



5. Between April and October 1979, you went to NJP on four additional occasions for numerous periods UA, disobeying orders, and making false official statements.

6. On 18 November 1979, you commenced a period of UA that ended on 2 June 1980. On 1 July, you commenced another period of UA that ended on 9 July 1980. For these offenses, you were referred to a court-martial.

7. Based on the information contained on your Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty (DD Form 214), it appears that you submitted a voluntary written request for an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge for separation in lieu of trial by court-martial. In the absence of evidence to contrary, it is presumed that prior to submitting this voluntary discharge request, you would have conferred with a qualified military lawyer, been advised of your rights, and warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. As part of this discharge request, you would have acknowledged that your characterization of service upon discharge would be an OTH.

8. Unfortunately, the documents pertinent to your administrative separation are not in your official military personnel file (OMPF). Notwithstanding, the Board relies on a presumption of regularity to support the official actions of public officers and, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, will presume that they have properly discharged their official duties. Your DD Form 214 indicates you were separated on 2 December 1980 with an "Under Other Than Honorable Conditions" characterization of service, narrative reason for separation of "For the Good of the Service," reentry code of "RE-4," and separation code of "KFS," which indicates that you had submitted a written request for an OTH discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial.

In your application to this Board, you express a desire for your discharge character of service be upgraded and contend that you deployed on a WESTPAC onboard █, you turned yourself in to try to correct the situation, the upgrade would show that you did do some good time in service and all your service was not bad, at the time you were young, immature and making bad decisions that you regret, and the fact that you did do two good years should qualify for an upgraded discharge status.

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 that formed the basis for your administrative separation and OTH discharge. Therefore, the Board determined the presumption of regularity applies to your administrative separation and no error exists with your record.

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, your desire for an upgrade to your characterization of service, your contentions, 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 advanced age, 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. Therefore, even taking into consideration all the mitigation factors in your case, the Board found that your misconduct while on active duty outweighed the mitigation evidence offered. Further, the Board also noted that the misconduct that led to your request to be discharged in lieu of trial by court-martial was substantial and determined that you already received a large measure of clemency when the convening authority agreed to administratively separate you in lieu of trial by court-martial, thereby sparing you the stigma of a court-martial conviction and possible punitive discharge. 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. 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 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,

3/20/2026



Executive Director

Signed by: 