



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

TRG  
Docket No: 2987-02  
13 August 2002

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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 August 2002. 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.

You enlisted in the Navy on 24 October 1988 at age 18. From the date of your enlistment until 1 February 1991, you served in an excellent manner with no marks in any category below 3.8. The Enlisted Performance Record (page 9) shows that in the evaluation for the period 1 February 1991 to 31 January 1992 you were assigned marginal marks of 3.2 in the categories of reliability and military bearing. A page 9 entry, dated 31 January 1992, indicates that you were not recommended for advancement. The marks assigned for the period 1 February 1992 to 25 July 1992 are not entered on the page 9. However, a page 9 entry, dated 25 July 1992, indicates that you were not eligible for reenlistment.

You were released from active duty in pay grade E-3 on 25 July 1992 with your service characterized as honorable. At that time, you were not recommended for reenlistment and were assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code. Subsequently, you were issued an honorable discharge at the end of your military obligation.

You state in your application that you do not have a copy of your last performance evaluation. You point out that you had an excellent record, and the unwarranted RE-4 reenlistment code

could cause a problem if you attempt to enter an ROTC program.

Although the last performance evaluation is unavailable, the Board noted the reduction in the quality of your service, as documented in the evaluation for the period ending 31 January 1992, and that you were not recommended for advancement at that time. In addition, the page 9 clearly shows that you were not eligible for reenlistment on 25 July 1992. Therefore, it appears that your performance either stayed at the same level documented in the 31 January 1992 evaluation, or continued to decline. The Board thus concluded that the available records support the assignment of the RE-4 reenlistment code.

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