DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO
COMNAVRESWINST 5814.1E
N05

01 NOV 2004

COMNAVREGSW INSTRUCTION 5814.1E

Subj: ARTICLE 64, UCMJ, REVIEW OF SUMMARY COURT-MARTIAL AND NON-BCD SPECIAL COURT-MARTIAL RECORDS OF TRIAL

Ref: (a) Article 64, UCMJ
(b) R.C.M. 1112, MCM
(c) R.C.M. 1306, MCM
(d) Section 0153, JAGINST 5800.7D (JAGMAN)
(e) R.C.M. 1305, MCM

Encl: (1) CNRSW letters designating Command Judge Advocates of Special Court-Martial Convening Authorities as Post-Trial Judge Advocate Review Authorities
(2) Sample Summary of Proceedings - Guilty Pleas Case
(3) Sample Summary of Proceedings - Not-Guilty Pleas Case

1. Purpose. To establish procedures within Navy Region Southwest (NRSW) for review of records of trial of summary courts-martial (SCM) and special courts-martial (SPCM) not involving a bad conduct discharge (BCD) and to ensure submission of complete and properly prepared records of summary courts-martial for judge advocate review.

2. Cancellation. COMNAVREGSWINST 5814.1D.

3. Background. References (a), (b), and (c), require a judge advocate review records of trial of SCM and SPCM not involving a bad conduct discharge in which there have been approved guilty findings. Reference (d) directs that such records be forwarded for review to the Staff Judge Advocate (SJA) of the Officer Exercising General Court-Martial Jurisdiction (OEGCMJ). In accordance with reference (d), the SJA of the OEGCMJ may review such records pursuant to reference (b), or may task another judge advocate to perform such review. Pursuant to reference (d), certain Special Court-Martial Convening Authority (SPCMCA) Command Judge Advocates (CJA) have been designated to conduct the required post-trial review of SCM and non-BCD SPCM records of trial under references (a) and (b). See enclosure (1).

4. Action. For a SPCMCA without a designated CJA to perform review of SCM and NON-BCD records of trial, such records shall

be forwarded to the SJA for Commander, Navy Region Southwest (CNRSW) for the required review. Reference (e) prescribes the minimum contents for summary courts-martial records of trial and authorizes prescription of additional requirements by the convening or higher authority. Reports of summary courts-martial submitted for review to the SJA of CNRSW shall contain the original of the following:

a. Charge sheet and appointing order.

b. Record of Trial by Summary Court-Martial (DD Form 2329), a sample of which is found in Appendix 15 of the Manual for Courts-Martial and can be downloaded at this website: http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/infomgt/forms/forminfo/forminfopage1471.html. The convening authority's action shall include approval or disapproval of findings; order of execution or suspension of sentence; and designation of the place of confinement and limits of restriction, when applicable. The convening authority's action must identify SJA, CNRSW, as the authority to conduct review under Article 64(a), UCMJ.

c. Summary of proceedings. The summary shall include the following:

(1) In cases of guilty pleas, the providency inquiry, i.e., facts constituting the accused's affirmation of each element of the offense. See enclosure (2).

(2) In cases of not-guilty pleas, a brief summary of the testimony of each witness on the merits of the case. The record shall state what documents were admitted into evidence. Copies of all documents offered shall be attached to the record of trial. See enclosure (3).

(3) In cases of guilty findings, a brief summary of testimony in aggravation and extenuation and mitigation. Copies of all documents offered in aggravation and extenuation and mitigation shall be attached to the record.

d. Certificate demonstrating the accused's receipt of a copy of the Record of Trial.

e. Clemency requests or other post-trial matters submitted by the accused, if any.

f. Records should be brief, in keeping with the purpose and expedited nature of summary courts-martial. Records of trial,

however, must provide sufficient recitation of the facts to permit a legally sufficient and effective review by the Staff Judge or his designee. A command point of contact with phone/fax number and e-mail address should be included on the forwarding letter.

J. D. BETANCOURT

Distribution:
Web page: (www.cnrsw.navy.mil/admin/menu.htm)

file

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R / 3218
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Base San Diego

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Base San Diego, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Base San Diego.

J. L. BETANCOURT

Encl (1)

file

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/~~3129~~ 3219
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Transient Personnel Unit San Diego

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Transient Personnel Unit, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Transient Personnel Unit.

J. L. BETANCOURT

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/ 3220
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Medical Center San Diego

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Medical Center, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Medical Center San Diego.

J. L. BETANCOURT

file

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/ 3221
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commander, Naval Base Coronado

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Base Coronado, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commander, Naval Base Coronado.

J. L. BETANCOURT

fer

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/3222
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Base Point Loma

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Base Point Loma, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Base Point Loma.

J. L. BETANCOURT

Lee

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/ 3223
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Base Ventura County

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Base Ventura County, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Base Ventura County.

J. B. BETANCOURT

File

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5800
Ser N05R/3224
25 February 2002

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Lemoore

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Air Station Lemoore, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Lemoore.

