



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

█
Docket No. 2961-25
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 30 June 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, 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).

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 20 June 1973. Between 13 May 1974 and 27 March 1975, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on seven occasions for failure to sign on liberty, four instances of unauthorized absence (UA), assault by striking another Marine with an entrenching tool, violating a lawful order by introducing alcoholic beverages into the squad bay, disrespectful in language towards an NCO, failure to maintain proper shave, and sleeping on post. On 27 March 1975, you began a period of UA which lasted 154 days. On 29 September 1975, you requested an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service in lieu of trial by court-martial. On 30 September 1975, your administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact. On 16 October 1975, you received an eighth NJP for disobeying a lawful order. Subsequently, the separation authority approved your discharge request and you were so discharged on 21 October 1975.

Post-discharge, you applied twice to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. The NDRB denied your requests, on 8 September 1976 and 19 December 1979, 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 for a discharge upgrade and contentions that: (a) you request that the Board consider to grant you a discharge upgrade even though it was all your fault, (b) you are 68 years of age and would like for the Board to give you a second chance, (c) you made mistakes and you take full responsibility for your actions, (d) you would like to use the Department of Veterans Affairs facilities for medical care, (e) you have learned from your mistakes and apologize for all your faults. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted solely of the personal statement you included with your DD Form 149 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 and request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial, 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. The Board also noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial; thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and possible punitive discharge. Finally, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans' benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities.

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. While the Board appreciates your expression of remorse, 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 the 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,

7/17/2025

