



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

██████████
Docket No. 6211-25
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 case on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 16 December 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 U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and began a period of active duty on 15 July 1992. On 18 February 1993, you were released from active duty at the completion of your initial duty for training and assigned to your Reserve unit. On 9 January 1994, you were issued a counseling warning for your unsatisfactory drill attendance for unauthorized absence (UA) from 1-3 October 1993 and directed to perform EIOD's by 30 January 1994. From April 1996 until February 1997, administrative notes were placed in your official military personnel file (OMPF) that your participation was unsatisfactory. On 7 February 1997, your Commanding Officer (CO) began the process of administrative separation that included sending you the notice of administrative processing, via certified mail return receipt, to your last known address. In the notification, the specific basis for the recommendation was your unsatisfactory participation in ready reserve. After you failed to respond, the CO forwarded the documents to the Separation Authority (SA). On 2 March 1997, an Enlisted Screening Board determined you should be

administratively reduced in paygrade due to your unsatisfactory participation in your required drills. After reviewing all the separation documents, the SA directed that you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) characterization of service for unsatisfactory participation in ready reserve. You were so discharged on 6 August 1997.

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 was not limited, your request to upgrade your characterization of service and change your narrative reason for separation. You contend you made a terrible mistake by stopping attending drills between 1996-1997. You also contend, at the time, you were carrying the unresolved trauma of your childhood, dealing with financial hardship, relying on a failing car that would regularly stall, and struggling with undiagnosed ADHD. You also checked the "Other Mental Health" box on your application but did not respond to the Board's request for supporting evidence of your claim. 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 that your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined that your misconduct, as evidenced by your unsatisfactory participation in required drills, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Your conduct not only showed a pattern of misconduct but was sufficiently pervasive and serious to negatively affect the good order and discipline of your command. The Board also considered that you failed to fulfill your contractual obligation to the Marine Corps and that unexpectedly absenting yourself from your command placed an undue burden on your chain of command and fellow service members, and likely negatively impacted mission accomplishment.

As a result, the Board determined that there was no impropriety or inequity in your reason for separation and 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 submitted in mitigation and commends you on your post-discharge accomplishments, 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,

1/7/2026

