1 Military Criminal Justice: Practice and Procedure § 16-6

Military Criminal Justice: Practice and Procedure > CHAPTER 16 SENTENCING > Part I Sentencing Procedures

§16-6 The *Victim*'s Right to Be Heard.

§16-6(A) In General.

At the beginning of the presentencing proceeding, the military judge must announce that any <u>victim</u> of the accused's offense, who is present at the presentencing proceeding, has the right to be reasonably heard—which includes the right to make a sworn <u>statement</u> or an unsworn <u>statement</u>, or both.¹ The <u>victim</u>'s opportunity to be heard takes place after the prosecution has presented its evidence and before the defense presents its evidence.² The <u>victim</u> has that right regardless of whether the <u>victim</u> testified during the findings portion of the <u>court-martial</u>⁶ and regardless of whether one of the parties called the <u>victim</u> to testify at the presentencing proceeding.⁴

The <u>victim</u>'s testimony, as with any other witness's testimony may be subject to the Rules of Evidence.⁵ If the <u>victim</u> will be making a <u>statement</u>, the <u>court-martial</u> will call the <u>victim</u> as a witness.⁶

¹ R.C.M. 1001(a)(3)(A).

³ R.C.M. 1001(c)(1).

⁴ R.C.M. 1001(c)(1).

⁶ R.C.M. 1001(c).

²R.C.M. 1001(c)(1). <u>United States v. Cornelison, 78 M.J. 739 (Army Ct.Crim.App. 2019)</u> (court held that presentation of <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> during Government's presentencing case was nonprejudicial error; court noted that R.C.M. 1001A is part of presentencing procedure but is temporally located between the Government and defense presentations; it is distinct from the Government's ability to present <u>victim-impact statements</u> <u>in</u> aggravation, citing <u>United States v. Barker, 77 M.J. 377 (C.A.A.F. 2018)</u>.

⁵ <u>United States v. Gomez, 76 M.J. 76 (C.A.A.F. 2017)</u> (admitting testimony from sexual assault <u>victims</u> regarding <u>impact</u> of offenses on them was not plain error; one <u>victim</u> gave inadmissible opinion and hearsay testimony regarding the stress caused by the trial and the other <u>victim</u>'s testimony was ambiguous regarding the stress of the trial).

1 Military Criminal Justice: Practice and Procedure § 16-6

<u>*In*</u> capital cases, the right to be heard means that the <u>*victim*</u> may make a *sworn* <u>*statement*</u>.⁷ For example, the <u>*victim*</u> could offer an affidavit.⁸ If the <u>*victim*</u> is under 18, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the military judge may permit a designee to present the *victim's statements*.⁹

Before the military judge concludes the presentencing proceeding, he or she must ensure that any crime <u>victim</u> was given the opportunity to be reasonably heard.¹⁰

§16-6(B) A Victim's Unsworn Statements.

<u>In</u> noncapital cases the right to be heard means that the <u>victim</u> may make either a *sworn* or an *unsworn* <u>statement</u>.¹¹ A <u>victim</u> addressing the <u>court-martial</u> at sentencing through an unsworn <u>statement</u>, is not considered a witness for purposes of Article 42(b), U.C.M.J., which requires that all witnesses be administered an oath.¹² Nor are a *victim*'s unsworn *statements* considered evidence.¹³

If the <u>victim</u> wishes to make an unsworn <u>statement</u>, then the <u>victim</u> must provide a written proffer of the contents of the unsworn <u>statement</u> to the trial counsel, the defense counsel, and the military judge,¹⁴ unless the military judge for good cause, waives that requirement.¹⁵ If the <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> includes matters that were not disclosed to the parties, the military judge will take appropriate action,¹⁶ which could include, for

⁷ R.C.M. 1001(c).

⁹ Art. 6b(c), U.C.M.J.; R.C.M. 801(a)(6).

¹⁰ R.C.M. 1001(a)(3)(A).

¹¹ R.C.M. 1001(c)(1).

¹³ United States v. Tyler, 81 M.J. 108 (C.A.A.F. 2021) (court held that either party may comment on the contents of a <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u>, which is admitted under R.C.M 1001A; thus, it was not error for the trial counsel to comment on the <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> during arguments on sentencing; court added that Military Rules of Evidence do not apply to <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> (MIL. R. EVID. 403 does not apply to unsworn <u>victim impact statements</u>, which are not evidence; <u>United</u> <u>States v. Barker, 77 M.J. 377 (C.A.A.F. 2018)</u> (nonprejudicial error for judge to admit <u>victim impact statements</u> at sentencing; such <u>statements</u> are not considered to be either sworn or unsworn <u>statements</u>, as envisioned by R.C.M. 1001A).

