



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

701 S. COURTHOUSE RD

ARLINGTON, VA 22204

██████████
Docket No. 6782-25

Docket No. 6783-25

Docket No. 6785-25

Ref: Signature Date

████████████████████
████████████████████
████████████████████

████████████████████

This is in reference to your three applications, notated above, 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 applications, 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 applications have been denied.

A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your applications 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 applications, together with all material submitted in support thereof, relevant portions of your naval record, and applicable statutes, regulations, and policies, as well as the as well as the three 13 June 2025 decisions, one provided in response to each application, furnished by the Marine Corps Performance Evaluation Review Board (PERB), and the 22 May 2025 advisory opinions (AO) provided to the PERB by the Manpower Management Performance Branch (MMPB-23). The AOs were provided to you on 13 June 2025, and you were given 30 days in which to submit responses. Although you were afforded an opportunity to rebut the AO's, 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 1) modify your fitness report covering the period of 11 June 2021 to 31 May 2022 to remove the Reporting Senior (RS) attribute marks and Reviewing Officer (RO) comparative assessment (CA) mark and retain, only, the Section I and K comments; 2) modify your fitness report covering the period of 1 June 2022 to 15 May 2023, to change the RS attribute marks in Section F2 (developing subordinates), and Section F4 (ensuring

the well-being of subordinates), from scores of “C” to “D,” and amend the RO comments in Section K to include the words, “a must for promotion to Lieutenant Colonel and select for command at the next opportunity;” 3) modify your fitness report covering the period of 16 May 2023 to 29 February 2024 to change the RS attribute marks in Section D2 (proficiency) from a score of “D” to “E,” and Section F4 (ensuring well-being of subordinates), from a score of “C” to “D;” and 4) direct a Special Selection Board (SSB) be convened to consider you for promotion to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel (LtCol), along with your contentions that these fitness reports contain inconsistencies between numerical markings and narrative comments that are corroborated by formal correction letters provided by both the RS and Reviewing Officer (RO), multiple letters of support, and award documentation, indicating a direct conflict with policy established in Marine Corps Order (MCO) 1610.7B, and failure to accurately reflect your performance and potential, which has, in turn, has adversely affected your promotion.

As a preliminary matter the Board noted, following a favorable decision by the PERB, that the corrections identified in item 2), above, have already been made, in part, to your fitness report covering the period of 1 June 2022 to 15 May 2023. The attribute markings in Sections F2 and F4 of the fitness report have been changed from marks of “C” to “D.” Additionally, the comment: “A must for promotion to Lieutenant Colonel and select for command at next opportunity,” has been added to Section K. This corrected report is present in your Official Military Personnel File (OMPF). Similarly, regarding the corrections identified in item 3), above, the Board noted the scores you desire are already reflected in the fitness report on file in your OMPF. The attribute markings in Sections D2 and F4 already reflect marks of “E” and “D,” respectively. Because these corrections have already been made, or the desired scores were already reflected, in your OMPF, the Board determined no further action is needed on these matters.

Regarding the remainder of your requests, the Board concurred with the AO’s in finding that you did not demonstrate probable material error, substantive inaccuracy, or injustice warranting the relief requested. Regarding the corrections requested in item 1), above, the Board found your request is not supported by the evidence. While the Board carefully considered the letters of support, including those submitted by your reporting officials, the Board found these letters unconvincing. As the AO identified, although the support letters are favorable, they neither request, nor substantiate, any modifications to your fitness report, nor do they allege any procedural errors or inaccuracies in the attribute marks. Similarly, the letters submitted by your reporting officials are general in nature, are not specifically addressed to the PERB, and do not request changes to your fitness report. In short, as the AO assessed, they do not provide substantive evidence to refute or invalidate the assessments made in your fitness report. Regarding alleged lack of counseling, the Board again agreed with the AO, finding that relief is not generally granted solely on the basis of a claim of insufficient counseling, as counseling can occur in many forms. Furthermore, you have not demonstrated how a lack of counseling impaired your understanding of your duties or your ability to perform them. Regarding your RS’s comment on his underdeveloped profile for Majors, as the AO also explained, this comment does not invalidate the fitness report. Comments such as this are permissible under MCO 1610.7B, as they allow the RS to provide clarification to the reader of the report why their

marking philosophy may create a disparity not readily apparent without proper context. The Board also considered your receipt of the Meritorious Service Medal (MSM), which is, of course, commendable, but agreed with the AO that there is no prescribed evaluation metric associated with receipt of a personal award, and thus determined your receipt of the award has no impact on the validity of your fitness report.

Regarding the remainder of the corrections requested in items 2) and 3), apart from those changes already reflected in your OMPF, the Board, in agreement with the AO, found no further changes were warranted. The Board's determination on these remaining matters is identical to its determination on the corrections requested in item 1), and is, thus, already articulated in the preceding paragraph.

Lastly, regarding your request to be considered for promotion at a SSB, the Board found you have not exhausted your available administrative remedies. Specifically, in light of the corrections since made to your OMPF by the PERB, pursuant to Secretary of the Navy Instruction (SECNAVINST) 1402.1, you may request an SSB through MMPB-23.

In conclusion, given the totality of the circumstances, apart from those corrections already made to your OMPF by the PERB, the Board determined your request does not merit further 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,

4/15/2026