J. L. BETANCOURT

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY REGION SOUTHWEST
937 NO. HARBOR DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92132-0058

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5800
Ser N05R/ 3257
11 MAR 02

From: Commander, Navy Region Southwest
To: Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon

Subj: RCM 1112 JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW DESIGNATION

Ref: (a) JAGMAN 0153
(b) R.C.M. 1112
(c) UCMJ Art. 64

1. Pursuant to reference (a) I hereby appoint the Command Judge Advocate for Naval Air Station Fallon, as the designated judge advocate for all post trial reviews required under references (b) and (c) for cases convened by, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada.

J. L. BETANCOURT

File

SAMPLE

REPORT OF SUMMARY COURT-MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS- GUILTY PLEAS

Summary Court-Martial case of Fireman Recruit John Doe, U.S. Navy, 000-00-0000.

PROVIDENCY FOR GUILTY PLEAS

Charge I: Article 86, Unauthorized Absence

The Summary Court-Martial Officer inquired as to the identity and military status of the accused as of the date of his departure from his unit. The court also verified that such departure was without proper authority and that the accused was indeed an unauthorized absentee from 1245, 24 May 1998 until 1200, 10 December 1998 when he surrendered to military authorities on board Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Center, St. Louis, Missouri.

Charge II: Article 134, Breaking Restriction

The Summary Court-Martial Officer determined that the accused was on active duty on 24 May 1998, was assigned to Transient Personnel Unit, Naval Station, San Diego, California and was duly restricted by Commander Johnson, Commanding Officer, Transient Personnel Unit, Naval Station. The Summary Court Officer further determined that the accused knew of his restriction and the limits thereof, and that on 24 May 1998, he went beyond the limits of the restriction without authority.

AGGRAVATION

The Summary Court-Martial Officer accepted Exhibit 1, record of prior non-judicial punishment, into evidence.

EXTENUATION AND MITIGATION

The accused made a sworn statement as follows:

The day I went UA my father was very sick. My father was in the hospital with chest problems. He had a heart attack about

six or seven days after I got there. He stayed in the hospital for three weeks. Two of the three weeks were in intensive care.

I have other brothers, but they were not at home. They were at school. I took all the responsibilities. I returned from UA when my brother came home from school. The Summary Court-Martial Office accepted Exhibit 2, photos of family and dog, and Exhibit 3 letter from Mrs. Crabtree, a third-grade teacher, into evidence.

SAMPLE

REPORT OF SUMMARY COURT-MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS - NOT GUILTY PLEAS

Summary Court-Marital case of Fireman Apprentice John Doe, U.S. Navy, 000-00-0000.

Merits

The Summary Court-Martial Officer received Exhibit 1 into evidence.

Witness for the government, MA1 Jane M. Jones, U.S. Navy, was sworn and testified substantially as follows:

I am a military working dog handler. I remember doing a drug dog gate inspection on the morning of 19 April 1998, but I don't specifically remember FA Doe. My dog "Charlie" will sit when responding to a person in possession of drugs. I mainly look for the change of behavior in the dog. I've worked with my dog for two and a half years and I am very familiar with his responses. I received my dog handling training at Lackland Air Force Base.

Witness for the government, Petty Officer Smith, U.S. Navy, was sworn and testified substantially as follows:

I saw "Charlie" alert on FA Doe on 19 April 1998. Doe was brought in to give urine sample. After he refused to provide a sample, I informed Captain Johnson that he had been alerted upon in a military working dog gate inspection and had refused to give a consent urine sample. Captain Johnson then issued an order for Doe to provide a urine sample. When I returned, I notified Doe that Captain Johnson had ordered him to provide a urine sample. Doe again refused, and stated that he did not have the time, and had to go to work. I then called base police, and they took him away. Doe indicated on a form that he wound not consent to a urinalysis.

Witness for the accused, Fireman Witness, U.S. Navy, was sworn and testified as follows:

On the morning of 19 April 1998, Fireman Apprentice Doe and I went to chow. We took the bus to get back to the Naval Station. At the gate, everybody on the bus was ordered to get off so the dogs could go through the bus and inspect it. The first dog went by us and the second dog came by and sat on Doe's foot. Doe was then searched. I was not present when Doe was ordered to provide a urine sample.

FA John Doe was sworn and testified substantially as follows:

I was searched and nothing was found on me. I refused to provide a urine sample. A phone call was then made to Captain Johnson. Captain Johnson gave me a direct order to provide a sample. I still refused to give a sample and was written up for disobeying a direct order. I did give a sample on 28 March 1998 that came up negative. I did not submit to a urinalysis on the morning of 19 April 1998 because I was getting fed up with giving samples. I had given two samples the prior month which both came up negative.

AGGRAVATION

The Summary Court-Martial Officer received Exhibit 2, a page 13 counseling sheet, into evidence.

EXTENUATION AND MITIGATION

The accused made a sworn statement as follows:

The reason I believe the dog might have alerted on me that morning is that I was wearing a dirty pair of dungarees with cigarette smell. I had just gotten back from breakfast, and the dog could have been hungry. Another reason why I didn't submit to a urinalysis is because I felt threatened by the consent statement on the form. I have never used drugs in my life except for doctor prescribed drugs.

The Summary Court-Martial Officer received Exhibit 3, Sailor of the Week certificate, into evidence. Exhibit 4, an unsigned letter of appreciation from National Marijuana Growers was not accepted into evidence.