



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

TJR  
Docket No: 6098-10  
18 March 2011

MR. RICARDO E. UZZELL  
C/O MR. STEPHEN J. WENGER  
1422 SALAM ROAD  
DORLINGTON NJ 08018

Dear Mr. Uzzell:

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 15 March 2011. 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 Marine Corps on 27 November 1974 at age 17 and served for a year and two months without disciplinary incident. However, during a 12 month period from 6 January to 26 December 1976, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) on nine occasions for five periods of absence from your appointed place of duty, three specifications of failure to obey a lawful order, being incapacitated for duty due to intoxication, sleeping on watch, a three day period of unauthorized absence (UA), and attempting to break into an automobile.


On 26 May 1977 you submitted a written request for an other than honorable discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for three periods of absence from your appointed place of duty, disrespect, failure to obey a lawful order, and using provoking words. 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. Subsequently, 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 7 June 1977 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 and desire to upgrade your discharge. It also considered your assertions regarding your period of service and the characterization of your discharge, which included, but is not limited to a review of your case by the Naval Discharge Review Board, legal misrepresentation, disputes due to lack of evidence, unfairness of discharge characterization based on minor misconduct, and the subsequent discharge from the Marine Corps. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge because of the seriousness of your repetitive and frequent misconduct which resulted in nine 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 Marine Corps when your request for discharge was granted and you should not be permitted to change it now. Finally, the Board noted that there was documented evidence in the record that is contrary to 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