



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

REC
Docket No: 07199-10
7 April 2011



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 6 April 2011. 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 and began a period of active duty on 14 June 1972. On 2 October 1973, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for failure to go to your appointed place of duty. On 29 October 1973, you received NJP for failure to obey and disobeying a lawful order. On 25 February 1974, you received NJP for failure to go to your appointed place of duty, and failure to obey a lawful order. On 8 March 1974, you received NJP for wrongfully appropriating a government Jeep, and breaking restriction. On 11 April 1974, you were convicted at a summary court-martial (SCM) of being in an unauthorized absence (UA) status from the rifle range, disobeying a lawful order, and failure to obey a lawful order. You were sentenced to a forfeiture of \$150, and 45 days restriction. Between 10 April and 23 April 1974, you had eight periods of UA, failure to go to your appointed place of duty, willfully disobeyed a lawful order, and had two incidents of being disrespectful in language toward a senior noncommissioned officer. On 28 May 1974, you submitted a request for a good of the service discharge to avoid trial by court-martial for the above mentioned pending charges. Prior to

submitting this request for discharge, you conferred with a qualified military lawyer, were advised of your rights, and were warned of the probable adverse consequences of accepting such a discharge. Your commanding officer forwarded his recommendation that you be discharged under other than honorable (OTH) conditions for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial. Your request for discharge was granted and on 18 June 1974, you received an OTH discharge for the good of the service in lieu of trial by court-martial. 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. At that time you were assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

The Board, in its review of your application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth, conduct and performance, and overall record of service. Nevertheless, the Board found that these factors were not sufficient to warrant changing the reason or characterization of your discharge, given your record of four NJP's, conviction by one SCM, periods of UA, and request for discharge. The Board also concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Marine Corps when your request for discharge was granted and should not be permitted to change it now. 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