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

[redacted]
Docket No. 5935-25
Ref: Signature Date

[redacted]

Dear [redacted],

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 29 April 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 46) on [redacted]. Although you were afforded an opportunity to submit a rebuttal, you did not do so.

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 remove the Field Code 17 (FC17)[1] designation from your officer summary record (OSR) which you imply reflects negatively on your service and future promotion potential because the entry is considered adverse. Further, based on the definition provided in MILPERSMAN 1070-020, you contend the use of the FC17 likens your declination to conduct that is derogatory in nature such as nonjudicial punishment, punitive letters, drug and alcohol reports, etc. You also contend the FC17 should be removed because you were never made aware the FC17 entry would be added to your record. You contend the "unjustly damaging" procedure of having an officer decline selection is currently handled differently because of past harm and individuals are counseled to submit a "don't pick me" letter prior to the screening. You further contend you were not aware that you were being screened for Executive Officer-Special Mission (XO-SM) since you had not pursued Command Afloat nor did you receive notice about the XO-SM screening. If you had been made aware, you contend you would have submitted a "don't pick me"

[1] The Board noted you did not provide your Officer Summary Record so the Board was unable to see the FC17 entry.

letter to avoid the actions that have been taken. Additionally, you contend your situation is like that of the Petitioner awarded relief in Docket No. 6678-24 and the precedent from that case should be followed.

The Board, however, determined the FC17 was appropriately annotated in your OSR. The Board noted your 30 January 2020 memorandum closed with the statement, "I fully understand the impact of my decision to decline my XO Afloat/XO-SM assignment and that a de-screening letter will be placed in my permanent official record." The Board also noted that in response to your memorandum, the Deputy Chief of Naval Personnel (DCNP) informed you that your letter would be made a part of your official service record and, since the action "may be considered adverse," you were given an opportunity to submit a statement regarding the matter before it was placed in your official record. You declined the opportunity. The DCNP memo also stated that your name would be removed from the XO-SM list and "applicable Navy Personnel Command selection board results." Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined you did not provide any indication that you were unaware you were being considered for Command at Sea in the correspondence provided to the PERS-41 detailer. Lastly, the Board noted the AO's explanation that "various board decisions [field boards]" are also reason for a FC17 entry. After carefully considering your contentions, the Board concluded there is insufficient evidence of material error or injustice warranting the removal of the FC17 from your officer record.

Although the Board is not bound by precedent, it did consider the factual circumstances and decision made in your referenced case. The Board noted the Petitioner in 6678-24, after initially being denied removal of the FC17 entry, requested reconsideration of the earlier denial and submitted new evidence in the form of a recommendation letter from the Assistant Commander for Reserve Personnel Management Department (PERS 9) which detailed a change in guidance that was promulgated specifically to prevent issues like you have experienced. Unfortunately, in that letter, PERS-9 does not detail when the new guidance – submitting a "don't pick me" letter prior to screening – was promulgated so this Board was unable to determine if your situation truly mirrored the case you reference.

Based on the available evidence, the Board determined there is insufficient evidence of an error or injustice in the decision to annotate your OSR with a FC17 entry.

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,

5/14/2026

[redacted]