



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

701 S. COURTHOUSE RD

ARLINGTON, VA 22204

[REDACTED] Docket No. 4262-25

Ref: Signature Date

[REDACTED]

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.

Because your application was submitted with new evidence not previously considered, the Board found it in the interest of justice to review your application. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 29 September 2025. The names and votes of the panel members will be furnished upon request. Your allegations of error or 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, and 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).

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.

You previously applied to this Board for an upgrade to your characterization of service and were denied on 23 August 2021. In that request you asserted that: (1) you were involuntarily extended on active duty and your pay was unjustly stopped, (2) you went into an unauthorized absence status as a result of the pay issue, and (3) you were offered the opportunity to reenlist as an E-1 following your court-martial but you declined. The summary of your service remains substantially unchanged from that addressed in the Board's previous decision.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interest of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. These included, but were not limited to, your desire for an upgrade of your discharge and your contentions that: (1) you joined the military to escape a troubled childhood and were struggling

with mental health challenges that you did had not yet learned to manage, (2) the military provided you with structure and discipline, but you now recognize that your lack of emotional readiness contributed to mistakes early in your service, (3) despite these initial struggles, you quickly adapted, excelled, embraced the military's discipline and leadership structure and advanced within your unit, (4) you regret declining the opportunity to remain in the military as an E-1 following your court-martial, (5) since your discharge you have worked diligently to improve yourself and your community by serving in various roles including motivational speaker, retail manager, radio show host, deacon, book author, baseball coach, life coach, customer service strategist, youth counselor, and college graduate, (6) you have continued your commitment to helping others overcome challenges similar to those you faced, (7) and you expressed a willing to demonstrate your commitment to military service by joining the Reserves if given the opportunity. Additionally, the Board noted that you checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but did not provide any medical evidence in support of your claim. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149 and the evidence you provided in support of your application.

After a thorough review, the Board concluded these potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct, as evidenced by your special court-martial for an unauthorized absence lasting 117 days, two specifications of stealing currency, and three specifications of fraud against the U.S. Government, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded that it showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board further noted that, as a Disbursing Clerk, you held a position of fiduciary trust and responsibility requiring the highest standards of integrity, reliability, and accountability. Your actions were inconsistent with the professional and ethical obligations inherent in that role and undermined the confidence essential to the proper functioning of the service. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service.

While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and acknowledged your post-service accomplishments, 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 is attached 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,

11/19/2025

[REDACTED]