



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

█
Docket No. 7640-25
Ref: Signature Date

█
█
█

Dear Petitioner:

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552. 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 application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 26 January 2026. 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, 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).

The following is the relevant factual background of your case based upon review of your naval record and/or the matters provided with your application:

1. You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 10 December 1984. During your enlistment processing, you admitted preservice use of drugs and shoplifting.
2. Between 20 December 1985 and 1 September 1987, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on four occasions for three instances of UA and two instances of disobeying lawful orders.
3. On 16 October 1987, you were counseled concerning frequent involvement resulting in four NJPs. You were advised that failure to take corrective action could result in administrative separation.
4. On 4 December 1987, the suspended portion of your 1 September 1987 NJP was vacated.

5. On 9 December 1987, you received a fifth NJP for failure to report to your prescribed place of duty and failure to shave.

6. On 5 January 1988, you were convicted by summary court martial (SCM) for willfully damaging an M813 truck, military property of the U.S., by placing water in the exhaust system. You were sentenced to reduction in rank and a period of confinement.

7. On 26 January 1988, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to pattern of misconduct. You requested to consult with counsel and have your case heard by an Administrative Discharge Board (ADB). Your commanding officer recommended you be discharged with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service.

8. On 26 February 1988, the ADB found that you committed misconduct due to pattern of misconduct and recommended that you be discharged with an OTH characterization of service. The separation authority approved the recommendation and you were so discharged on 22 April 1988.

After careful review, the Board reached the following conclusions and denied your application for relief.

The Board initially concluded you were appropriately processed for administrative separation based on your record of misconduct. While the Board carefully considered your contention for mitigation, the Board noted you did not deny committing the misconduct. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies to the finding that you committed the misconduct that formed the basis of your administrative separation and were properly separated for misconduct with an OTH characterization of service.

The Board also considered the totality of the circumstances to determine whether equitable relief was warranted in the interests of justice in accordance with the Wilkie Memo. In this regard, the Board considered, amongst other factors, the totality of your service, the non-violent nature of your misconduct, your relative youth and immaturity at the time of your misconduct, the negative effect your discharge has had on your life, your rehabilitation efforts, your post-service record of accomplishments, your service to your community, the character reference you provided for review, and the passage of time since your discharge.

The Board found that the mitigating factors were not nearly sufficient to justify any equitable relief. Specifically, the Board found that the severity of your misconduct far outweighed all of the mitigating factors combined. In particular, the Board found that your conduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. The Board observed you were given multiple opportunities to correct your conduct deficiencies but chose to continue to commit misconduct; which led to your OTH discharge. 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. Further, while the Board considered your positive service, it also noted that your record of misconduct spans almost the entirety of your active duty service.

Therefore, the Board found any mitigation associated with your positive active duty service was significantly outweighed by your multiple incidents of misconduct. Finally, the Board believed that it would be unjust to characterize your less than honorable service in the same manner as the service of the thousands of service members who, unlike you, honorably completed their enlistments without engaging in misconduct warranting the early curtailment of their service. Therefore, the Board did not find an upgrade of your discharge to General (Under Honorable Conditions) or Honorable to be warranted in the interests of justice.

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 the 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,

2/2/2026

