

MIDLANT Legal Compass

Guiding Warfighters through Legal and Ethical Waters

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Top Ten Insights From an Ethics Attorney	2
Annual Ethics Refresher	5
A Gift Accepted, A Career Infected	6
Update to RLSO MIDLANT's Legal Assistance Services	7
QR Scan Codes for Common Legal Assistance Matters	8
MIDLANT Adjudged Court-Martial Sentences	9
MIDLANT Board of Inquiry Results	10
RLSO MIDLANT Command Services Directory	13

Focus on Ethics

As the U.S. moves forward following a decade of wars with tremendous public support for the military and service members, it is incumbent on leaders at all levels to maintain focus on what has made both our force great and engendered public support: our commitment to integrity and ethics. While integrity is a challenge within ourselves to do the right thing, ethics are the obligations we have as public servants to do what is right to protect the public trust.

As the public wants to show its support of the military, so do companies want to align their products with the military and associate the military with their services. The confluence of these circumstances and a continued focus on how the military spends money creates a challenging environment for leaders.

This issue of the *Legal Compass* highlights how to guide through the ethical minefield created by the confluence of these events. First, a veteran ethics attorney provides insights on how to navigate through ethical challenges. Next, we revisit the Vice Chief of Naval Operations Annual Standards of Conduct Guidance. Then, we examine one of the most problematic ethics questions faced by commands and legal officers in dealing with each other and outside sources: Gifts.

Following the ethics articles, updated information about the legal assistance department at RLSO MIDLANT along with hours of operation and contact information is also included. Additionally, QR scan codes are included that link to worksheets and informational guides for common legal assistance matters. Legal officers and servicemembers can access scan these codes to review materials before meeting with a legal assistance attorney.

At this waypoint in 2014, this issue is not offered as a comprehensive ethical guide, but a reference check for issues frequently addressed by commands and legal officers. The articles are designed as quick reference guides on these subjects. But as always, the *Legal Compass* is not meant as a substitute to seeking legal advice. You can use these articles as references, but please do not hesitate to reach out to us at RLSO MIDLANT, or a Staff Judge Advocate in your chain of command, when the tough questions present themselves.

Very Respectfully,
 /s/
 David G. Wilson
 CAPT, JAGC, USN
 Commanding Officer, RLSO MIDLANT

The primary mission of Region Legal Service Office Mid-Atlantic (RLSO MIDLANT) is to provide prosecution, command services, and legal assistance support to eligible commands and persons in support of Fleet operational readiness.

The *MIDLANT Legal Compass* is a periodic newsletter published by the RLSO MIDLANT Command Services Department.



Top Ten Insights from an Ethics Attorney

CDR Mark Nevitt, Regional Environmental Counsel for Navy Region Mid-Atlantic

This article appeared in the April edition of *Proceedings*. It is printed with the permission of the author.

“Ethics” is a broadly defined term, and its legal aspects, detailed through congressional statutes, DOD directives, and regulations, can be confusing. While most service members have generally heard of the Joint Ethics Regulations (JER) and the Joint Federal Travel Regulations (JFTR), misperceptions and misapplications often occur. This is somewhat understandable, as the JFTR weighs in at 832 pages. However, the stakes of not knowing the rules are high, and the failure to follow them closely can derail an otherwise stellar military career.

Here are some key aspects and best practices for applying ethics regulations, which, in my experience, every service member should know.

1. Consult your ethics attorney and take advantage of “safe harbor.” Have him or her on speed dial, as there is no downside in having one weigh in early on difficult decisions. If there is a legal basis for a course of action, a good lawyer can provide workable courses of action that stay well within the bright lines of ethics regulations.

In most substantiated misconduct cases, the flag officer did not have a legal review conducted. Federal regulations under safe-harbor provisions can assist servicemembers, as they allow for protection of official actions if an official reasonably relied on the advice provided by their ethics attorney. Seeking counsel should be part of every senior officer’s and command’s standard operating procedure.

2. Refer to the JER. If you have only one tool at your fingertips, this should be it. This easily accessible document, read by lawyers and laymen alike, is the DOD’s single source for standards of ethical conduct and ethics guidance.

