



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

██████████  
Docket No. 4459-25  
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.

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 6 June 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).

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 originally enlisted in the U.S. Navy and began a period of active duty service on 13 July 1990. Your pre-enlistment physical examination, on 10 March 1990, and self-reported medical history both noted no psychiatric or neurologic issues or symptoms. On 12 November 1992 you received non-judicial punishment (NJP) for an assault. You did not appeal your NJP. On 16 July 1993, you reenlisted for four (4) years.

On 19 April 1995, your command issued you a "Page 13" retention warning (Page 13)

documenting an unauthorized absence (UA). The Page 13 expressly advised you that any further deficiencies in your performance and/or conduct may result in disciplinary action and in processing for administrative separation.

On 16 August 1996, you received NJP for: (a) two (2) separate UA specifications, (b) failing to obey a lawful order, and (c) insubordinate conduct. You did not appeal your NJP.

Following a positive urinalysis test, on 22 October 1996, you received NJP for the wrongful use of a controlled substance (marijuana). You did not appeal your NJP.

On 23 October 1996, your command notified you of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to drug abuse. You waived your rights to consult with counsel and to request an administrative separation board. In the interim, your separation physical examination, on 28 October 1996, noted no psychiatric or neurologic issues, symptoms, or conditions.

On 4 November 1996, your command recommended to the Separation Authority that you should receive an under Other Than Honorable conditions (OTH) discharge characterization. Ultimately, on 14 April 1997, you were separated from the Navy for misconduct with an OTH discharge characterization and assigned an RE-4 reentry code. Your DD Form 214 did not annotate your period of continuous Honorable service.

Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for a discharge upgrade. The NDRB denied your request, on 5 April 1999, based on their determination your discharge was proper as issued. However, the NDRB directed an administrative change to your DD Form 214 to annotate the missing period of continuous Honorable service<sup>1</sup>.

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) a higher discharge status can improve your employment prospects, as employers may consider discharge status during hiring decisions, (b) with the passing of your parents, the repayment of a home loan is in question to your qualifications being under review, (c) your discharge can restore the honor and respect associated with military service, especially if the discharge was not reflective of your overall service, a grave mistake was made in judgement of your decisions made in your youth, and (d) your work ethics have dramatically improved with age also becoming a second generation family member. 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 and contentions were insufficient to warrant relief. The Board did not believe that your record was otherwise so meritorious as to deserve a discharge upgrade. The Board concluded that significant negative aspects of your conduct and/or performance greatly outweighed any positive aspects of your military record. The Board determined that illegal drug use is contrary to military core values

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board will forward a copy of the NDRB decision to Commander, Navy Personnel Command to allow them to make the necessary correction to your DD Form 214.

and policy, renders such service members unfit for duty, and poses an unnecessary risk to the safety of their fellow Sailors. The Board noted that marijuana use is still against Department of Defense regulations and its use in any form is still not permitted for recreational use while serving in the military. The Board determined that characterization under OTH conditions is generally warranted for misconduct and is appropriate when the basis for separation is the commission of an act or acts constituting a significant departure from the conduct expected of a Sailor. The Board determined that the record clearly reflected your cumulative misconduct was intentional and willful and indicated you were unfit for further service. Moreover, the Board noted that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should not otherwise be held accountable for your actions.

Further, absent a material error or injustice, the Board declined to summarily upgrade a discharge solely for the purpose of facilitating veterans or VA benefits, or enhancing educational or employment opportunities.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your discharge, and the Board concluded that your serious misconduct and disregard for good order and discipline clearly merited your discharge. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation and expressed their condolences for your loss, 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,

6/17/2025

