



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

█  
Docket No. 6792-24  
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 7 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).

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 Marine Corps on 3 October 1979. On 10 June 1980 and 2 July 1980, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for four specifications of failure to be at appointed place of duty and two specifications of unauthorized absence (UA). On 30 September 1980, a summary court-martial (SCM) convicted you of five days of UA, four specifications of failure to go to appointed place of duty, and three specifications of violation of article 91. On 12 February 1981, you received NJP for two specifications of willfully destroying government property.

Subsequently, you continued to commit misconduct that included a period of UA, 11 instances of failure to go to your appointed place of duty, two instances of disobedience of non-commissioned

officers, and dereliction of duty. This misconduct resulted in charges being preferred to a court-martial. Subsequently, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial for the aforementioned misconduct. 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 (CO) was directed to issue an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for the GOS. On 22 June 1981, you were so discharged.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. On 3 June 1996, the NDRB denied your request after determining that your discharge was proper as issued.

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 contention that your discharge was unjust because you did not disobey an order, you were sick and passed out on watch due to drinking contaminated water at █, you woke up in jail, and were forced to sign your GOS discharge request. 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 these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, SCM, and 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. Therefore, the Board was not persuaded by your arguments of denial of due process. 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. 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 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,

8/23/2024