If you are a senior uniform or civilian leader within the military or DOD leadership, know what the JER generally addresses. It applies to all members of the DOD and lists punitive provisions in bold. It touches on most of the ethical areas and issues that service members will face, including the acceptance of gifts, working with contractors, non-federal entities, conflicts of interest, political activities, and seeking outside and post-government employment. It is a good document for “all hands” to read and apply, and whole sections can be lifted for “plan of the week” notes and messages. Appealingly, it weighs in at one-fifth the size of the JFTR and is generally better organized and easier to read.

3. Be aware of restrictions on political activities. Keep the DOD Directive on Political Activities (DoDD 1344.10) handy, especially during political campaign season. The DOD seeks to balance First Amendment voting and speech rights with good order and discipline while keeping a safe distance from the partisan political process. Only ten political activities for active-duty service members are allowed. These include making monetary contributions to campaigns within statutorily prescribed limits, assisting with voting rights, and displaying a single political bumper sticker on a vehicle while on a military installation.

The stakes of not knowing the rules are high, and the failure to follow them closely can derail an otherwise stellar military career.

There are 16 prohibited activities for active-duty members, which include limitations on the publishing of partisan political articles, speaking before a partisan gathering, and participating in partisan political fundraising. DOD civilian employees are covered by the Hatch Act, which prohibits the use of a federal employee's official authority or influence to interfere with or affect the result of an election. It also prohibits participation in political activities while on duty.

4. Senior leaders must ensure they have sound office ethics processes in place. If you are a senior officer, work to set up an effective and efficient staffing system for you, your subordinates, and your ethics attorney to help identify issues before making decisions. This can include reviewing routine items, such as the expenditure of funds, receipt of gifts, and the use of government resources (for example, military aircraft and government vehicles). All too often, people do not ask key questions before making decisions. Sound internal processes will ensure they are addressed beforehand. Be sure that these processes "close the loop" after any travel or expenditure of funds so an outsider can crosswalk your documentation and have evidence to refute any allegation of wrongdoing.

5. Know the rules before driving a government vehicle. The rules and regulations behind the use of government-owned vehicles and government-funded rental vehicles are trickier than most people think. In your local duty area, this is straightforward—these vehicles should be used for official functions only, such as attending a meeting or participating in a change-of-command ceremony.

Even if you are on temporary duty with a government-funded rental car, rules for its use still apply, albeit in a slightly more liberal manner. While on travel, you can use government vehicles for subsistence, comfort, or health if public transportation is not available or impractical. For example, you can use a government-funded rental to go to the barber, a drugstore, or a place of worship. But you're on your own for entertainment and recreation purposes. If you're going to a movie, for example, find alternative means of transportation. If you're unsure, don't drive it. And if you're taking leave in conjunction with a TDY period, be sure to turn in your government rental beforehand and have all necessary documentation in place.

Never use government vehicles for transportation between your residence and place of duty. Only a select few active-duty members have "home to work" privileges, which the Secretary of the Navy must approve.

6. Resist the urge for staff "mission creep." If you're in charge, beware of overzealous staff members. What seems helpful in the short run may ultimately cause you difficulty. Your employees should only be working on official matters and using government resources for official purposes. For senior officers with full-time aides and staff working routine 12- to 14-hour days, the "get it done at all costs" mentality is a reality. Resist the urge to have your staff work on your personal matters; this is acceptable only in unique circumstances. Flag aides can assist their respective flag officer on personal matters only if the services performed are rare, minor, and truly voluntary.

If you're in charge, beware of overzealous staff members. What seems helpful in the short run may ultimately cause you difficulty.

7. *Establish the right climate through training.* The “Fourteen Principles of Ethical Conduct,” standards signed in 1990 by President George H. W. Bush, apply to all government employees and fit on a one-page document. Post these throughout the workspace and make sure every new check-in has a copy. While not everyone in the command may have read the JER or JFTR in depth, these bedrock principles can serve as a gold standard for behavior. Everyone should also have a general idea of what the JER and JFTR cover. Follow up with required standards of conduct/ethics training for your staff. Online training is acceptable, but in-person training with real-world examples is preferable.

Think ahead to situations that have their own ethical challenges and issues. From my experience, leaders should be particularly proactive in promulgating guidance for changes of command, prior to the winter holiday season, during spousal programs, and during the political-campaign season. These all create standards-of-conduct challenges. Communicate with your staff about specific guidance for these situations to manage ethical expectations well in advance.

