



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS  
2 NAVY ANNEX  
WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

ELP  
Docket No. 5769-01  
7 December 2001

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

This is in reference to your application for correction of your naval record pursuant to the provisions of Title 10, United States Code, Section 1552.

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Navy Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 4 December 2001. Your allegations of error and injustice were reviewed in accordance with administrative regulations and procedures applicable to the proceedings of this Board. Documentary material considered by the Board consisted of your application, together with all material submitted in support thereof, your naval record and applicable statutes, regulations and policies.

After careful and conscientious consideration of the entire record, the Board found that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you enlisted in the Naval Reserve on 23 April 1992 for eight years at age 19. You were ordered to active duty for a period of two years on 17 March 1993. The record reflects that you were advanced to SN (E-3) and served without any disciplinary infractions. On 16 March 1995 you were honorably released from active duty, transferred to the Naval Reserve, and assigned an RE-7 reenlistment code.

Regulations authorize the assignment of an RE-7 reenlistment code to individuals completing an initial two-year period of active duty obligation in the Naval Reserve. This reenlistment code was established since most of these reservists are unable to meet the professional growth criteria for reenlistment in only two years of service, specifically, be serving in pay grade E-4 or have passed an examination for pay grade E-4. One of these

criteria must be met in order to be eligible for an RE-1 reenlistment code. An RE-7 reenlistment code is not a derogatory code and it may allow reenlistment. However, reenlistment authority rests with recruiting officials and not this Board. The Board concluded the assigned reenlistment code was proper and no change is warranted. Accordingly, your application has been denied. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request.

It is regretted that the circumstances of your case are such that favorable action cannot be taken. You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new and material evidence or other matter not previously 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,

W. DEAN PFEIFFER  
Executive Director