



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

█  
Docket No. 1075-25  
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 11 June 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 15 December 2024 decision by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 25 November 2024 Advisory Opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Headquarters Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Section (MMPB-23). Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal, you did not do so.

The Board determined your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove the annual (AN) fitness report for the reporting period 1 September 2020 to 31 May 2021 or, in the alternative, change the dates of the report to reflect 28 February 2021 to 31 May 2021 and insert an administrative filler for the period 1 September 2020 to 27 February 2021<sup>1</sup> because the report is not written in accordance with the Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual and is an “erroneous and unfair assessment of [your] performance.” Specifically, you contend that during the reporting period from 1 September 2020 to 31 May 2021, you served in two different billets in the detachment but the contested AN report only covers the latter portion when you served as the Operations

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board noted your requested dates “20200901 – 20210827” were likely written in error and should have read “20200901 – 20210227.”

Department schedule writer. You further contend you should have received a transfer fitness report for the period you served as the Assistant S-4 under the supervision of the H-1 S-4 Officer. Instead, you contend you were issued a fitness report that solely evaluated you as the schedule writer for the entirety of the reporting period and did not include evaluation of your performance by the H-1 S-4 Officer. You also contend you addressed the matter with the Reviewing Officer (RO) before the report was processed. In support of your contentions, you submitted a statement from [REDACTED], the officer who supervised your performance as the Assistant S-4, which echoed your contentions and opined that your report was “erroneous in that it fail[ed] to account for time that should have been captured in a TR FITREP” because the “bulk of [your] service during the FITREP 3263299 reporting period was spent [under his] supervision and should not have been captured by a single fitness report by another RS.” [REDACTED] also noted that “seeking redress in this matter would have proven exceptionally difficult” due to the RO’s removal from the command shortly after the report was processed.

The Board, however, determined the AN fitness report was valid as written and filed, in accordance with the applicable PES Manual guidance. The Board, substantially concurring with the AO, noted you have not included an endorsement from the RS of the report, who retains an active profile, supporting your request for modification or removal. Further, you do not argue the RS of the contested report lacked meaningful observation nor do you specify errors/injustices in the report as currently written, aside from the noted contentions above. Additionally, the Board noted that both periods of service as the Assistant S-4 and the schedule writer were observed and evaluated by the same RO. Based on the available evidence, the Board concluded there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting your requested 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,

6/17/2025

[REDACTED]

Deputy Director

Signed by: [REDACTED]