

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES’ ANSWER TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION
	)	FOR GRANT OF REVIEW
v.	)	
	)	USCA Dkt. No. 24-0228/AF
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
ROBERT D. SCHNEIDER,	)	Crim. App. No. 40403
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	21 October 2024

MARY ELLEN PAYNE  
Associate Chief  
Government Trial and  
Appellate Operations Division  
1500 W. Perimeter Re., Ste. 1190  
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762  
United States Air Force  
(240) 612-4800  
Court Bar No. 34088

## INDEX OF BRIEF

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
ISSUES PRESENTED .....	1
STATEMENT OF STATUTORY JURISDICTION .....	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	3
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT .....	5
AFCCA HAD NO AUTHORITY TO CORRECT THE 18 U.S.C. § 922 ANNOTATION ON THE STATEMENT OF TRIAL RESULTS OR THE ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BECAUSE APPELLANT DID NOT RAISE OR DEMONSTRATE POST- TRIAL PROCESSING ERROR UNDER ARTICLE 66(D)(2) AT AFCCA, AND THE ANNOTATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ERROR IN THE PROCESSING OF THE COURT-MARTIAL AFTER THE JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED INTO THE RECORD.....	5
Standard of Review .....	5
Law.....	5
Analysis.....	7
A. The Section 922 annotation was not an error because it accurately notified Appellant that his conviction triggered the firearms prohibition under federal law .....	8
B. At AFCCA, Appellant failed to raise the Section	

922 annotation on the STR or the EOJ as a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2) .....	9
C. The Section 922 annotation on the First Indorsement to the STR was entered into the record before the judgment of the court was entered via the EOJ.....	10
CONCLUSION.....	13
CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE .....	14
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 24(d).....	15

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES**

<u>United States v. Brubaker-Escobar</u>	
81 M.J. 471, 473-474 (C.A.A.F. 2021).....	5
<u>United States v. Johnson</u>	
Dkt. No. 24-004 (C.A.A.F. September 24, 2024).....	13
<u>United States v. Williams</u>	
__ M.J. __, 2024 CAAF LEXIS 501 (C.A.A.F. 2024).....	6, 7, 8, 9

### **AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

<u>United States v. Lepore</u>	
81 M.J. 759 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 2021) .....	3
<u>United States v. Schneider</u>	
No. ACM 40403, 2024 CCA LEXIS 288 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 16 July 2024) (unpub. op.).....	3
<u>United States v. Vanzant</u>	
No. ACM 22004, 2024 CCA LEXIS 215 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 28 May 2024) (unpub. op.) .....	3

### **STATUTES**

Article 60, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 60.....	4, 5, 10
Article 60c, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 60c .....	5, 11
Article 66, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 66.....	<i>passim</i>
Article 67, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 67.....	2, 13
18 U.S.C. § 922.....	<i>passim</i>

## OTHER AUTHORITIES

Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 51-201, <i>Administration of Military Justice</i> , para. 13.3.3 (dated 18 Jan. 2019).....	6, 8, 11
Manual for Courts-Martial, pt. IV, para. 41.d(1) (2019 ed.) .....	8
Rules for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.), Rule 1101 .....	6, 10

21 October 2024

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE ARMED FORCES**

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' ANSWER TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION
	)	FOR GRANT OF REVIEW
v.	)	
	)	USCA Dkt. No. 24-0228/AF
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
ROBERT D. SCHNEIDER, USAF,	)	Crim. App. No. 40403
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES:**

**ISSUES PRESENTED**

**I.<sup>1</sup>**

**WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ERRED BY  
ALLOWING [THE VICTIM] TO INSINUATE THAT  
[APPELLANT] WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR AN  
UNCHARGED AND UNRELATED IDENTITY  
THEFT THAT TOOK PLACE AFTER THE  
CHARGED OFFENSE.**

**II.**

**WHETHER THE LOWER COURT ERRED BY  
AFFIRMING THAT [APPELLANT'S]  
CONVICTION FOR NON-VIOLENT OFFENSES  
TRIGGERED THE FIREARMS PROHIBITION**

---

<sup>1</sup> The United States responds to Issue II of Appellant's Supplement to Petition for Grant of Review in this Answer, and otherwise enters its general opposition to the other issue raised. The United States relies on its brief filed with AFCCA on 9 May 2024, unless requested to do otherwise by this Court.

**UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 922 AS EXECUTED THROUGH  
THE ENTRY OF JUDGMENT.**

**STATEMENT OF STATUTORY JURISDICTION**

The Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals (AFCCA) reviewed this case under Article 66(d), UCMJ. 10 U.S.C. 866(d). If this Court grants review of this case, it will have jurisdiction over this matter under Article 67(a)(3), UCMJ. 10 U.S.C. 867(a)(3).

**STATEMENT OF CASE**

Appellant was convicted, pursuant to his guilty pleas, at a general court-martial convened at Hill Air Force Base, Utah, on 27 October 2022, to one charge and eight specifications of making a false official statement in violation of Article 107, UCMJ. (R. at 138.) The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, to be reduced to the grade of E-1, to be confined for a total of 12 months, and to be discharged with a bad-conduct discharge. (R. at 368; Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, *Entry of Judgment (EOJ)*.) The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. (ROT, Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action.) The convening authority denied Appellant's deferment requests relating to his reduction in grade and automatic forfeitures. (Id.) The convening authority also denied Appellant's request to have his automatic forfeiture waived. (Id.)

The First Indorsement to the Statement of Trial Results (STR) and the EOJ contains the following statements: “Firearm Prohibition Triggered Under 18 U.S.C. § 922: Yes.” (*STR* and *EOJ*, ROT, Vol. 1.)

At AFCCA, Appellant submitted a brief, including the fourth assignment of error, “Whether the government can prove 18 U.S.C. § 922 is constitutional by ‘demonstrating that it is consistent with the nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation....’?” AFCCA considered the fourth issue and summarily decided that Appellant was not entitled to relief citing to its published opinions in United States v. Vanzant, 84 M.J. 671 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 28 May 2024) and United States v. Lepore, 81 M.J. 759 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 16 September 2021) (*en banc*). United States v. Schneider, No. ACM 40403, 2024 CCA LEXIS 288, \*2 (A.F. Ct. Crim. App. 16 July 2024) (unpub. op.). AFCCA decided, “The findings and sentence are correct in law and fact, and no error materially prejudicial to the substantial rights of Appellant occurred.” Id. at \*31.

### **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

Appellant lied to eight United States Air Force applicants for the Officer Training School (OTS). (Pros. Ex. 1). He told four of them that an officer selection board chose them to attend OTS, when they were not selected. (*Id.*) He told three of them that they were alternates to attend OTS, when they were not alternates. (*Id.*)



And he told one of them that he had an appointment at the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS), when there was no such appointment. (Id.)

### **SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT**

Appellant failed to demonstrate that the 18 U.S.C. § 922 firearm prohibition annotations on the STR and EOJ were post-trial processing errors occurring after the judgment of the court-martial was entered into the record. 10 U.S.C. 866(d)(2). Article 66(d)(2) provides three prerequisites that an appellant must meet before AFCCA has jurisdiction to review a case for post-trial processing error: (1) an error occurred; (2) the appellant met his burden to demonstrate an error occurred and raised the issue at the Court of Criminal Appeals; and (3) the error occurred “after the judgment was entered into the record” via the EOJ. 10 U.S.C. § 866(d)(2). Appellant did not meet any of the three prerequisites to trigger Article 66(d)(2) review. First, the Section 922 annotation was not an error because it accurately notified Appellant that his conviction triggered the firearms prohibition under federal law. Second, Appellant failed to raise the Section 922 annotation on the STR and EOJ as a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2) at AFCCA. Third, and finally, the Section 922 annotation on the First Indorsement to the STR was entered into the record before the judgment of the court was entered via the EOJ and again simultaneously with the EOJ when the EOJ was entered into the record.

