

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

No. ACM S32626

UNITED STATES
Appellee

v.

Jacob L. BRINGARD
Airman Basic (E-1), U.S. Air Force, *Appellant*

Appeal from the United States Air Force Trial Judiciary
Decided 27 March 2020

Military Judge: Andrew R. Norton.

Sentence: Sentence adjudged on 1 October 2019 by SpCM convened at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware. Sentence entered by military judge on 30 October 2019: Bad-conduct discharge, confinement for 44 days, and a reprimand.

For Appellant: Major Rodrigo M. Caruço, USAF.

For Appellee: Lieutenant Colonel Brian C. Mason, USAF.

Before MINK, LEWIS, and D. JOHNSON, *Appellate Military Judges*.

**This is an unpublished opinion and, as such, does not serve as
precedent under AFCCA Rule of Practice and Procedure 30.4.**

PER CURIAM:

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

* After the court-martial adjourned, the military judge signed a Statement of Trial

(Footnote continues on next page)

Articles 59(a) and 66(d), Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. §§ 859(a), 866(d). *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2019 ed.). Accordingly, the findings and sentence are **AFFIRMED**.



FOR THE COURT

Carol K. Joyce

CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

Results (STR) and inserted it into the record of trial in accordance with Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1101(a). The rule lists a number of required contents, including *inter alia* “the command by which [the court-martial] was convened.” R.C.M. 1101(a)(3). The STR in this case included most of the required contents, and it indicated the squadron and major command to which Appellant was assigned, but it omitted the command which convened the court-martial. *United States v. Moody-Neukom*, No. ACM S32594, 2019 CCA LEXIS 521, at *2–3 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 16 Dec. 2019) (unpub. op.). However, we find no colorable showing of possible prejudice from this minor omission, see *United States v. Scalo*, 60 M.J. 435, 436–37 (C.A.A.F. 2005) (citing *United States v. Kho*, 54 M.J. 63, 65 (C.A.A.F. 2000)), and we do not find it necessary to direct corrective action pursuant to R.C.M. 1112(d)(2).