



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

██████████
Docket No. 3148-25

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 case on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 14 July 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).

Regarding your request for a personal appearance, the Board determined that a personal appearance with or without counsel will not materially add to their understanding of the issue(s) involved. Therefore, the Board determined that a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 1 December 1998. On 18 May 2000, you were counseled concerning your failure to obey grooming standards; specifically, you were stopped by the MPs for wearing an earring. On 2 February 2001, you were convicted by special court martial (SPCM) for two instances of wrongful use of a controlled substance and three instances of unauthorized absence (UA) from appointed place of duty. You were sentenced to a Bad Conduct Discharge (BCD), a period of confinement, and forfeiture of pay. After completion of levels of legal review, you were so discharged on 28 Mar 2003.

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) it was difficult for you to growing up without a father figure, (b) you were young and made poor decisions, to include staying up until early morning hours, learning about sex at age 13, and dropping out of high school at age 16, (c) your mother was everything to you; however, she worked two jobs and was not able to teach you how to become a man, (d) you fell back into a younger lifestyle and made two mistakes by not passing urinalysis, (e) no help was offered and your choices caused you to be discharged with a BCD, (f) you have used your MOS skills to become successful in the restaurant industry, (g) you have become part of the Armed Forces Partner network; which provides assistance to kids in not making the same mistakes you made while growing up, (h) you have a beautiful family with 20 years of marriage and four kids. You also checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but chose not to respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which included your DD Form 149 and the evidence you provided in support of it.

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 SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it included drug related offenses. The Board determined that illegal drug use by a service member is contrary to military core values and policy, renders such members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow service members. The Board noted that marijuana use in any form is still against Department of Defense regulations and not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. Further, the Board found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. 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.

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 carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation, 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. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence you provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of your misconduct. 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,

7/29/2025