## **ARGUMENT**

### **II.**

**AFCCA HAD NO AUTHORITY TO CORRECT THE 18 U.S.C. § 922 ANNOTATION ON THE STATEMENT OF TRIAL RESULTS OR THE ENTRY OF JUDGMENT BECAUSE APPELLANT DID NOT RAISE OR DEMONSTRATE POST-TRIAL PROCESSING ERROR UNDER ARTICLE 66(D)(2) AT AFCCA, AND THE ANNOTATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ERROR IN THE PROCESSING OF THE COURT-MARTIAL AFTER THE JUDGMENT WAS ENTERED INTO THE RECORD.**

#### **Standard of Review**

Courts of Criminal Appeals (CCA) are courts of limited jurisdiction, and this Court reviews the scope of a CCA's jurisdiction *de novo*. United States v. Brubaker-Escobar, 81 M.J. 471, 473-474 (C.A.A.F. 2021).

#### **Law**

A CCA “*may* provide appropriate relief if the accused demonstrates error or excessive delay in the processing of the court-martial *after* the judgment was entered into the record under section 860c of this title[.]” 10 U.S.C. § 866(d)(2) (emphasis added). The military judge enters the court-martial judgment into the record via the EOJ. 10 U.S.C. § 860c(a)(1). By statute, the EOJ includes the STR. 10 U.S.C. § 860c(a)(1)(A). The STR contains: (1) “each plea and finding;” (2) “the sentence, if any; and” (3) “such other information as the President may prescribe by regulation.”

10 U.S.C. § 860(a)(1). The President prescribed that “[a]ny additional information directed by the military judge or required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned” may be added to the STR. R.C.M. 1101(a)(6). This Court determined an annotation on the STR notifying the Appellant of an 18 U.S.C. § 922 firearm prohibition constituted “other information” as required by R.C.M. 1101(a)(6). United States v. Williams, 2024 CAAF LEXIS 501, \*12-13 (C.A.A.F. 5 September 2024).

Following the President’s instructions in R.C.M. 1101(a)(6), the Secretary of the Air Force required “other information” be provided in a First Indorsement attached to the STR. Department of the Air Force Instruction (DAFI) 51-201, *Administration of Military Justice*, para. 20.6 (dated 14 April 2022). On the STR, the SJA must annotate whether “firearm prohibitions are triggered.” Id. The Secretary of the Air Force also requires a First Indorsement to the EOJ that also states whether a firearm prohibition is triggered by a conviction. DAFI 51-201, para. 20.41. “In cases where specifications allege offenses which trigger a prohibition under 18 U.S.C. § 922 and the accused is found guilty of one or more such offenses, the appropriate box must be completed on the First Indorsements to the STR and EOJ by the SJA.” DAFI 51-201, para. 20.39.

## Analysis

Article 66(d)(2) did not grant AFCCA jurisdiction in Appellant's case to correct the 18 U.S.C. § 922 annotation on the First Indorsement of the STR or the EOJ. Appellant did not request relief under Article 66(d)(2) at the CCA, and the 18 U.S.C. § 922 firearm annotation was neither an error, nor one that occurred after the judgment of the court-martial was entered on the record. "Article 66(d)(2), UCMJ, only authorizes a CCA to provide relief when there has been an 'error or excessive delay in the processing of the court-martial.'" Williams, 2024 CAAF LEXIS at \*14. In Williams, this Court pointed to three statutory conditions that must be met before a CCA may review a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2). Id. First, an error must have occurred. Id. Second, an appellant must raise a post-trial processing error with the CCA. Id. Third, the error must have occurred after the judgment was entered. Id.

In Williams, this Court reiterated the statutory language identifying the three triggers required for Article 66(d)(2) review by a CCA. The Court laid out the three triggers and said:

First, Article 66(d)(2), UCMJ, only authorizes a CCA to provide relief when there has been an "error or excessive delay in the processing of the court-martial.

...

Second, even if there was an error, Article 66(d)(2), UCMJ, places the burden on the accused to raise the issue before the CCA.