¹⁴ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(B). <u>United States v. Cornelison, 78 M.J. 739 (Army Ct.Crim.App. 2019)</u> (accused failed to show that Government's failure to provide <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> to him <u>in</u> advance of her making the <u>statement</u> was prejudicial).

¹⁵ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(B).

¹⁶ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(C).

⁸ <u>United States v. Gonzalez, 16 MJ 58 (C.M.A. 1983)</u> (affidavits from sentencing witnesses other than accused admissible at *courts-martial*).

¹² Art. 42(b), U.C.M.J.

example, an instruction to the court members that the *victim* did not comply with the procedural requirements for making an unsworn *statement*.

The military judge may permit <u>victim</u>'s counsel to deliver all, or part, of the <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u>, for good cause shown.¹⁷ If the <u>victim</u> makes an unsworn <u>statement</u>, neither the prosecution nor defense may crossexamine the <u>victim</u>.¹⁸ But they may offer rebuttal evidence of any facts contained <u>in</u> the <u>statement</u>.¹⁹ And both sides may comment on a <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u>.^{19.1} <u>In</u> addressing the <u>court-martial in</u> an unsworn <u>statement</u>, the <u>victim</u> may present information only <u>in</u> the form of <u>victim</u>-<u>impact</u> evidence²⁰ or mitigation evidence.²¹ The <u>victim</u> may not make a recommendation as to a specific punishment.²²

§16-6(C) A Victim's Sworn Statement.

If the <u>victim</u> makes a sworn <u>statement</u> to the <u>court-martial</u>, the <u>victim</u> may be cross-examined by both the prosecution and the defense, and may also be questioned by the <u>court-martial</u>²³ <u>In</u> addressing the <u>court-martial</u> in a sworn <u>statement</u>, the <u>victim</u> may present information only <u>in</u> the form of <u>victim-impact</u> evidence²⁴ or

¹⁸ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(A).

¹⁹ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(A). Because the <u>victim</u> is permitted to make a <u>statement in</u> mitigation, the prosecution may wish to respond with rebuttal evidence.

^{19.1} United States v. Tyler, 81 M.J. 108 (C.A.A.F. 2021) (court held that either party may comment on the contents of a <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u>, which is admitted under R.C.M 1001A; thus, it was not error for the trial counsel to comment on the <u>victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement</u> during arguments on sentencing).

²⁰ R.C.M. 1001(c)(3). See <u>§ 16-5(E)(3)</u>, supra. See also <u>In</u> <u>Re A.J.W., 80 M.J. 737 (N.M.Ct.Crim.App. 2020)</u> (petitioner not entitled to writ of mandamus to compel military judge to allow her to provide complete <u>victim impact statement</u> at sentencing; judge omitted portions of <u>victim's statement</u> alleging sexual assault but accused's plea agreement did not include guilty plea to sexual assault and accused was not found guilty of sexual assault).

²¹ R.C.M. 1001(c)(3).

²² R.C.M. 1001(c)(3).

¹⁷ R.C.M. 1001(c)(5)(B). <u>United States v. Cornelison, 78 M.J. 739 (Army Ct.Crim.App. 2019)</u> (military judge erred <u>in</u> permitting trial counsel to participate <u>in victim</u>'s unsworn <u>statement in</u> question and answer form; R.C.M. 1001A contemplates that neither trial nor defense counsel will participate; only two persons other than <u>victim</u> may participate—<u>victim</u>'s counsel or <u>victim</u>'s designee).

²³ R.C.M. 1001(c)(4). The Manual for <u>Courts-Martial</u> does not set out any specific guidelines for court members questioning the <u>victim</u>. Sound practice would dictate that the military judge use the same procedures whenever court-members question other witnesses. See <u>§ 15-12(C)(2)</u>. Thompson, "Truth or Dare: An SVC's Dilemma <u>in</u> Handling a Client's Potential Falsehoods," ARMY LAW., Issue 4 (2019) (author addresses application of the rules of professional responsibility set out <u>in</u> AR 27-6 (2018), regarding issues that arise when <u>victim</u> is not being truthful with counsel).

1 Military Criminal Justice: Practice and Procedure § 16-6

mitigation evidence.²⁵ As with an unsworn <u>statement</u>, the <u>victim</u> may not make a recommendation as to a specific punishment.²⁶

Military Criminal Justice: Practice and Procedure Copyright 2022, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.

End of Document

²⁴ R.C.M. 1001(c)(4). See § 16-5(E)(3), supra.

²⁵ R.C.M. 1001(c)(4).

²⁶ R.C.M. 1001(c)(4).