



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

██████████
Docket No. 5678-25
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.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 4 March 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 Advisory Opinion (AO) provided by Navy Personnel Command (PERS 32) on 10 June 2025 and your statement in rebuttal.

The Board determined your personal appearance, with or without counsel, would not materially add to their understanding of the issues involved. Therefore, the Board determined a personal appearance was not necessary and considered your case based on the evidence of record.

The Board carefully considered your request to modify the evaluation & counseling record for the reporting period 1 December 2023 to 15 November 2024 by “discrediting” or changing the report from “progressing” to “promotable.” You contend a “situation that happened with [your] work” did not result in the imposition of nonjudicial punishment but only a “letter for corrective action” which when completed “would result in no disciplinary action taken.” Regardless, you contend you were unjustly given an adverse evaluation “due to that one incident.” In response, to the adverse evaluation, you filed a complaint with the Inspector General but the “results came back negative.” You further explain that a week later, your senior rater, the Executive Officer (XO), stepped down as XO, and you contend “this was the command’s way of handling the situation without making a big deal of it.” Additionally, you expressed your strong belief you were “unfairly ranked due to toxic leadership.” Lastly, you contend you did not elect to submit a

statement when you signed the contested evaluation because you feared the XO would lower additional marks on your evaluation because he has done this in the past during debriefs with other individuals.

The Board, however, substantially concurred with the AO and determined there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice in the contested report. The Board, noting you did not provide any details of the “situation” that happened at work, was unable to fully ascertain the circumstances that led to the adverse evaluation and concluded there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice to overcome the XO’s decision to assign you a “progressing” promotion recommendation on the contested evaluation. Based on the available evidence, the Board concluded that there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice warranting removal of the evaluation. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined your request does not merit relief.

In the absence of sufficient new evidence for reconsideration, the decision of the Board is final, and your only recourse would be to seek relief, at no cost to the Board, from a court of appropriate jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

3/13/2026

