



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVY RECRUITING COMMAND
5722 INTEGRITY DR.
MILLINGTON, TN 38054-5057

5800
Ser 00 [REDACTED]
6 Sep 23

THIRD ENDORSEMENT on AT3 [REDACTED], USN ltr 27 Sep 22

From: Commander, Navy Recruiting Command

To: Commander, Naval Education and Training Command

Subj: RESPONSE TO COMPLAINT OF WRONGS AGAINST A SUPERIOR UNDER
NAVY REGULATIONS ARTICLE 1150 BY AT3 [REDACTED], USN

Ref: (a) Article 1150, U.S. Navy Regulations
(b) JAGINST 5800.7G, Chapters, I, III
(c) OPNAVINST 1420.1B

Encl: (1) Original Complaint with enclosures and endorsements

1. Per references (a), (b), and (c), enclosure (1) has been investigated.

2. In enclosure (1), AT3 [REDACTED] alleges that he was not allowed to commission as an Ensign and re-designate due to a failure to disclose his medical history during Officer Candidate School (OCS). A thorough review of his allegations have been considered, and **I find there was an irregularity on the part of an officer under my command and that he was improperly denied the chance to re-designate. I have concluded that his complaint has merit** based upon enclosure (1).

...

15. The fact that AT3 [REDACTED] had successfully completed OCS and accepted a commission renders [REDACTED] Service Agreement paragraph 1(b) moot. As such, the determination by Commander, Navy Recruiting Command that [REDACTED] Service Agreement paragraph 1(j)(1) did not apply was in error.

16. Giving full consideration to AT3 [REDACTED] circumstances as they were at the time, I find it appropriate to correct the discrepancy now. Enclosure (1) shows that AT3 [REDACTED] successfully completed OCS, accepted a commission in Feb 22, and failed his flight physical in Nov 21. Based on these conditions, **the appropriate determination by Commander, Navy Recruiting Command, pursuant to the [REDACTED] Service Agreement, is that its paragraph 1(j)(1) is most applicable and should be hereafter implemented.**