

**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

---

---

**UNITED STATES**

**v.**

**Airman First Class SCOTT V. BRIDGES  
United States Air Force**

**ACM 36977**

**30 January 2008**

Sentence adjudged 10 January 2007 by GCM convened at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. Military Judge: Adam Oler.

Approved sentence: Bad-conduct discharge, confinement for 22 months, forfeiture of all pay and allowances for 22 months, and reduction to E-1.

Appellate Counsel for the Appellant: Lieutenant Colonel Mark R. Strickland and Captain Lance J. Wood.

Appellate Counsel for the United States: Colonel Gerald R. Bruce, Major Matthew S. Ward, and Captain Coretta E. Gray.

Before

**SCHOLZ, JACOBSON, and THOMPSON  
Appellate Military Judges**

This opinion is subject to editorial correction before final release.

**PER CURIAM:**

Contrary to his pleas, the appellant was found guilty of rape, in violation of Article 120, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. §920. A general court-martial comprised of officer and enlisted members sentenced the appellant to a bad conduct discharge, confinement for two years, reduction to the grade of E-1, and total forfeitures of all pay and allowances for two years. The convening authority approved only so much of the findings and sentence as provided for a bad conduct discharge, confinement for 22 months, reduction to the grade of E-1, and total forfeitures of all pay and allowances for 22 months.

The appellant asks that we find the evidence to be legally and factually insufficient to support his conviction. Finding his assertion of error to be without merit, we affirm the findings and sentence.

In accordance with Article 66(c), UCMJ, 10 USC §866(c), we review issues of legal and factual sufficiency de novo. *United States v. Washington*, 57 M.J. 394, 399 (C.A.A.F. 2002).

The test for legal sufficiency of the evidence is “whether, considering the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, a reasonable factfinder could have found all the essential elements beyond a reasonable doubt.” *United States v. Humpherys*, 57 M.J. 83, 94 (C.A.A.F. 2002); (quoting *United States v. Turner*, 25 M.J. 324 (C.M.A. 1987)) (citing *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 319 (1979)). In resolving questions of legal sufficiency, we are “bound to draw every reasonable inference from the evidence of record in favor of the prosecution.” *United States v. Barner*, 56 M.J. 131, 134 (C.A.A.F. 2001). Our assessment of legal sufficiency is limited to the evidence produced at trial. *United States v. Dykes*, 38 M.J. 270, 272 (C.M.A. 1993). We have considered the evidence produced at trial in a light most favorable to the government, and find a reasonable factfinder could have found all of the essential elements of the specification beyond a reasonable doubt. Thus, we find the appellant’s conviction to be legally sufficient.

The test for factual sufficiency is “whether, after weighing the evidence in the record of trial and making allowances for not having personally observed the witnesses [we] are [ourselves] convinced of the accused’s guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.” *United States v. Turner*, 25 M.J. 324, 325 (C.M.A. 1987). Review of the evidence is limited to the entire record, which includes only the evidence admitted at trial and exposed to the crucible of cross-examination. Article 66(c), UCMJ, *United States v. Bethea*, 46 C.M.R. 223, 224-25 (C.M.A. 1973). We have carefully considered the evidence under this standard and find ourselves convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused is guilty of the charge and its specification.

#### *Conclusion*

The findings and sentence are correct in law and fact, and no error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the appellant occurred. Article 66(c), UCMJ; *United States v. Reed*, 54 M.J. 37, 41 (C.A.A.F. 2000). Accordingly, the findings and sentence are

AFFIRMED.

OFFICIAL



*Christina E. Parsons*  
CHRISTINA E. PARSONS, TSgt, USAF  
Deputy, Clerk of the Court