

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

UNITED STATES

Appellee

v.

Chief Warrant Officer (CW2)

BRENTON R. HUDGENS,

United States Army

Appellant

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR
GRANT OF REVIEW

Crim. App. Dkt. No. 20240257

USCA Dkt. No. 26-0222/AR

Jessica A. Adler

Captain, Judge Advocate

Defense Appellate Attorney

Defense Appellate Division

9275 Gunston Road

Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

(703) 495-3762

USCAAF Bar No. 38047

Grant A. Olan

Captain, Judge Advocate

Defense Appellate Attorney

Defense Appellate Division

USCAAF Bar No. 38257

Kelsey Mowatt-Larssen

Major, Judge Advocate

Branch Chief

Defense Appellate Division

USCAAF Bar No. 38204

Jonathan F. Potter

Senior Appellate Attorney

Defense Appellate Division

USCAAF Bar. No. 26450

Kyle C. Sprague

Lieutenant Colonel, Judge Advocate

Deputy Chief

Defense Appellate Division

USCAAF Bar No. 36867

Frank E. Kostik, Jr.

Colonel, Judge Advocate

Chief

Defense Appellate Division

USCAAF Bar No. 35108

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

UNITED STATES
Appellee

v.

Chief Warrant Officer (CW2)
BRENTON R. HUDGENS
United States Army,
Appellant

SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR
GRANT OF REVIEW

Crim. App. Dkt. No. 20240257

USCA Dkt. No. 26-0222 /AR

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

Issue Presented¹

**WHETHER THE RECORD OF TRIAL IS SUBSTANTIALLY
INCOMPLETE SINCE THE PANEL AND THE MILITARY
JUDGE REVIEWED TRANSCRIPTS OF PROSECUTION
EXHIBITS 6 AND 12 BUT THOSE TRANSCRIPTS WERE NOT
MARKED AS APPELLATE EXHIBITS NOR INCLUDED IN
THE RECORD OF TRIAL.**

Statement of Statutory Jurisdiction

The Army Court of Criminal Appeals (Army Court) had jurisdiction over
this matter pursuant to Article 66, Uniform Code of Military Justice [UCMJ], 10

¹ Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982), Appellant respectfully requests this Court consider the information provided in Appendix C.

U.S.C. § 866. This Honorable Court has jurisdiction over this matter under Article 67(a)(3), UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 867(a)(3).

Statement of the Case

On May 16, 2024, a panel of officers sitting as a general court-martial convicted Appellant, Chief Warrant Officer Two Brenton R. Hudgens, contrary to his pleas, of two specifications of domestic violence in violation Article 128b, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. (R. at 1096; Charge Sheet). On May 17, 2024, the panel sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, to forfeit \$3,128 per month for two months, and to be confined for fifteen days. (R. at 1255).

On June 7, 2024, the convening authority approved the findings and sentence. (Convening Authority Action). On June 12, 2024, the military judge entered judgment. (Judgment of the Court).

On March 9, 2026, the Army Court affirmed Appellant's conviction. (Appendix A). On April 3, 2026, Appellant filed a Motion for Reconsideration and Suggestion for *En Banc* Reconsideration. On April 21, 2026, the Army Court issued a Summary Disposition on Reconsideration. (Appendix B). On June 17, 2026, Appellant filed a petition for a grant of review to this Court and was granted an enlargement of time until July 8, 2026, to file Appellant's supplement. On July 6, 2026, Appellant filed a second enlargement of time and was granted until July 23, 2026. This is Appellant's Supplement.

Reasons to Grant Petition

This case presents a matter of first impression, whether Rules of Court Martial (R.C.M.) 1112 and Article 54(c)(2) apply to Article 66(b)(1) cases.

This Court should grant review because the record of trial is substantially incomplete, preventing a full and fair appellate review. The military judge and panel members relied on transcripts to understand inaudible and indecipherable audio recordings. These crucial transcripts were never included in the record. This substantial omission creates a presumption of prejudice the government cannot overcome and presents a critical question of law on an issue of first impression for this Court to resolve. *See* Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces [CAAF] Rule 21(b)(5)(A).

