



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
701 S. COURTHOUSE RD  
ARLINGTON, VA 22204

██████████  
Docket No. 2862-25  
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 19 November 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 13 March 2025 decision furnished by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 4 February 2025 advisory opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Manpower Management Performance Branch (MMPB-23). The AO was provided to you on 13 March 2025, and you were given 30 days in which to submit a response. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal, you did not do so.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove from your record your fitness report for the reporting period of 23 October 2021 to 23 January 2022, or in the alternative, change the report to "Not Observed" (NOB), and if the forgoing is approved, remove all failures of selection for promotion from your record. The Board considered your contention that the Reviewing Officer (RO) did not adhere to Performance Evaluation System (PES) Manual guidelines when completing Section K of the fitness report by (1) not amplifying the comparative remarks, which is a critical element in providing a clear distinction between you and your peers; (2) not identifying opportunities for your continued professional development; and (3) not including marks for retention, command assignment, and future Professional Military Education (PME), all of which are important for assessing your long-term career potential and readiness for increased responsibility. You further contend, by not adhering to the standards set forth in the PES Manual, the RO failed to offer necessary context for future boards or panels that may review

your record and contributed to a fitness report that lacks the depth, context, and accuracy necessary to provide a complete and fair evaluation of your performance.

The Board, however, substantially concurred with the PERB's decision in its entirety, finding that you did not demonstrate probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting removal or modification of your fitness report. The Board determined that your RO adhered to the PES Manual, was not required to supply amplifying information as you contend, and that your fitness report is valid as written and filed in accordance with the PES Manual. The Board noted that this was your third consecutive observed fitness report while serving as Supply Officer, that the RO was the same officer in all three reports, and in all three reports he marked you in block "5" of the comparative assessment. The Board determined that his concurrence with your Reporting Senior's (RS) comments and evaluation validates his portion of the report and supports the RS's recommendations, including those for promotion, future assignments, and PME. Moreover, the PES Manual does not require an RO to specifically address an officer's potential for command in the fitness report. The Board also determined it is a misconception to assume an RO would recommend an officer for command if he did not deem the officer worthy of such a highly coveted and limited opportunity.

Regarding your alternate request to change the RS portion of the report to NOB, the Board found that your request lacks credibility, noting you do not contend your RS violated the PES Manual or committed any other wrongdoing in relation to his evaluation of your performance. The Board thus concluded there is no probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting corrective action. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined your request does not merit relief. Please note, because the Board denied your request to remove or change your fitness report, it did not address your secondary request to have the failures of selection for promotion removed from your record.

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,

11/21/2025

