



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

█
Docket No. 8075-24
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 11 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 Marine Corps on 3 January 1978. On 2 February 1979, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for two specifications of absence from appointed place of duty. On 9 February 1979, you were charged with possession of 24.0 grams of marijuana. On 14 February 1979, you received NJP for possession of .025 grams of marijuana. Consequently, you submitted a written request for discharge for the good of the service (GOS) to avoid trial by court-martial for the 9 February 1979 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 20 April 1979, 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 to Honorable and contentions that the marijuana found in your locker did not belong to you, you never failed a drug test, you became a whistleblower, but the Marine Corps pinned the drugs on you, and you did not have access to an attorney. You further contended that you served as an Aerospace Engineer for the DOD, currently hold a secret clearance, and you would like to receive Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health benefits. 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 and request for GOS discharge, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved drug related offenses. The Board determined that illegal drug use or possession by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow service members. The Board also considered the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board considered that there is no evidence in your record, and you submitted none, to substantiate your contentions. However, contrary to your contention that you lacked access to an attorney and did not commit the misconduct, the Board noted that your GOS request was witnessed by an attorney and states:

I am guilty of the foregoing misconduct and I understand that if tried by court-martial the-maximum sentence authorized by the Uniform Code of Military Justice, as implemented in the Manual for Courts-Martial, 1969 (Rev), for any offense listed above includes a punitive discharge, confinement, and other punishments.

Prior to submitting the foregoing request I have been afforded the opportunity to consult with a lawyer counsel and I have consulted with the lawyer hereinafter attesting this request as a witness. I am completely satisfied with the advice I have received from said lawyer. After consulting with counsel, I am absolutely convinced that this request is the best course of action for me I understand that I have an unqualified right to withdraw this request at any time prior to approval by the discharge authority. [Emphasis added]

Additionally, 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. 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.

The Board also determined there was insufficient evidence to conclude you were the victim of reprisal in violation of 10 USC 1034. 10 USC 1034 provides the right to request Secretary of Defense review of cases with substantiated reprisal allegations where the Secretary of the Navy's follow-on corrective or disciplinary actions are at issue. Additionally, in accordance with DoD policy you have the right to request review of the Secretary of the Navy's decision regardless of whether your reprisal allegation was substantiated or non-substantiated. Your written request must show by clear and convincing evidence that the Secretary of the Navy acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or contrary to law. This is not a de novo review and under 10 USC 1034(c) the Secretary of Defense cannot review issues that do not involve reprisal. You must file within 90 days of receipt of this letter to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)), Office of Legal Policy, 4000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-4000. Your written request must contain your full name, grade/rank, duty status, duty title, organization, duty location, mailing address, and telephone number; a copy of your BCNR application and final decisional documents; and, a statement of the specific reasons why you are not satisfied with this decision and the specific remedy or relief requested. Your request must be based on factual allegations or evidence previously presented to the BCNR, therefore, please also include previously presented documentation that supports your statements.

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,

9/30/2024

