

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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

> Docket No. 2191-25 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 23 April 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).

The Board determined that your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You entered active duty with the Navy on 10 August 1988. On 28 March 1989, you were counseled on your involvement and participation in hazing ceremonies. On 27 April 1989, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for violation of a lawful general regulation by missing curfew. On 9 February 1990, you received NJP for disrespect toward a petty officer, disobeying a lawful order, displaying provoking gestures toward a petty officer, and assaulting a petty officer. On 30 March 1990, you received NJP for failure to go to appointed place of duty and failure to obey a lawful order. On 8 February 1991, you received NJP sleeping on watch. Consequently, you were notified of pending administrative separation action by reason of misconduct due to a pattern of misconduct. After you elected to waive your rights, your commanding officer (CO) forwarded your package to the separation authority (SA) recommending your discharge with an



Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service. The SA approved the CO's recommendation and you were so discharged on 7 March 1991.


Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your application, on 13 March 1995, after determining your discharge was proper as issued.

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 and contentions that you were told you were receiving a General (Under Honorable Conditions) discharge, you were young, immature, and a hothead, and you regret your actions. You further contend that you have been trouble free, a productive member of society, and worked for the government for the past 14 years. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted solely of your petition without any other additional documentation.

After thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJPs, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board observed you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently pervasive and serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. Further, the Board noted that your record clearly reflected your misconduct and the evidence of record did not show that you were not responsible for your conduct or that you should not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, the Board noted you provided no evidence other than your statement, to substantiate your contentions.

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