8. *Know what constitutes a legal gift.* Whether or not you can accept one depends on a variety of factors, including who is giving it, and why. According to the JER, a gift is considered to be “anything of value.” Yes, anything. As a general rule, you can only accept one from a subordinate on an occasional basis—such as holidays and birthdays—if its value is less than \$10. Any gift given because of your official position must not exceed \$20.

Legally acceptable foreign gifts can be of higher value, and ethics counselors should review the guidelines for them with you. Regardless of the amount, the best course may be to speak with your attorney immediately and politely decline a gift. If you improperly accept one, you may still be able to remedy this by sharing it with your office staff, reimbursing the giver, or sending a note politely declining it.

9. *Follow the money.* Purpose, time, and amount are the three pillars for the proper expenditure of government funds. Every dollar spent by the federal government must be appropriated for a specific purpose and fiscal year, and cannot exceed the allocated amount. Mixing “pots” of money can make for difficult reverse engineering. Be ready to ask, “Who is paying for this?” and “Is this the right source of money to fund this expenditure?” If you receive blank stares in response to these questions, it is time to get your comptroller and fiscal law attorney together.

10. *Appearances matter.* A perfectly legal action may still look questionable to the general public. The Freedom of Information Act and the rise of technologies such as email have greatly furthered transparency. This is positive; the DOD wants to show the public what the military is doing. Still, the DOD is under scrutiny due to increasing budgetary restraints and a renewed focus on ethics because of recent high-profile incidents.

The mere appearance of a conflict of interest—even if it stays within the letter of the law—may not fit the public’s perception of what is legal. Always consider “The Washington Post test.” If your activity or action would not hold up to the scrutiny of the public eye regardless of the applicable law and regulation, it fails.

Establish a command climate of ethical conduct through training.

Annual Ethics Refresher

LTJG Allyson Breech, Command Services Department, RLSO MIDLANT

On 6 January 2014 the Vice Chief of Naval Operations issued his annual standards of conduct guidance. While the guidance was directed toward Flag Officers, much of what is discussed is valuable refresher information for commanding officers and legal advisors. Areas of particular interest include: command coins; use of government vehicles; commercial air travel at DoD expense; gifts; and communicating with industry.

* Command Coins - The prohibition on using appropriated funds to purchase command coins or other presentation items, such as ball caps or plaques, remains in effect. Commanders may purchase command coins or other items to give as gifts or tokens of appreciation and recognitions with their private funds. As a reminder, certain DoD and DoN seals or emblems require permission before they can be used.

* Government Vehicles - Government passenger vehicles (GOVs) are for official use only. Official use is defined as essential to the completion of a DoD function, activity, or operation, along with the activity being consistent with the purpose for which the GOV was acquired. Examples of official use include traveling for official business or driving from the workplace to an official after-hours work event (although the GOV must be returned to the workplace once the event is over). When TDY/TAD, a GOV or government rental may be used for “subsistence, comfort, and health” purposes. However, it is important to remember that this excludes entertainment, such as movies. Use of the GOV to travel between home and work is strictly prohibited, unless a waiver is granted.

* Commercial Air Travel - Official travel on commercial aircraft must be in coach class. There are certain instances in which business or first class travel will be permitted, but these trips must be approved in advance.

* Gifts - The general rule remains: employees are not permitted to accept or solicit gifts from prohibited sources or given because of the employee’s position. Please see the in-depth article below for more discussion on gift rules.

* Communicating with Industry - While there is no per se rule against communicating with members of industry, members of the Navy must ensure such communication does not provide preferential treatment and protects sensitive information. “Industry” includes entities that do business with or wish to do business with the Navy, although most often this applies to contractors who have large or extensive dealings with the Navy or DoD. Communicating with industry members is best done in a group setting and in a manner that does not present the appearance of actual or apparent conflict between official duties and personal interests. Commanders and other DoN employees are advised to seek guidance from their JAG and Public Affairs offices before any anticipated communication.

