



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

701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

Docket No. 1716-25
Ref: Signature Date

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 27 August 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 16 January 2025 decision by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB), the 18 November 2024 Advisory Opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Headquarters Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Section (MMPB-23), and your rebuttal of 27 February 2025.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove the fitness report for the reporting period 24 November 2021 to 26 May 2022 due to its unjust markings. Specifically, you contend the fitness report is unjust because your relief as the Aircraft Maintenance Officer (AMO) was inconsistent with what “[your] peers and commanders had experienced during similar situations.” By your own detailed statement, you acknowledged that you “failed to properly prepare the department for the inspection cycle” but you contend factors beyond your control should have been considered. Additionally, you contend that “[w]hile it is not acceptable to fail an inspection, the squadron’s ability to safely repair and fly the aircraft was not called into question, and there was no ceasing of flight operations.” Further, you contend you “lacked the appropriate time to ensure the training of the new division officers and over 100 Marines joining the department within weeks of the inspection cycle.” In your rebuttal response of 27 February 2025, you also contend the inspectors informed you that “removal was outside the intent of the inspection program, especially because the squadron did not have any discrepancies that resulted in a concern for [the] ability to safely fly aircraft.” Lastly, you contend you were provided

inadequate time to rebut the fitness report during its processing because “it took months for [you] to appropriately gather the data from adjacent units’ maintenance inspection failures.”

The Board, however, determined the fitness report was valid as written and filed, in accordance with the applicable Performance Evaluation System Manual guidance. Noting your relief from your duties as AMO stemmed from a “lack of performance” by failing “to ensure that the Maintenance Department was adhering to all policies and procedures,” as evidenced by two failed maintenance assessments, the Board considered whether your relief as AMO was in error and/or unjust. Based on the available evidence, the Board determined there is insufficient evidence that your relief as the AMO was in error or unjust. The Board, noting the failed inspections are an undisputed fact and you accepted full responsibility in your fitness report statements, did not find your arguments regarding the circumstances and factors surrounding your relief, nor the alleged actions taken against others in similar situations, to be compelling. Further, concurring with the AO, the Board determined your relief as the AMO was properly documented and the reporting chain appropriately addressed any factual disagreements. The Board also determined you were provided the appropriate and authorized amount of time for submitting a rebuttal and, although you contend gathering the data from adjacent units took months, the Board concluded there is no error or injustice in the timeline of the processing of your contested fitness report. Based on the available evidence, the Board concluded there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting removal or modification of the fitness 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,

9/9/2025

