



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

TAL
Docket No: 7487-12
10 May 2013

[REDACTED]

[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 8 May 2013. 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 and began a period of active duty on 5 October 1966 at age 18. On 5 June 1969, you received nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for unauthorized absence (UA) your unit for a period of 80 days. On 30 June 1969, you were UA from your unit until you were apprehended on 21 January 1970, a period of 205 days. On 2 March 1970, you were UA from your unit for a period of two days. On 15 April 1970, you made a written request for discharge for the good of service to avoid trial by court-martial for UA from your unit for the forgoing periods. On 17 April 1970, the separation authority disapproved your request and directed that you be retained in the Marine Corps. On 30 March 1970, you were again UA from your unit until you were apprehended on 10 December 1970, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), in Bridgeport, Ohio. On 23 December 1970,

you again made a written request for discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for UA from your unit for periods totaling 462 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. Your good of the service request was granted and the separation authority directed your other than honorable (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 8 January 1971, 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, overall record and Vietnam combat service. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant recharacterization of your discharge given the seriousness and repetitiveness of your misconduct that resulted in an NJP, periods of UA totaling over one year and three months 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. Further, the Board 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. Finally, there is no provision of law or in Navy regulations that allows for the recharacterization of service due solely to the passage of time. 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