Ethical standards of conduct apply to DoN active duty, reserve, and civilian members at all times. Members should keep in mind that public service is a public trust. The key part of that public trust is that members will put the conscientious performance of duty ahead of any private gain. Additionally, members should make every effort to avoid the appearance of ethical misconduct as they perform their official duties and interact with others outside of the Navy or Department of Defense. Your friendly JAG office is standing by to help whenever ethical questions arise.

A Gift Accepted, A Career Infected

LTJG Greg Gianoni, Command Services Department, RLSO MIDLANT

In our society where gifts are used to show thanks, gratitude, affection, and acknowledgment, it is easy to get wrapped up in the excitement of receiving a token of another's appreciation. As leaders, however, there are certain parameters which guide our conduct.

If you remember one thing from this article, remember the following: avoid any actions that create the appearance of violating the law or ethical standards, and always seek a written determination from an ethics counselor. In other words: if it looks bad, it likely is bad; and if it looks good, get it in writing.

It is easy to point out the obvious ethical violations. We cannot accept gifts from prohibited sources. If you are not sure whether it is a prohibited source, consult a JAG. We cannot use our government credit cards for family dinner and we cannot accept an upgrade to first-class based upon our status in the military when we fly commercial airlines, sorry folks. But what if we are receiving a gift while acting in our official military capacity? What if our spouse is?

As a general rule, an employee shall not directly or indirectly, solicit or accept a gift, from a prohibited source or given to the employee because of the employee's official position. If this appears to be occurring please seek advice from an ethics counselor.

As with many laws and rules, there are exceptions. One of the exceptions has been deemed the "twenty-fifty rule." This exception states that an employee may accept *unsolicited* gifts under an aggregate market value of \$20 so long as the total aggregate market value does not exceed \$50 in a calendar year. For example, if an employee is given two gifts simultaneously from one source, valued at \$18 and \$15 respectively, the employee may accept only one of the gifts because the aggregate value of the two items exceeds \$20. If, however, these gifts were given by two different sources or at two separate occasions, the employee could accept both.

Another exception applies to certain widely attended gatherings (WAGs), which are determined by your ethics counselor. If an employee is speaking in his official capacity at a widely attended gathering, his acceptance of free attendance to the event for the day of his presentation is permissible when provided by the sponsor of the event. Included as free attendance he may receive food, refreshments, entertainment, and materials provided to all attendees as an integral part of the event. Moreover, the employee's spouse may enjoy free attendance as well. The market value of the WAG gifts is currently a maximum of \$800; however, that does include items for both the employee and the spouse. The employee is NOT entitled to travel expenses, lodgings, entertainment collateral to the event, or meals taken in other than a group setting at the event.

When in doubt, you can never go wrong paying for a gift. If you have paid for it, it is no longer a gift. If you have received a prohibited gift there are several ways to dispose of it. If it is tangible either return it to the donor or pay the donor its market value. If it is intangible such as entertainment, a favor, or service, reimburse the donor the market value. If the item is perishable it may be given to an appropriate charity, shared with the recipient's office, or destroyed.

If you have any doubt as to whether to accept a gift, please consult your ethics counselor for a written determination. If it looks bad, it likely is bad, and if it looks good, get it in writing.

If accepting a gift looks bad, it likely is bad; and if it not, then get it in writing.

Legal Assistance: If your Sailors are in need of personal advice services, you should direct them to the RLSO MIDLANT Legal Assistance Department. For example, do they need a will? Are they going through a divorce and need general advice? Are they in a dispute with their landlord?

RLSO MIDLANT (Hampton Roads) Legal Assistance Service Hours

If one of your Sailors needs legal assistance advice in the Hampton Roads area, direct them to the Legal Assistance Department onboard Naval Station Norfolk, located in Building A-50, 9620 Maryland Ave., Suite 100. Below are LA Department's hours of operation:

Powers of Attorney and Notary Services Walk-ins:

Mon – Thurs, 0800-1530

Will Walk-ins:

Mon, 0800-1100 & 1300-1530

Family Law:

Tues 0740-1100 &

Thurs 0740-1100

Appointments for all other legal issues:

Made through the appointment line (757-341-4491)

Mon – Thurs, 1000-1300

If your command is deploying, the Legal Assistance Department can send attorneys to your command to do will intakes and executions on-site (20 or more personnel). If you would like to organize a will workshop in the Hampton Roads area, please contact the Will Visit Coordinator at RLSOMIDLANTWillRequests@navy.mil. For Pre-deployment briefs, please contact LT Clayton McCarl at 757-341-4489.

