

instruction and report any errors or send a letter to the president of the selection board calling attention to the matter.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

ARPC/DPB recommends denial. In the case of reserve officers, AFI 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems*, does not require performance reports in a service member's records until 90 days after the close-out date. The OPR in question was signed by the applicant's rater on behalf of the applicant on 16 June 2011 and the selection board convened on 13 June 2011. The OPR was not required for filing in the selection record until 8 September 2011. While it is admirable for the unit to attempt to submit the OPR early, the fact that they did not succeed does not constitute an error in the applicant's record.

When preparing the AF Form 709, *Promotion Recommendation Form*, senior raters are advised they may use one line to document accomplishments during the previous reporting year if an OPR is pending for an officer meeting a promotion board. A review of the applicant's PRF shows the senior rater did use one line to inform the promotion board members of the applicant's accomplishments since completion of the last OPR.

There was no error when the applicant's record met the promotion board.

The complete DPB evaluation, with attachment, is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

Upon reviewing his record, he discovered several issues that directly impacted his non-selection to Lt Col. There were six medals missing from his record and he also received a board discrepancy report on 12 April 2012.

He strongly believes this information should justify an SSB as his record was not complete and contained errors when the board convened. Based upon his previous PRF, Professional Military Education and completion of his Master's Degree, the only explanation for his non-selection is the missing documents and errors previously mentioned.

The applicant's response, with attachments, is at Exhibit E.

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
2. The application was timely filed.
3. Insufficient relevant evidence has been presented to demonstrate the existence of error or injustice. We took notice of the applicant's complete submission in judging the merits of the case; however, we agree with the opinion and recommendation of the Air Force office of primary responsibility and adopt its rationale as the primary basis for our conclusion that the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. Additionally, although the applicant notes in his rebuttal to the Air Force evaluation that he "discovered several issues with his record that directly impacted the non-selection on Lt Col Board V0511B," he has not provided sufficient evidence to show he exercised due diligence to insure his officer selection record was correct prior to its consideration for promotion. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no compelling basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of an error or injustice; that the application was denied without a personal appearance; and that the application will only be reconsidered upon the submission of newly discovered relevant evidence not considered with this application.

The following members of the Board considered BCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00630 in Executive Session on 24 July 2012, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

Panel Chair
Member
Member

The following documentary evidence pertaining to BCMR Docket Number BC-2012-00630 was considered:

- Exhibit A. DD Form 149, dated 7 Feb 12, w/atchs.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, ARPC/DPB, dated 13 Mar 12, w/atcch.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 27 Mar 12.
- Exhibit E. Applicant's Response, dated 25 Apr 12, w/atchs.

Panel Chair