discharge 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 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 considered that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to substantiate your contentions. Additionally, the Board noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years. 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 evidence you submitted in mitigation and commends you for your post-discharge rehabilitation, 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 mitigated 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,

8/13/2024

