



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

██████████
Docket No. 11787-24
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 father's 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 26 March 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 entered active duty with the Marine Corps on 7 July 1998. On 12 October 1999, you were counseled on your poor judgement, professional conduct, and disrespectful mannerisms. On 31 May 2000, you received non-judicial Punishment (NJP) for disobeying a lawful order, destruction of government property, willfully acting in a manner to provoke a physical confrontation, and drunk and disorderly conduct. On 13 July 2000, you received NJP for being disrespectful to a non-commissioned officer and wrongful use of marijuana sometime prior to 19 June 2000. On 5 December 2000, a special court-martial (SPCM) convicted you, pursuant to your pleas, of two specifications of wrongful use of marijuana. The specifications involved wrongful use of marijuana between 16 May 2000 and 16 June 2000 and 7 July 2000 and

7 August 2000. As a result, you were sentenced to confinement for seven days and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). After completion of all levels of review, you were so discharged on 9 July 2002.

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 your first urinalysis was positive due to drinking alcohol at a concert, your second urinalysis only showed traces of low level marijuana use, and you were not properly evaluated for mental health issues, and you were exposed to chemical during a mission. Additionally, the Board noted that you checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted solely of your petition without any other additional documentation.

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 SPCM, outweighed the mitigating evidence in your case. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved multiple drug related offenses. The Board determined that illegal drug use 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. Further, the Board observed you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently pervasive and serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. Finally, the Board noted you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions. Moreover, the Board observed that you pleaded guilty to both drug abuse specifications at your SPCM. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies case and that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions.

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 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,

4/14/2025

