



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

██████████  
Docket No. 933-25  
Ref: Signature Date

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████  
Dear ██████████,

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.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 18 March 2025. The names and votes of the members of the panel 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 this 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, as well as the ██████████ decision furnished by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB), and ██████████ advisory opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Manpower Management Division Records and Performance Branch. The AO was provided to you on 11 December 2024, and you were given 30 days in which to submit a response.<sup>1</sup>

The Board carefully considered your request to remove the fitness report for the reporting period 1 August 2023 to 29 February 2024. The Board considered your contention that the Reporting Senior's (RS's) O-4 profile contains overinflated markings on all fitness reports. The RS consistently overinflated markings on previous O-4 reports without those Marines facing positive or negative consequences due to the RS not having an O-4 profile. You also contend your Sections D-G (D, E, and F) markings and Section I comments do not match the cumulative relative value of 85.00 percent. You claim the RS was a Navy O-6 who admitted, post fitness report submission that he was not familiar with Marine Corps fitness report markings/processes and did not understand that Marine Corps fitness reports at the Naval Academy were weighted and considered at the same level as Fleet Marine Force reports. You also claim the RS was in

---

<sup>1</sup> Email by you dated 18 March 2025, stated "[a]pologize for the delay; my Command has recommended a different avenue of approach and this was just finalized on Friday. I will not be submitting a rebuttal to pull my FitRep. I appreciate you being accommodating and thank you for the communication."

the process of retiring and was not in direct observation of you for approximately three months. Further, you received no periodic counselings during the period or debrief on the report at any prior to, or after, submission. Additionally, you claim you were informed by one of the previous Marines that there was an unduly familiar relationship with the first (and highest ranked) O-4 that was written on, wherein that O-4 was on first name basis with the RS and childcare was provided for the RS by the O-4.

The Board, however, substantially concurred with the PERB's decision that you did not demonstrate probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting removal of your fitness report. The Board determined that your fitness report is valid as written and filed in accordance with the applicable Marine Corps Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual. In this regard, the Board noted that the PES Manual does not provide a metric to align Section I comments to relative values. The Board also determined that the competitiveness of a report's relative value or comparative assessment is not a basis for the removal or modification of a fitness report. Additionally, the fact that the RS evaluated other Majors higher than you is not an error or injustice. Other than your statement, the Board found no evidence of favoritism or that the RS was unfamiliar with the Marine Corps fitness report process. Moreover, as required by the PES Manual, the Reviewing Officer (RO), a Marine Colonel, reviewed your fitness report and concurred with the RS's assessment and comments regarding your performance.

Concerning your claim that the RS was absent for three months during the reporting period, the Board found no evidence to support your contention, and you provided none. Even if the RS was absent, it would have left 123 days of observation, which still exceeds the minimum requirement for an observed report. The Board thus concluded there is no probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting corrective action. 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,

3/28/2025