



1. You enlisted in the Marine Corps and began a period of active duty on 20 February 1979.
2. On 1 July 1982, you began a period of unauthorized absence (UA) which lasted two-days.
3. Between 15 July 1982 and 6 October 1982, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on three occasions for ten instances of UA from appointed place of duty, disobeying a lawful order, and breaking restriction.
4. Consequently, you were notified of the initiation of administrative separation proceedings by reason of misconduct due to frequent involvement of a discreditable nature with military authorities. You decided to waive your procedural rights and your commanding officer (CO)

recommended that you be separated with an Other Than Honorable (OTH) discharge characterization of service. After your administrative separation proceedings were determined to be sufficient in law and fact, the separation authority approved the CO's recommendation. On 23 January 1983, you were so discharged.

5. Post-discharge, you applied to the Naval Discharge Review Board (NDRB) for relief. The NDRB denied your request, on 3 April 1986, after determining your discharge was proper as issued.

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 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 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 rehabilitation efforts, your post-service record of accomplishments, your ADHD diagnosis, your advanced age, the resume 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, the Board was not persuaded by your contention that your ADHD condition should mitigate your misconduct. In making this finding, the Board noted you provided no evidence, other than your statement, to substantiate you were diagnosed with the condition or that your condition had a nexus to your misconduct. Moreover, while significant time has passed since your discharge, the Board was not inclined to grant clemency to a service member who doesn't appear to accept responsibility for their conduct. 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. While the Board commends you for your post-service accomplishments, 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 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,

3/9/2026

