



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

██████████
Docket No. 4441-25
Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████
██████████
████████████████████

Dear ██████████

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.

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 18 August 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, 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).

You enlisted in the Marine Corps and commenced active duty on 3 November 1982. On 16 June 1983, you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for wrongful possession of marijuana. You were additionally issued an administrative remarks (Page 11) counseling concerning deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct concerning drug abuse. You were advised that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative discharge.

Unfortunately, not all of the documents pertinent to your administrative separation are in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, 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 that they have properly discharged their official duties. Based on documents that are present in your OMPF, you were processed for administrative separation for drug abuse and elected an administrative discharge board (ADB). The ADB heard your case on 19 December 1983 and found that you were aware of the Marine Corps policy on

drug abuse, used marijuana prior to active duty and received a waiver, and you possessed and used marijuana while on active duty. The ADB recommended that you be separated from the Marine Corps with an Other Than Honorable (OTH). The separation authority approved the ADB recommendation and you were so discharged on 19 January 1984.

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 to upgrade your discharge and your contentions that, after 41 years, you would like your honor as a Marine restored, the time and nature of your misconduct should be considered, and you were a good Marine who made bad decisions. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the totality of your application; which consisted of your DD Form 149 and your VA administrative decision letter that you provided.

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your NJP, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and the fact it involved a drug offense. 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 agreed with the ADB rationale that you were given an opportunity to correct your pre-service conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. Finally, the Board noted that there is no provision of federal law or in Navy/Marine Corps regulations that allows for a discharge to be automatically upgraded after a specified number of months or years.

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 provided 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 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,

8/27/2025

