



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

██████████
Docket No. 9342-24
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 18 December 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 commenced a period of active duty in May 1988. After a period of Honorable service, you immediately reenlisted and commenced a second period of active duty on 25 October 1990. On 2 August 1991, a summary court-martial (SCM) convicted you of UA totaling 49 days and two specifications of missing ship's movement. On 15 May 1992, you were formerly counseled on your financial and indebtedness problems. On 1 June 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for UA totaling 21 days. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to commission of a serious offense. You elected to consult with legal counsel and requested an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB found that you committed misconduct and recommended you receive an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The separation authority concurred with the ADB and you were so discharged on 19 September 1992.

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 went UA due to you wife's sister dying, you worked in the construction profession for over 20

years, and you currently own a lawn service business. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provided advocacy letters and a personal statement.

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 SCM, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the likely negative impact your conduct had on the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board noted that your record clearly reflected your misconduct and the evidence of record did not show that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, the Board observed you were provided an opportunity to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH 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. While the Board commends your post-discharge accomplishments and carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation, 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,

1/17/2025

█