RLSO MIDLANT (Northeast Locations) Legal Assistance Service Hours

If your Sailor requires legal assistance in the Northeast AOR, please contact the Legal Assistance office at the respective detachment office for their hours of operation:

Groton: (860) 694-3741

Newport: (401) 841-3766

Earle: (732) 866-2066

Below are QR scan codes linking to worksheets and informational guides for servicemembers provided by the Navy JAG Corps. Servicemembers should review these documents before heading to legal assistance to speak with an attorney or have a power of attorney drafted.



Pre-Deployment Checklist



Family Care Plan



Standardized Will
Worksheet



Understanding Your
Power of Attorney



Power of Attorney
Worksheet



Going to Court:
General District Court



Virginia Divorce and
Spousal Support



Virginia Child
Support Guidelines



Landlord/Tenant Issues



Lease Termination
under the SCRA and
Virginia Law



SCRA Overview



SCRA and Mobile Phone
Contract Termination

MIDLANT Adjudged Court-Martial Sentences

For the period of January to May 2014, RLSO MIDLANT tried 7 General Court-Martials and 4 Special Court-Martials. A summary of each case and the results are listed below. Please include this information in your POD/POWs as appropriate.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA an E-6 pled not guilty for knowingly and wrongfully possessing child pornography. On 2 January 2014 a panel of members sentenced to be confined for a period of 18 months and discharged from the naval service with a bad conduct discharge.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA an E-4 pled not guilty of making a false official statement, engage in a sexual act with another service member by force, commit an assault upon another service member with force likely to produce death or grievous bodily harm. On 10 January 2014, a panel of members sentenced to be reduced to pay grade E-1, restricted for 60 days to the limits of his ship (CVN- 69), and to be sentenced to hard labor without confinement for a period of 30 days.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA a LTJG pled guilty of missing ships movement through design, violating a lawful general order, making a false official statement with intent to deceive, committing a sexual act upon another service member who was incapable of consenting, and conduct unbecoming of an officer and gentleman. On 12 February 2014, the military judge sentenced to be fined for the amount of \$ 42,000, and confined for 89 days.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA a LTJG was tried for sexual contact upon another sailor. On 18 February 2014, the military judge returned a verdict of not guilty.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA an E-5 pled Guilty of knowingly and wrongfully received child pornography, conduct being of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces, wrongfully solicit a civilian to commit the offense of wrongful distribution of a child pornography by asking a civilian to send via email a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct, such conduct being of a nature to bring discredit upon armed forces. On 20 February 2014, military judge sentenced to reduced pay grade to E-1, confined for 2 years, and discharged with a dishonorable discharge.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA an E-5 pled guilty to violation of the UCMJ Article 120 and to committing sexual contact upon a civilian. On 26 February 2014, the military judge sentenced to confinement for a period of 18 months, and to be discharged from the service with a dishonorable discharge.

At a General Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA an E- 4 pled not guilty to fail to obey lawful order on divers occasions, and commit a sexual act. On 27 March 2014, a panel of members sentenced to be reduced to the pay grade of an E- 3 and confined for a period of 90 days.

At a Special Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA, an E-8, pled not guilty to derelict in the performance of duties. On 18 January 2014, a panel of members sentenced the E-8 to be reduced to the pay grade of E-7.

At a Special Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA, an E-4, pled not guilty to a violation of lawful general regulation. On 1 February 2014, a panel of members sentenced the E-4 to be reduced to E-2, forfeit \$1,145.00 pay per month for a period of two months, restricted for 30 days, and perform hard labor without confinement for one month.

At a Special Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA, an E-5, pled guilty of stealing military property of a value more than \$500.00. On 5 March 2014, the military judge sentenced the E-5 to be reduced to E-1, a fine of \$5,000.00, and confined for six months.

At a Special Court- Martial in Norfolk, VA, a CWO2, pled guilty to assault consummated by battery, and conduct unbecoming of an officer. On 19 March 2014, the military judge sentenced the CWO2 to be reprimanded with a punitive letter of reprimand, restricted to Naval Air Station Oceana for a period of 30 days, and forfeiture of \$2,500.00 a month for one month.

