



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

TJR  
Docket No: 12305-09  
3 September 2010

[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 Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 1 September 2010. The names and votes of the members of the panel will be furnished upon request. 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 the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

You enlisted in the Navy on 19 April 1976 at age 29 and served for about five months without disciplinary infraction. However, during the period from 14 September 1976 to 4 May 1977 you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on three occasions for three periods of unauthorized absence (UA) totalling 28 days and three periods of absence from your appointed place of duty.


During the period from 9 June 1977 to 17 March 1978 you were again in a UA status on three more occasions and declared a deserter. The record reflects that these periods of UA were referred for court-martial action. On 22 May 1978 you began another period of UA that was not terminated until 30 May 1978. However, the record does not reflect the disciplinary action taken, if any, for this misconduct. However, on 9 June 1978, you submitted a written request for an other than honorable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for three periods of UA totalling 245 days. Prior to submitting this request you conferred with a qualified military lawyer at which time you were advised of your rights and warned of the probable adverse

consequences of accepting such a discharge. On 13 June 1978 your request was granted and the commanding officer was directed to issue you an other than honorable discharge by reason of the good of the service. As a result of this action, you were spared the stigma of a court-martial conviction and the potential penalties of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor. On 21 June 1978 you were issued an other than honorable discharge.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth, desire to upgrade your discharge, and assertions of animosity from your superiors, personality conflicts, and being misinformed regarding the characterization of your discharge. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your other than honorable discharge because of the seriousness of your frequent, repetitive, and lengthy periods of UA from the Navy, which resulted in three NJPs and your request for discharge. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge to avoid trial by court-martial was approved. Further, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. Finally, there is no evidence in the record, and you provided none, to support your assertions. Accordingly, your application has been denied.

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