



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

TLG  
Docket No: 7574-14  
22 July 2015

5 U.S.C 552(b) (6)

Dear 5 U.S.C 552(b) (6)

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. The application was filed in a timely manner.

Although your application was not filed in a timely manner, the Board found it in the interest of justice to waive the statute of limitations and consider your application on its merits. A three-member panel of the Board for Correction of Naval Records, sitting in executive session, considered your application on 10 July 2015. 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 21 April 1993. You served for about two years without disciplinary incident. During the period from 27 April to 8 June 1995, you received two received nonjudicial punishments (NJP) for absence from your appointed place of duty, making a false official statement, and failure to go to your appointed place of duty.

On 13 October 1995, you were in an unauthorized absence (UA) status for a period of 85 days. As a result, it appears that you requested discharge for the good of the service to avoid trial by court-martial for the foregoing period of UA. Regulations required that before making such a request, an individual had to be advised by military counsel concerning the consequences of such a request. Since the record shows that you were discharged by reason of good of the service to avoid trial on 31 January 1996, the Board presumed that the foregoing occurred in your case. Because you requested discharge in lieu of trial, you avoided the possibility of a punitive discharge and confinement at hard labor.

The Board, in its review of your record and application, carefully weighed all potentially mitigating factors, such as your desire to upgrade your discharge and assertion that you were mentally, physically and sexually abused. Nevertheless, the Board concluded these factors were not sufficient to warrant relief in your case given the severity of your misconduct and lengthy period of UA which resulted in NJP and presumably your separation from the Navy. The Board believed that considerable clemency was extended to you when your request for discharge was approved since, by this action, you escaped the possibility of confinement at hard labor and a punitive discharge. The Board further 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. Finally, there is no evidence in the records, and you submitted none, to support your assertion of being mentally, physically, or sexually abused while serving in the Navy. 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 within one year from the date of the Board's decision. New evidence is evidence not previously considered by the Board prior to making its decision in your case. 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,

5 U.S.C 552(b) (6)

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area.

ROBERT J. O'NEILL  
Executive Director