MIDLANT Board of Inquiry (BOI) Results

For the period of January to May 2014, RLSO MIDLANT convened 20 BOIs. A summary of each case and the results are listed below. Please include this information in your POD/POWs as appropriate.

During a board held on 10 January 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of UCMJ Article 92 (Failure to obey order or regulation) and UCMJ Article 133 (Conduct Unbecoming a Naval Officer), and the member had not failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 4 February 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of UCMJ Article 92 (Failure to obey order or regulation), UCMJ Article 107 (False official statement), and UCMJ Article 108 (Loss, damage, destruction, or disposition of military property), and the member had failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be separated with an Honorable characterization of service.

During a board held on 7 February 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to a civilian conviction for driving under the influence. The board recommended that the member be separated with an Honorable characterization of service.

MIDLANT Board of Inquiry Results, continued

During a board held on 10 February 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of UCMJ Article 134 (Adultery) and the member had not failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 21 February 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to substandard performance of duty (PFA failures). The board found that the basis for separation had been met and recommended that the member be separated with an Honorable characterization of service.

During a board held on 25 February 2014, an O3, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to drug use. The board found that the basis for separation had been met and the member had not failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 27 February 2014, a CWO3, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 11 March 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to substandard performance of duty (PFA failures). The board found that the basis for separation had been met. The board recommended the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 14 March 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of Article 111 (Driving under the influence) and the member had failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be separated with an Honorable characterization of service.

During a board held on 20 March 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to drug use. The board found that the basis for separation had been met and the member had not failed to conform to prescribed standards of military department. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 26 March 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 22 April 2014, an O4, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to substandard performance of duty (PFA failures). The board found that the basis for separation had been met and recommended that the member be separated with an Honorable characterization of service.

MIDLANT Board of Inquiry Results, continued

During a board held on 23 April 2014, an O3, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to a civilian conviction for domestic violence. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 24 April 2014, an O3, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of UCMJ Article 92 (Failure to obey order or regulation - Fraternization/Sexual Harassment) and that the member had failed to conform to prescribed standards of military deportment. The board recommended that the member be separated with a General characterization of service.

During a board held on 1 May 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 8 May 2014, an O3, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found that the member had committed a violation of UCMJ Article 121 (Larceny) and UCMJ Article 133 (Conduct unbecoming an officer), and that the member had not failed to conform to prescribed standards of military deportment. The board recommended that the member be retained on active duty.

During a board held on 19 May 2014, an O6, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to failure to command assiduously. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 20 May 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 27 May 2014, an O6, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to misconduct and substandard performance of duty. The board found the basis for separation had not been met.

During a board held on 30 May 2014, an O5, USN, was ordered to show cause for retention due to a civilian conviction for conspiracy and fraud. The board recommended the member be retained on active duty.

RLSO MIDLANT
COMMAND SERVICES TEAM

HAMPTON ROADS AOR

RLSO Command Services Department
757-444-1266

Post-Trial Processing Division
757-341-4568

NAVSTA Norfolk SJA
757-444-1266

NAS Oceana / Dam Neck Annex SJA
757-433-2946

JEB Little Creek-Fort Story SJA
757-462-7224

Naval Weapons Station Yorktown SJA
757-322-3065

NSA Hampton Roads SJA
757-322-3065

TPU NORFOLK SJA
757-445-0715
757-444-1340

NORTHEAST AOR

RLSO MIDLANT DET Groton
860-694-3309

NSB New London SJA
860-694-4739

NAVSTA Newport SJA
401-841-6195

Portsmouth NSY SJA
401-841-3766 x 201

NWS Earle/NSA Lakehurst SJA
732-866-2576

**NSA Mechanicsburg/NSA
Philadelphia SJA**
732-323-5108

**Region Legal Service
Office Mid-Atlantic**
9620 Maryland Avenue
Suite 201
Norfolk, VA 23511

RLSO Mid-Atlantic welcomes suggestions for articles and recommendations for improvement. For addition to the RLSO Legal Compass distribution list or to make suggestions or recommendations, please email:
RLSOMIDLANTNEWSLETTER@navy.mil.

