



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

██████████
██████████ No. 6753-25
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.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 1 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 13 June 2025 decision by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB) and the 15 May 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 11 August 2022 to 30 April 2023 by removing the Reporting Senior's (RS's) markings because the report "does not accurately reflect [your] performance during this period." You contend the RS, while deployed, explained to you that her profile management, along with limited observation of Chief Warrant Officer 2s, "led to [you] being marked as her 80 to establish a profile." Further, you contend the Reviewing Officer had discussions with the RS regarding the markings, but they were not revised.

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 that beyond your statement, there is no evidence to support your contention the RS intentionally assigned an "80" relative value in order to establish a profile. Further, the Board, noting you do not have a comparable observed report to substantiate your claims of consistent performance at a higher grade, again concurring with the AO, concluded you have provided insufficient evidence that your performance warranted different markings. Thus, 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,

4/7/2026

