

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
AIR FORCE BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOCKET NUMBER: BC-2012-02663
COUNSEL: NONE
HEARING DESIRED: YES

APPLICANT REQUESTS THAT:

He be awarded the Presidential Unit Citation (PUC).

APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT:

In late 1962 his unit deployed to Florida to support other units during the missile crisis.

The PUC was presented to his unit for participation in the missile crisis.

The applicant's complete submission is at Exhibit A.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The applicant served in the Regular Air Force from 6 Mar 1961 to 24 Apr 1964.

The PUC is conferred on units of the Armed Forces of the United States and of cobelligerent nations, for extraordinary heroism in action against an armed enemy on or after 7 Dec 1941.

The unit must display such gallantry, determination, and esprit de corps in accomplishing its mission as to set it apart from and above other units participating in the same campaign.

The degree of heroism required is the same that which would warrant award of the Distinguished Service Cross to an individual.

An individual assigned or permanently attached to, and also present for duty with, a unit in the action for which the PUC is awarded may wear the emblem as a permanent part of their uniform.

AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

AFPC/DPSID recommends denial. DPSID states the applicant's only unit of assignment was with the 27th Armament and Electronics Maintenance Squadron from 21 Feb 1962 to 24 Apr 1964. After a thorough review of Air Force Pamphlet 36-2801, *Unit Decorations, Awards, and Campaign Credits*, DPSID was unable to verify award of the PUC during his tenure with that squadron.

The complete DPSID evaluation is at Exhibit C.

APPLICANT'S REVIEW OF AIR FORCE EVALUATION:

On 11 Sep 2012, a copy of the Air Force evaluation was forwarded to the applicant for review and comment within 30 days. As of this date, no response has been received by this office (Exhibit D).

THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT:

1. The applicant has exhausted all remedies provided by existing law or regulations.
 2. The application was not timely filed; however, it is in the interest of justice to excuse the failure to timely file.
 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 basis for our conclusion the applicant has not been the victim of an error or injustice. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we find no basis to recommend granting the relief sought in this application.
 4. The applicant's case is adequately documented and it has not been shown that a personal appearance with or without counsel will materially add to our understanding of the issue(s) involved. Therefore, the request for a hearing is not favorably considered.
-

THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT:

The applicant be notified that the evidence presented did not demonstrate the existence of material 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 this application in Executive Session on 14 Feb 2013, under the provisions of AFI 36-2603:

- , Panel Chair
- , Member
- , Member

The following documentary evidence was considered in AFBCMR BC-2012-02663:

- Exhibit A. DD Forms 149, dated 24 May 2012.
- Exhibit B. Applicant's Master Personnel Records.
- Exhibit C. Letter, AFPC/DPSID, dated 4 Sep 2012.
- Exhibit D. Letter, SAF/MRBR, dated 11 Sep 2012.

Panel Chair