



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

■
Docket No. 1696-25
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.

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 28 May 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 began a period of active duty on 14 February 2000. On 18 April 2001, you were issued an administrative remarks (6105) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and conduct. Specifically, unlawful entry, in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) and insubordinate conduct, in violation of Article 91, UCMJ. The 6105 expressly advised you that any further disciplinary infractions or continuation of deficient performance may result in disciplinary action and/or processing for administrative discharge. On 23 January 2002, you were found guilty by a special court-martial (SPCM) of larceny, conspire to commit an offense under the UCMJ, to wit: larceny of U.S. government property, unlawfully enter a building, the property of the U.S. government with intent to commit larceny, breaking restriction, and additional charge of two specifications of willfully damage property of the United States. As punishment, you were sentenced to confinement, forfeiture of pay, and a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD). Upon the completion of appellate review in your case, you were so discharged from the Marine Corps on 14 September 2004.

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 upgrade your discharge character of service and contentions that you were intoxicated, made the “stupidest” decision of your life, and you would not have made such a decision had you not been intoxicated. You also checked the “PTSD” box on your application, but you did not respond to the Board’s request for evidence in support of this claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted solely of the personal statements you included with your DD Form 149 without any other additional documentation.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard of military authority and regulations. The Board also considered the negative impact your conduct likely had on the good order and discipline of your unit. Further, the Board determined the record reflected that your misconduct was intentional and demonstrated you were unsuitable for continued naval service. The Board also determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions. Furthermore, the Board noted that, although it cannot set aside a conviction, it might grant clemency in the form of changing a characterization of discharge, even one awarded by a court-martial. However, the Board concluded that despite your contentions this was not a case warranting any clemency based on the gravity of your misconduct. Finally, the Board noted that, although one’s service is generally characterized at the time of discharge based on performance and conduct throughout the entire enlistment, the conduct or performance of duty reflected by only a single incident of misconduct may provide the underlying basis for discharge characterization. There is no precedent within this Board’s review for minimizing the “one-time” isolated incident. As with each case before the Board, the seriousness of a single act must be judged on its own merit; it can neither be excused nor extenuated solely on its isolation. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and the Board 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,

6/16/2025

