



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

██████████
Docket No. 1745-25
Docket No. 1747-25
Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████

Dear ██████████,

This is in reference to your applications 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 applications, 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 applications have been denied.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your applications on 3 September 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 applications, together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies, as well as the 19 February 2025 decisions by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 22 January 2025 Advisory Opinions (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 carefully considered your request to remove the To Duty (TD) fitness report for the reporting period 1 April 2020 to 30 September 2020 and the Transfer (TR) fitness report for the reporting period 19 December 2020 to 10 June 2021 because the reports do not accurately represent your service, especially in light of the fact you were awarded the Navy Marine Corps Achievement Medal for your performance. Specifically, you contend the reports “directly contradict the roles and responsibilities” of the Reporting Senior (RS) and Reviewing Officer (RO) as stated in the Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual. Additionally, you contend the Staff Non-Commissioned Officer in Charge (SNCOIC) of the ██████████ with ██████████, who worked with you on a daily basis, had a more accurate evaluation of your performance because, as he stated in his submitted advocacy letter, the RS and RO “had limited interaction with [you] and were unable to personally observe [your] performance and leadership during these reporting periods.” The SNCOIC’s advocacy letter contends the RS and RO lacked direct observation and that led to an

“inaccurate and unfair evaluation” of your performance despite the SNCOIC making “multiple efforts to meet with them and provide detailed updates on each instructor’s leadership and contributions.” The SNCOIC further states “it was clear [you were] a top performer on the cadre” and, of the eight instructors, you “consistently stood out, taking on the most demanding tasks and excelling in high-stress situations” and your “leadership, initiative, and ability to adapt under pressure were key to the success of the mission.”

The Board, however, substantially concurred with the AOs and the PERB decisions that both the TD and TR fitness reports are valid as written and filed, in accordance with the applicable PES Manual guidance. In this regard, the Board noted co-location of yourself, and the reporting officials is not required in order for observation to occur. Further, the Board appreciated the SNCOIC’s advocacy letter but viewed it as just that, an advocacy letter, and not a substitute for the observations of your RS and RO. Lastly, the Board noted your contention the reports do not accurately reflect your service, but your claims of inaccurate and unjust markings are unsupported by the evidence. 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,

9/10/2025

