



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

Docket No. 11862-24
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 24 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 Reserve on 6 March 1981. You completed the first phase of incremental initial active duty for training (IIADT) from 13 May 1981 to 31 July 1981 and the second phase of IIADT from 9 June 1982 to 30 July 1982. As a member of the Selected Marine Corps Reserve, you were required to attend forty-eight scheduled drills and no less than fourteen days of active duty for training (ADT) per year after completing IADT.

On 13 November 1983, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful possession of cannabinoids as evidenced by positive urinalysis. Additionally, 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 26 June 1984, your command received notification that you again tested positive for cannabinoids. Consequently, on 22 August 1984, you were notified via registered mail of pending administrative separation processing with an Under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH)

discharge by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. Your letter of notification was received and signed for; however, you did not return the statement of acknowledgement, nor did you contact your command at any point prior to your discharge. Your commanding officer recommended administrative separation with an OTH characterization of service due to your two positive drug tests and twenty-seven unauthorized absences. The separation authority directed your discharge with an OTH characterization of service and you were so discharged in absentia on 12 December 1984.

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 and your contentions that you have completely changed your life, earned multiple degrees, work with underserved communities, and request upgrade based on your service, personal growth, and many positive contributions. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which included your statement, the advocacy letter, and educational, ministerial, and professional certificates.

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 NJP and unsatisfactory participation in reserve drills, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved drug 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. Additionally, 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.

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. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and commends your post-discharge accomplishments, 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 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

