



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

██████████
Docket No. 4727-25
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.

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 25 February 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 29 April 2025 decision by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 18 March 2025 Advisory Opinion (AO) provided to the PERB by the Headquarters Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Section (MMPB-23). Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal, you chose not to do so.

The Board carefully considered your request to modify the fitness report for the reporting period 21 December 2019 to 15 May 2020 by removing the Reporting Senior's (RS's) markings and comments. You contend the report should have been non-observed due to the short period of observation, coupled with the initial COVID-19 restrictions at the Pentagon, which only allowed you six weeks of in-person observation time. Further, you contend you were not able to break out from the experienced analysts with more time on station due to the short period of in-person observation. In support of your request for modification, the RS provided a letter explaining to the Board that you were at the bottom of his profile "due to no fault of [your] own." The RS emphasized that you "stepped into a difficult, technical, and analytical billet that requires over a year to learn." Lastly, the RS highlighted that this situation put you in "a position where it was difficult for [you] not to be at the bottom of [his] profile" so he stated he should have made the report non-observed due to the limited observation.

The Board, however, determined the fitness report was valid as written and filed, in accordance with the applicable Performance Evaluation System Manual. The Board, concurring with the AO, noted co-location is not required for observation to occur and, while the relationship may have been affected by the COVID-19 restrictions, the RS did not specify any periods of non-availability in the contested report nor in the endorsement letter. Based on the available evidence, the Board concluded there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting modification of the fitness report. 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,

3/20/2026

