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

TRG
Docket No: 1307-00
19 January 2001

[redacted]

Dear [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 17 January 2001. 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 27 July 1995 at age 20. The record shows that on 16 May 1996 you were advanced to SKSA (E-2). In the performance evaluation for the period 16 January to 15 July 1998, you were assigned a mark of 2.0 in quality of work. The evaluation comments state that you were a marginal performer. However, you were recommended for retention and promotion. There are no further evaluations in the record. You were released from active duty on 30 June 1999 with your service characterized as honorable. At that time you were still serving as an SKSA and were assigned an RE-4 reenlistment code.

Regulations require the assignment of an RE-4 reenlistment code to individuals who have not met professional growth criteria by advancing to pay grade E-3 during an extended period of active duty. Since you had over three years to advance and did not do so, and have been treated no differently than others in your situation, the Board could not find an error or injustice in 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