# UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

No. ACM 39182

### UNITED STATES

Appellee

 $\mathbf{v}$ .

### Scott A. STAJCAR

Senior Airman (E-4), U.S. Air Force, Appellant

Appeal from the United States Air Force Trial Judiciary
Decided 28 July 2017

\_\_\_\_

Military Judge: Charles E. Wiedie, Jr.

Approved sentence: Dishonorable discharge and confinement for 9 months. Sentence adjudged 30 August 2016 by GCM convened at Kadena Air Base, Japan.

For Appellant: Colonel Christopher W. Dentel, USAF; Major Mark C. Bruegger, USAF.

For Appellee: Major Mary Ellen Payne, USAF; Major Meredith L. Steer, USAF.

Before MAYBERRY, JOHNSON, and SPERANZA,  $Appellate\ Military\ Judges.$ 

This is an unpublished opinion and, as such, does not serve as precedent under AFCCA Rule of Practice and Procedure 18.4.

### PER CURIAM:

The approved findings and sentence are correct in law and fact, and no error materially prejudicial to Appellant's substantial rights occurred. Arti-

## United States v. Stajcar, No. ACM 39182

cles 59(a) and 66(c), Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. §§ 859(a), 866(c). Accordingly, the approved findings and sentence are **AFFIRMED**.<sup>1</sup>

FOR THE COURT

KURT J. BRUBAKER

Clerk of the Court

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We note two errors in the promulgating order with respect to the language of Specification 1 of the Charge. First, the order incorrectly reads "... with your finger and his mouth," whereas the specification alleges "... with his finger and his mouth." Second, the order incorrectly indicates Appellant pleaded guilty to the entire specification, and the military judge found Appellant guilty of the specification except the words "and mouth," of which the military judge found Appellant not guilty. In fact, Appellant pleaded guilty to the specification but excepted the words "and mouth," to which he pleaded not guilty. After pleas but before the military judge entered findings, the Government withdrew and dismissed the words "and mouth," and the military judge subsequently found Appellant guilty of the remaining language without exceptions. We find no prejudice, but to ensure the accuracy of court-martial records, we direct the publication of a corrected court-martial order.