



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS
701 S. COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 1001
ARLINGTON, VA 22204-2490

TAL
Docket No: 4350-11
16 February 2012



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 8 February 2012. 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 and began a period of active duty on 17 October 1972 at age 17. On 4 December 1972, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for misbehavior as a sentinel. On 12 April 1973, you received NJP for failure to go to your appointed place of duty, unauthorized absence (UA) from your unit and failure to obey a lawful order. On 15 June 1973, you were UA from your unit for a period of eight days until you were apprehended by civil authorities on 23 June 1973. On 10 August 1973, you were UA from your unit for a period of three days until you surrendered on 13 August 1973. During the forgoing period of UA you were apprehended by civil authorities on charges of interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle. On 7 September 1973, you submitted a written request for an

other than honorable (OTH) discharge in order to avoid trial by court-martial for the forgoing UA charges. 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 17 September 1973, you were sentenced to three years confinement in Federal District Court, Pensacola, Florida. On 21 September 1973, you were released to civil authorities for confinement as a result of the theft conviction. On 9 October 1973, your good of the service request was granted and the commanding officer directed your OTH discharge. 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 10 October 1973, you were discharged under OTH conditions.

The Board, in its review of your entire record and application carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your youth and overall record of service. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given the seriousness of your misconduct that resulted in two NJPs, a civil conviction and 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. Finally, the Board concluded that you received the benefit of your bargain with the Navy 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