



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF NAVAL RECORDS

2 NAVY ANNEX

WASHINGTON DC 20370-5100

ELP

Docket No. 3095-99

17 September 1999

[REDACTED]

Dear [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 9 September 1999. 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 that the evidence submitted was insufficient to establish the existence of probable material error or injustice.

The Board found that you enlisted in the Navy on 16 October 1968 for two years at age 18. The record reflects that during the first week of recruit training you were seen in the recruit evaluation unit (REU) as part of in-processing procedures. During these procedures, you admitted that you had suffered a nervous breakdown, received treatment for nerves, and tried to commit suicide on two occasions. It was noted that after you began training, you made frequent sick calls and visits to the chaplain. The week following your initial interview in the REU, it appeared that you were adjusting reasonably well. However, your situation deteriorated and you were referred back to the REU because of your "frequent visits to sick bay, appearance of sadness and depression, and confusion." The company commander reported that in general you were mixed up, did not obey without supervision, were a poor mixer, showed poor progress and did not make good use of your spare time, and were incapable of assimilating recruit training. While examination revealed no evidence of psychosis or neurosis, you appeared to be an apathetic individual who had discovered that active duty was more difficult than anticipated. In summary, it was felt that your poor tolerance to stress and failure to respond effectively to

various social, emotional and physical demands marked you as unlikely to adapt successfully to the service.

On 12 October 1968 you appeared before a Navy aptitude board which found your general qualifications did not warrant retention in the service and recommended that you be discharged by reason of unsuitability. You declined an opportunity to submit a statement in your own behalf for consideration by the board. The discharge authority approved the board's recommendation for separation. On 15 November 1968 you were honorably discharged by reason of unsuitability due to inaptitude and assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

Regulations then in effect required the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code to individuals discharged by reason of unsuitability due to inaptitude. An RE-4 reenlistment code means that the individual is ineligible for reenlistment without prior approval from the Chief of Naval Personnel. The Board noted after more than 31 years, you now question why you were discharged. In view of the foregoing, it appeared to the Board that you were unable to adjust to the structured and rigorous demands of recruit training, as demonstrated by your lack of motivation, apathy, poor academic progress, confusion, need for supervision, and frequent visits to sick call. Since you were treated no differently than others discharged under similar circumstances, the Board could find no error or injustice in the basis for your discharge or the assigned reenlistment code. You have provided neither probative evidence nor a convincing argument in support of your application. The Board concluded that the reason for your discharge and reenlistment code were proper and no change is warranted. 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