



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

█
Docket No. 3323-25
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.

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 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 2 April 2025 advisory opinion (AO) provided by Navy Personnel Command. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal to the AO, you did not do so.

The Board carefully considered your request to remove a repeat evaluation from your record. You contend your record contains two Chief evaluations that share the same ID number and cover the same period of service. You state that the first of these two evaluations shows you were frocked and implies your transfer to the fleet reserve, while the second is a supplemental evaluation that does not contain language related to the fleet reserve. You contend you never had plans to transfer to the fleet reserve. You would like the first of these two evaluations removed from your record, and the second, retained.

After careful review, the Board concurred with the AO in its entirety, finding that you did not demonstrate probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting removal of the first evaluation. Review of your official record indicates that the first evaluation is on file in your record and that your reporting senior later submitted a Letter-Supplement, dated 22 November 2024, with a revised evaluation report, for the period in question. This Letter-Supplement and revised evaluation made changes to the original report which were entered into your record on 9 March 2025.

The applicable policy states: “After a FITREP or EVAL has been filed in the Official Military Personnel File (OMPF)/field service record, it may be modified only through an administrative change or the addition of supplementary material...or through an appeal process.” It further states: “Supplemental material *does not* replace the original report on the member’s OMPF nor does it change the information on the member’s Performance Summary Record; it only supplements the original report.” In reviewing your request, and based on the policy discussed herein, the Board concluded that your reporting senior properly submitted a Letter-Supplement and revised evaluation for the purpose of making corrections to the original report. Removal of the original report from your OMPF is not required, therefore, the Board concluded there is no error to correct. As such, the Board found your application did not meet the burden of proof or show by preponderance of the evidence probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice, and concluded your request should be denied.

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,

12/31/2025

