

## **DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

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

> Docket No. 1244-25 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.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 23 July 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 17 January 2025<sup>1</sup> decision by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 3 January 2025 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 chose not to do so.

The Board carefully considered your request to modify the fitness report for the reporting period 1 January 2023 to 5 May 2023 by redacting the reference to an Administrative Remarks (Page 11) 6105 counseling entry. Specifically, you contend the 6105 is not a proper entry because it does not include "the verbiage required to be classified as a 6105." Additionally, in block 18 of your DD Form 149, you request removal of the contested report because you were given an adverse marking for judgment and the only justification was the erroneous 6105. Further, you contend the report should be removed because both the Reviewing Officer and Third Officer Sighter reference the erroneous 6105 in their comments.

The Board, however, determined the fitness report was valid as written and filed, in accordance with the applicable Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual guidance. The Board noted

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The date listed on the PERB decision letter is 17 January 2024. However, based on the context of the letter, the correct year should be 2025.

two previous Boards<sup>2</sup> denied your request to remove the 6105 counseling entry. The Board concurred with the AO and agreed with the previous Boards' determination that the 6105 was valid. Therefore, the Board concluded there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting modification or removal of the contested report. 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,

8/5/2025



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In Docket No. 2793-23, you argued the counseling entry, which you contend accused you of something you did not do, was the result of an erroneous command investigation. In your most recent submission, Docket No. 4351-24, you argued the counseling entry was incomplete and did not include a "comprehensive explanation of the consequences of failure to successfully take the recommended corrective action;" which is the same contention you raise in the present case.