



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

701 S. COURTHOUSE RD

ARLINGTON, VA 22204

[REDACTED] Docket No. 2896-25

Ref: Signature Date

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED],

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 3 December 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 the administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. The documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all the 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 18 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 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.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove from your record the fitness report for the period of 1 June 2017, to 31 May 2018. The Board also considered your contentions that your Reporting Senior (RS) made comments on the report that equate to admitting he wrote it to a profile and not to your individual performance; that the 80 average markings he assigned you do not paint an accurate picture of your performance; that the report is at the RS's lowest markings of an 80 average, which has skewed your Master Brief Sheet markings; and that the RS did not follow the Performance Evaluation System Manual instructions on how he should grade fitness reports.

However, the Board substantially concurred with the PERB's decision that you did not meet the burden of proof, nor did you show by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice that would warrant the removal of the fitness report. Specifically, the Board found that the RS comment to which you object is a mandatory comment required by established reporting guidelines to provide context and clarity on your performance and potential. MCO 1610.7A, which governs fitness reports, emphasizes the importance of these comments in offering a comprehensive understanding of an officer's professional character, beyond attribute marks or other report sections. These comments also serve to offer clarification to the reader regarding any disparity in the RS's profile or marking philosophy that might not be immediately obvious without proper context. In your case, the RS used his Section I comment to explain the anomaly of your relatively low report average, despite you having distinguished yourself among your peers. The comment was intended to provide context, not to introduce bias. Although you may not be satisfied with your marks, it is essential to note that a low relative value does not constitute grounds for consideration or redress. In regard to your specific marks, the Board noted that you failed to provide any evidence, beyond your own statement, to support the claim that your performance and conduct warranted higher marks. In a subsequent report with the same reporting officials and billet, you received an identical report average and relative value, which suggests consistency in your evaluations, rather than any anomaly.

Lastly, the Board noted your significant delay in filing your petition, as the report in question was processed in 2018. Despite having this report in your record, you have since been promoted, which suggests that your concerns lack credibility. In conclusion, the Board found your report to be valid as written, and the RS's commentary to be a genuine technique meant to provide context. 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,

12/17/2025

