



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

JRE  
Docket No: 9218-97  
13 September 1999

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 10 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 Marine Corps on 10 September 1975. You underwent a pre-separation physical examination on 29 November 1982, and were found physically qualified for separation. Your visual acuity was recorded as 20/20 at that time. You were discharged on 7 December 1982, and assigned a reenlistment code of RE-1A, to indicate you were eligible and recommended for reenlistment. On 27 September 1989, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) awarded you a 70% rating for bilateral maculopathy.

The Board noted that early onset macular degeneration is a genetically determined, inherited condition which is generally not ratable by the military departments. In addition, it noted that unlike the VA, which must rate all conditions it classifies as service connected, the military departments may assign disability ratings only in those cases where a service member has been found unfit to perform the duties of his office, grade, rate or ranking. As macular degeneration is not unfitting per se, and as you have not demonstrated that you were unfit for duty at the time of your discharge in 1982, the Board was unable to recommend any corrective action in your case. 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