



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

█
Docket No. 1698-25
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 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.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove your 22 April 2022 6105 counseling entry. The Board considered your contentions that the investigation was unsubstantiated, it was not based on alleged fraternization, and no evidence was found to support such a claim. You also contend none of the recommendations indicate that you violated Uniform Code of Military Justice, Article 92, and there are no statements suggesting that your actions impacted good order and discipline.

The Board noted the command investigation endorsements and comments by █
█ and your chain of command regarding allegations of prohibited activity and conduct. The endorsements indicate that while your conduct toward the subordinate Marine did not meet the elements for sexual harassment or harassment, the EOA, SJA, and your chain of command concurred with the command investigation and found the relationship between you and the subordinate Marine to be inappropriate or unduly familiar.

As a result, pursuant to paragraph 6105 of the Marine Corps Separation and Retirement Manual (MARCORSEPMAN), you were issued a 6105 counseling for violating Navy Regulations 1165 for fraternization by having an inappropriate relationship with a Marine of lesser grade. The

Board also noted that you acknowledged the entry and elected not to submit a statement. The Board determined that the counseling entry was written and issued according to the MARCORSEPMAN. Specifically, the counseling entry provided written notification concerning your deficiencies, specific recommendations for corrective action, where to seek assistance, the consequences for failure to take corrective action, and it afforded you an opportunity to submit a rebuttal. The Board noted, too, according to Navy Regulation 1165, "personal relationships between officer members or between enlisted members that are unduly familiar and that do not respect differences in grade or rank are prohibited." The Board thus determined that your commanding officer acted within his/her discretionary authority and relied upon sufficient evidence that included a command investigation when determining that your relationship with a subordinate violated Navy Regulations. The Board thus concluded that 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,

7/8/2025

