



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

HD:hd  
Docket No: 08560-01  
18 June 2002

CDR [REDACTED] USNR  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear Commande [REDACTED]

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

A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 13 June 2002. 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. In addition, the Board considered the advisory opinions furnished by the Navy Personnel Command dated 15 February and 20 March 2002, copies of which are attached.

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. In this connection, the Board substantially concurred with the comments contained in the advisory opinions. 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

Enclosures

08560-01



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
NAVY PERSONNEL COMMAND  
5720 INTEGRITY DRIVE  
MILLINGTON TN 38055-0000

5420  
Pers-921  
15 Feb 02

MEMORANDUM FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF  
NAVAL RECORDS

Via: Assistant for BCNR Matters (Pers-00ZCB)

Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ICO [REDACTED]

Ref: (a) BCNR Memo 5420 Pers-00ZCB of 31 Jan 02

Encl: (1) BCNR File No. 08560-01 w/microfiche record

1. We are returning enclosure (1) with the following observations and the recommendation that [REDACTED] petition be denied.

2. [REDACTED] is petitioning for an adjustment to her year grouping as it applies to promotion eligibility. The petitioner asserts that she suffered an injustice when the Fleet Support Officer Community, (FSO) was detached from the Unrestricted Line Community, (URL) in 1995 and then recombined with the URL in 1999. We assert there was no injustice committed in that all 1100/1105/1107 personnel were treated the same in the movement of the FSO community from the URL and subsequently back to the URL in 1999. Specifically, 135 FSO Training and Administration of Reserves (TAR) officers were effected in the transition from and to the URL. It is worthy of note that the billet base for the FSO community caused personnel to be looked at earlier in the 1995-1999 time frame than their URL counterparts. In fact SECNAVINST 1420.1A addresses flow points for active duty which the reserve forces mirror through the use of the running mate system. The flow point for commander is 16 years with a variance of + or - one year. The petitioner promoted to commander at the 17-year point in keeping with her running mates and within the flow point guidelines of SECNAVINST 1420.1A. The projection for her next in zone eligibility for captain puts her at the 23 year mark, which is also one year above the notional flow point and in accordance with SECNAVINST 1420.1A.

3. [REDACTED] also asserts that she will not be in zone for promotion until 2006. Based on projections for the URL provided by Chief of Naval Personnel Code N13 she will be in zone for captain in FY-05. Incidentally, the FY-05 list of eligible officers in zone for captain is comprised of commanders in YG-82/83, the petitioner is YG-82.

Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IC [REDACTED]

4. We find that the petitioner failed to show that the Navy acted contrary to law in the detachment and reintegration of the FSO community into the URL. We find no basis for relief [REDACTED] petition.

5. [REDACTED] service to her country is laudable and she can be justifiably proud of her contributions, the negative response to this request does not detract from her honorable service to this nation and the Unites States Na [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Director, Naval Reserve Personnel  
Full Time Support, Community Manager  
By direction



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
NAVY PERSONNEL COMMAND  
5720 INTEGRITY DRIVE  
MILLINGTON TN 38055-0000

5420  
PERS-80  
20 MAR 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF  
NAVAL RECORDS

Via: Assistant for BCNR Matters (PERS-00ZCB)

Subj: REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATION IN CASE OF  
CE [REDACTED] USN [REDACTED]

Ref: (a) BCNR Memo 5420 PERS-921 of 31 Jan 02  
(b) SECNAVINST 1401.1B

Encl: (1) BCNR File 08560-01

1. Per reference (a), we are returning enclosure (1). Based on our observations, we concur with the opinion articulated by PERS-921 and recommend that Commande [REDACTED] request be disapproved. Commande [REDACTED] can be justifiably proud of her record and this negative response to her request in no way diminishes her contributions to her country.

[REDACTED]

Director, Active and Reserve  
Officer Career Progression  
Division