



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

Docket No. 11856-24
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 17 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).

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 27 March 1985. On 30 September 1985, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for assaulting a Private First Class by striking him in the eye. On 14 April 1986, you were issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge. On 1 May 1986, you received NJP for unauthorized absence (UA), disrespectful language toward a Sergeant, and willfully disobeying a Sergeant. On 6 May 1986, you received Page 11 counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct and were again advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge. On 28 May 1986, you received NJP for breaking restriction. On 18 April 1988, you received NJP for UA. On 14 June 1988, you received NJP for wrongful use of marijuana as evidenced by positive urinalysis. On 19 July 1998, you received NJP for UA and disobeying a lawful order.

Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation processing with an Under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You waived your rights to consult counsel, submit a statement, or have your case heard by an administrative discharge board. The separation authority subsequently directed your discharge with an OTH characterization of service and you were so discharged on 9 September 1988.

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 change your discharge characterization of service to qualify for Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) benefits and your contentions that you had a close call during a parachute jump and smoked marijuana because you did not want to jump anymore. Additionally, the Board noted you checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but chose not to provide evidence in support of your claim. 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 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 the fact it included a drug offense. 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, 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 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,

4/3/2025

