

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

---

**UNITED STATES**

**v.**

**Airman First Class TYLER T. WILLIAMS  
United States Air Force**

**ACM S30623**

**31 January 2006**

Sentence adjudged 6 April 2004 by SPCM convened at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska. Military Judge: Jack L. Anderson (sitting alone).

Approved sentence: Bad-conduct discharge, confinement for 3 months, and reduction to E-1.

Appellate Counsel for Appellant: Colonel Carlos L. McDade, Major Sandra K. Whittington, Major Karen L. Hecker, Captain David P. Bennett, and Captain Diane M. Paskey.

Appellate Counsel for the United States: Lieutenant Colonel Gary F. Spencer, Lieutenant Colonel Robert V. Combs, and Major Carrie E. Wolf.

Before

STONE, SMITH, and MATHEWS  
Appellate Military Judges

PER CURIAM:

We have reviewed the record of trial, the appellant's assignment of errors, and the government's reply. The appellant raises two issues for our consideration. In the first, he claims the convening authority did not receive all of his clemency submissions or the correct record of trial. We disagree.

The post-trial documents, to include an affidavit from the paralegal who handled the post-trial processing of the appellant's case, clearly establish that the convening authority received all of the appellant's post-trial submissions and the correct record of trial. *See United States v. Godreau*, 31 M.J. 809, 811-12 (A.F.C.M.R. 1990). We find the appellant's civilian defense counsel's listing of names following the abbreviation "xc:" at the conclusion of his written submission was not to identify the authors of

attachments. Rather, the civilian defense counsel was identifying those individuals who received a “Xerox copy” of his written submission. We also find the mention of another Airman’s record of trial as an attachment to the addendum to the staff judge advocate’s recommendation was an administrative error from which the appellant suffered no colorable showing of prejudice. *See* Article 59(a), UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 859(a).

Finally, we have also considered the appellant’s claim that his sentence was inappropriately severe and find it to be without merit.<sup>1</sup> *See United States v. Healy*, 26 M.J. 394, 395 (C.M.A. 1988); *United States v. Snelling*, 14 M.J. 267, 268 (C.M.A. 1982).

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, 10 U.S.C. § 866(c); *United States v. Reed*, 54 M.J. 37, 41 (C.A.A.F. 2000). Accordingly, the findings and sentence are

AFFIRMED.

OFFICIAL

ANGELA M. BRICE  
Clerk of Court

---

<sup>1</sup> This assignment of error was raised pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982).