...

Finally, even assuming that there was an error and that Appellant properly raised the issue, Article 66(d)(2), UCMJ, only applies to errors taking place “after the judgment was entered into the record.”

Williams, 2024 CAAF LEXIS at \*14. Appellant must meet all three conditions to trigger Article 66(d)(2) review. Id. In this case, Appellant did not meet any of these conditions because the Section 922 annotation was not an error, he did not raise the Section 922 annotation as a post-trial processing error at AFCCA, and the Section 922 annotation was entered into the record before the judgment and then again simultaneously with the judgment.

***A. The Section 922 annotation was not an error because it accurately notified Appellant that his conviction triggered the firearms prohibition under federal law.***

The 18 U.S.C. § 922 annotation on the First Indorsement of the STR and on the First Indorsement of the EOJ were not errors because they accurately stated that the firearm prohibition applied to Appellant in accordance with federal law. “Persons convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year” are subject to the federal firearm prohibition. DAFI 51-201, para. 29.30.1.; *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). Appellant faced a maximum of five years in confinement per specification of false official statement. Manual for Courts-Martial, pt. IV, para. 41.d(1) (2019 ed.). Appellant’s convictions triggered the firearm prohibition under 18 U.S.C. § 922, so the First Indorsement to the STR that was

incorporated into the EOJ, which included the firearm prohibition language, was not erroneous.

The government maintains that 18 U.S.C. § 922 is a constitutional limitation on a felon's ability to possess a firearm, and the government rests on its answer brief at AFCCA to address Appellant's arguments about the constitutionality of 18 U.S.C. § 922.

***B. At AFCCA, Appellant failed to raise the Section 922 annotation on the STR or the EOJ as a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2).***

Appellant never alleged a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2) in his brief at AFCCA, and because he never met his burden to demonstrate error, AFCCA did not have authority to review his case under Article 66(d)(2). Appellant argues the First Indorsement that accompanies the EOJ constitutes a post-trial processing error. (Supp. to Pet. at 19-20.) But Appellant never claimed in his brief to AFCCA that he experienced a post-trial processing error under Article 66(d)(2). In fact, he never cited Article 66(d)(2) in his brief at AFCCA. He only made a substantive constitutional claim under AFCCA's Article 66(d)(1) authority.

AFCCA's opinion accurately cited to its review authority triggered by Appellant's brief, and the court declined to invoke Article 66(d)(2) review presumably because Appellant did not meet his burden demonstrating post-trial error to trigger such review. "[E]ven if there was an error, Article 66(d)(2), UCMJ, places the burden on the accused to raise the issue before the CCA." Williams, 2024 CAAF

LEXIS at \*14. If AFCCA had corrected the STR or EOJ even though Appellant did not address Article 66(d)(2) jurisdiction or raise any post-trial processing error, then this Court would have likely found AFCCA operated outside the scope of its authority in making the correction, because one of the three prongs triggering Article 66(d)(2) review was missing.

The burden to trigger Article 66(d)(2) review belongs to the Appellant – “the Court may provide appropriate relief if the accused demonstrates error,” but the Appellant never demonstrated that the Section 922 annotations constituted a post-trial processing error at AFCCA. 10 U.S.C. 866(d)(2). Thus, he did not meet one of the three required prongs triggering AFCCA’s Article 66(d)(2) review. AFCCA did not have jurisdiction to review the Section 922 firearm annotations on the STR and the EOJ as a post-trial processing error. Appellant cannot now claim that AFCCA erred, when the burden fell squarely upon him to raise an error.

