



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

██████████
Docket No. 9954-24
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 6 November 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 commenced active duty with the Marine Corps on 1 August 1990. On 2 October 1992, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for absence from appointed place of duty. On 15 January 1993, you received NJP for making a false official statement and breaking restriction. On 21 April 1993, you received NJP for tampering with base telephone equipment without authorization. On 26 April 1993, you were formerly counseled on displaying a pattern of misconduct. On 1 September 1993, you received NJP for nine hours of unauthorized absence (UA). Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to minor disciplinary infractions. After electing to make a written statement, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the CO's recommendation and directed an OTH characterization of service by reason of misconduct due to minor disciplinary infractions. On 8 June 1994, 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 you

were targeted by the First Sergeant, your punishment was too harsh, and you would like to receive veterans' benefits. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board noted you provide 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, 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 punishment was a direct result of your actions and was not persuaded by your assertion that your punishment was too harsh or unfairly imposed. In reviewing the nature of your misconduct, the Board was unable to reasonably conclude that your First Sergeant was able to target you into breaking restriction, making a false official statement, or tampering with government property. Further, the Board considered that your commanding officer reviewed the evidence in your cases before deciding your guilt and imposing punishment. Finally, 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.

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 carefully considered the evidence you provided in mitigation and commends you for your post-discharge good character, 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,

12/2/2024

