



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

701 S. COURTHOUSE RD

ARLINGTON, VA 22204

█  
Docket No. 4055-25

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 28 January 2026. 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 16 June 2025 advisory opinion (AO) provided by Navy Personnel Command and your response to the AO.

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 1) overturn your detachment for cause (DFC), 2) remove the adverse materials from your Official Military Personnel File (OMPF), and 3) restore your Nuclear Additional Qualification Designator (ADQ), retroactive to the date of the DFC request. You contend that: 1) the DFC request, and subsequent endorsement, contained material errors and omissions that led to your unjust relief, 2) the underlying investigations into material challenges underpinning the DFC request do not contain a single instance where you directed your team to violate established procedures, and 3) the DFC disregarded all external sources of positive information contrary to an erroneous narrative that you fostered a non-compliant culture.

After careful review, the Board concurred with the AO, finding that you did not demonstrate probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting the relief requested. As a foundational matter, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers, and in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume the public officers have properly discharged their official duties. The Board found your evidence insufficient to overcome this presumption. Although the Board carefully considered your contentions and rebuttal to the AO, and was, to some extent, sympathetic to the possibility that you assumed command without knowledge of some pre-existing, not readily apparent, flaws with mechanical aspects of your ship, the Board opined that officers regularly assume command of aged vessels with known and unknown deficiencies, both in materials and crew, and are yet expected to effectively command. The Board further noted, although you identify specific flaws in the investigations that underpin your DFC, it is not the role of the Board to reinvestigate matters already addressed by command investigations. Rather, the Board must determine whether any material errors or injustices occurred in the process.

Regarding your DFC, as the AO addressed, reasons for requesting a DFC include, among others, substandard performance of duty over an extended period of time, and failure to improve. Procedural requirements for DFC include, among others, counseling and guidance to the officer prior to the request, consideration of whether reassignment within the command is a reasonable alternative, and adequate and appropriate investigative support for the request. The Board found the reasons for your DFC were well-supported and appropriate, and the procedural requirements were met. Specifically, as documented in your OMPF, the Board found the decision to remove you from command was based on substandard performance and failure to improve, as evidenced by multiple formal and informal counseling sessions, three separate command investigations or preliminary inquiries, and concurrence by experienced and senior members of your chain of command. The Board particularly noted the formal counseling administered to you by Commander, █, wherein he advised that you must demand your crew keep you updated on casualties, mission impacts, and actions being taken to correct them; that you must better leverage subject matter experts and mentors to ensure you were informed and proactive about solving problems on the ship; and, that you must redouble efforts to ensure procedural compliance. As the Commander pointed out, despite this, your ship suffered another casualty. The Board concurred with his conclusion that, ultimately, you did not recognize your fundamental responsibility and accountability as Commanding Officer. In conclusion, the Board found your DFC was supported by the evidence and without procedural error, and that the affiliated adverse material in your OMPF and loss of ADQ, remain appropriate. 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 that an error or injustice exists with your record. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined 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,

2/18/2026

