



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

Docket No. 10302-24
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 22 January 2025. 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 enlisted in the United States Navy and began a period of active duty on 18 April 1989. On 3 July 1989, you commenced a period of unauthorized absence that ended on 4 July 1989. On 18 July 1989, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for the nine-hour period of unauthorized absence (UA). On 5 July 1989, you received NJP for UA and dereliction of duty. On 31 January 1991, you received NJP for dereliction of duty and false official statement. On 2 May 1991, you received NJP for UA. On 20 June 1991, you received NJP for two specifications of unauthorized absence. Consequently, you were notified that you were being recommended for administrative discharge from the Navy by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and commission of a serious offense. You waived your right to consult with counsel and to present your case to an administrative discharge board. The commanding

officer forwarded your administrative separation package to the separation authority recommending your administrative discharge from the Navy with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The separation authority accepted the recommendation, and you were so discharged on 3 July 1991.

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 character of service and contentions that: (1) you were never absent from work, (2) you may have been late a few times, but you were never UA. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application, which consisted solely of what you stated on your DD Form 149 without any additional documentation for the Board's consideration.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your 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 concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board observed that you were provided opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies during your service, but you continued to commit additional misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. Finally, contrary to your contention, the Board found substantial evidence that you were UA multiple times and committed other serious offenses to support your administrative separation.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge and concluded that your misconduct and disregard for good order and discipline clearly merited your discharge. 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 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,

3/10/2025

■

Executive Director

Signed by: ■