***C. The Section 922 annotation on the First Indorsement to the STR was entered into the record before the judgment of the court was entered via the EOJ.***

The 18 U.S.C. § 922 annotation was entered into the record before the EOJ was entered into the record. The 18 U.S.C. § 922 annotation on the First Indorsement of the STR is attached to the STR as “other information” under R.C.M. 1101(a)(6), and then both the other information and the STR are entered into the record. 10 U.S.C. § 860(a)(1)(C). Then the EOJ is entered into the record – after the STR. The EOJ is “the judgment of the court” cited in Article 66(d)(2). *Compare* 10 U.S.C. §

866 *with* 10 U.S.C. § 860c. Because the STR and the First Indorsement are entered into the record before the EOJ is entered into the record under Article 60c, the Section 922 annotation on the STR’s First Indorsement is not an error occurring “*after* the judgment was entered into the record.” 10 U.S.C. § 866(d)(2) (emphasis added).

Then the STR and its First Indorsement are entered into the record again as attachments to the EOJ. 10 U.S.C. § 860c(a)(1)(A). Because they are entered again as attachments to the EOJ they are simultaneous with the judgment of the court. The STR and the STR’s First Indorsement are not errors occurring after the judgment was entered into the record. 10 U.S.C. § 860c(a)(1)(A); 10 U.S.C. § 866(d)(2).

Appellant argues that AFCCA could correct the First Indorsement to the EOJ because it is attached to the EOJ after the military judge signs it. (Supp. to Pet. at 19); DAFI 51-201, para. 20.41 (“After the EOJ is signed by the military judge and returned to the servicing legal office, the SJA signs and attaches to the EOJ a First Indorsement.”)) But a correction to the EOJ’s First Indorsement would be a pyrrhic victory. Even if AFCCA had authority to remove the firearms prohibition annotation from the First Indorsement to EOJ, it could not remove the firearms annotation from the STR that was incorporated into the EOJ, because that annotation on the STR occurred before the EOJ was entered into the record. Thus, Appellant would remain in the same situation he is in now – having a firearms prohibition annotated on the



EOJ. Since AFCCA's intervention under Article 66(d)(2) would not provide meaningful relief, this Court should deny Appellant's request for review.

Appellant failed to meet the three prerequisites for Article 66(d)(2) review. So AFCCA was correct in not reviewing Appellant's Section 922 firearm prohibition claim as a post-trial processing error. The CCA did not have authority to review and correct the STR and EOJ under Article 66(d)(2) because they are entered into the record before or simultaneously with the judgment of the court-martial. Article 66(d)(2) did not grant AFCCA authority to correct the STR or EOJ in this case because Appellant did not raise or demonstrate error, and the Section 922 annotations were not errors that occurred "after the judgment was entered into the record." Thus, any correction made by AFCCA to the STR and EOJ would be an *ultra vires* act. Appellant's argument with regard to Article 66(d)(2) in Issue II is without merit, and this Court should decline to review it. With regard to this Court's authority to review the EOJ under Article 67(c)(1)(B), the United States acknowledges that this Court has granted review of a similar issue in United States v. Johnson, Dkt. No. 24-0004/SF. Thus, granting review of this issue only would be appropriate in this case.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Court should grant review only for Issue II and only to the extent this Court has granted review in United States v. Johnson regarding the Court's authority to review the EOJ under Article 67(c)(1)(C), UCMJ.



STEVEN R. KAUFMAN, Col, USAF  
Appellate Government Counsel  
Government Trial and Appellate Operations  
Division  
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate  
United States Air Force  
(240) 612-4800



MARY ELLEN PAYNE  
Associate Chief  
Government Trial and Appellate Operations  
Division  
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate  
United States Air Force  
(240) 612-4800

## **CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE**

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and the Air Force Appellate Defense Division (Capt Michael Bruzik) on 21 October 2024.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SRK', is positioned above the printed name and title.

STEVEN R. KAUFMAN, Col, USAF  
Appellate Government Counsel  
Government Trial and Appellate Operations  
Division  
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate  
United States Air Force  
(240) 612-4800

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 24(d)**

This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 24(c) because this brief contains 2,743 words. This brief complies with the typeface and type style requirements of Rule 37.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SRK', enclosed within a light gray rectangular border.

STEVEN R. KAUFMAN, Col, USAF  
Appellate Government Counsel  
Government Trial and Appellate Operations  
Division  
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate  
United States Air Force  
(240) 612-4800