Statement of Facts

A. Prosecution Exhibit 6

Prosecution Exhibit 6 (Pros. Ex. 6), a recording of the Appellant allegedly referencing a threat made back in May of 2020 (Specification 1 of Charge II), was introduced by the Government. After the Government played Pros. Ex. 6 so the military judge could rule on Appellant's 404(b) objection, the military judge stated, "I couldn't understand most of that." (R. at 473). The military judge said, "To my ears, it was inaudible, expect for, 'I will fucking end you,' or words to that effect but most of it was inaudible to me." (R. at 473). The military judge stated that a

transcript would be helpful. (R. at 473). The Defense had a transcript and handed it to the court. (R. at 474). The military judge reviewed the transcript and asked the trial counsel to play Pros. Ex. 6 again while he reviewed the transcript. (R. at 474). The military judge permitted the government to attempt to lay the foundation to have Pros. Ex. 6 admitted, emphasizing again that the transcript was “helpful.” (R. at 476). The transcript, which the military judge relied on to make his ruling, was never marked as an appellate exhibit and was not included in the record of trial. (R. at 476). Pros. Ex. 6 was admitted over defense objection and published to the panel. (R. at 519). Pros. Ex. 6 related to Specification 1 of Charge II, which Appellant was found guilty of. (R. at 1096).

B. Prosecution Exhibit 12

Prosecution Exhibit 12 (Pros. Ex. 12) is a recording between Ms. KH, the alleged victim, and Appellant, which was offered as evidence of specification 4 of charge II². (R. at 465). The Government moved to publish Pros. Ex. 12 to the panel. (R. at 490). The military judge explained that a transcript would be handed to the panel, which contained what the Government believed they would hear. (R. at 491). The military judge explained “it is not evidence, and that if you, as the

² Appellant was found not guilty of this specification. (R. at 1096).

panel member think you hear something different on the recording, then you are to use your discretion.” (R. at 491).

The transcripts were handed to each member of the panel, and they were instructed not to mark them as they would be immediately collected. (R. at 492). The military judge interjected during the publishing of Pros. Ex. 12 that he could not hear it and asked if “there [was] any way to put the volume up in the courtroom?” (R. at 492). The trial counsel responded, “I’m at max volume here, your honor.” (R. at 492). After Pros. Ex. 12 was published, the Government counsel collected the transcripts from the panel. (R. at 492). This transcript was also never marked as an appellate exhibit and was not included in the record of trial. (R. at 490-493.)

Standard of Review

The questions of “[w]hether a record is complete, and a transcript is verbatim,” are matters of law this court reviews *de novo*. *United States v. Davenport*, 73 M.J. 373, 376 (C.A.A.F. 2014).

Law and Argument

Article 54, UCMJ, requires the preparation of a complete record of proceedings and testimony in any case of a sentence of death, dismissal, discharge, confinement for more than six months, or forfeiture of pay for more than six months. Art. 54(c)(2), UCMJ. For all other cases, the record shall contain such

matters as the President may prescribe by regulation. Art. 54(c)(1), UCMJ. By regulation (R.C.M. 1112) the President prescribed that a record of trial “includes any evidence or exhibits considered by the court-martial in determining the findings and sentence” and “shall include.... [e]xhibits, or, if permitted by the military judge, copies, photographs, or descriptions of any exhibits that were received in evidence and any appellate exhibits.” R.C.M. 1112(b)(5).

Attachments for appellate review include “[e]xhibits or, with the permission of the military judge, copies, photographs, or descriptions of any exhibits which were marked for and referred to on the record but not received in evidence.” R.C.M. 1112(f)(2).

Here, the military judge considered, and the panel was provided, transcripts necessary to understand Prosecution Exhibits 6 and 12. Those transcripts were never marked as appellate exhibits. Therefore, the record is incomplete, the omission is substantial, and the Government cannot rebut the presumption of prejudice.

A. The Same Factual Sufficiency Review Must Be Provided Regardless of the Path to Jurisdiction - Article 66(b)(1) vs. (b)(3).

Before the Army Court, the Government argued, in part, that because Appellant’s sentence did not include one of the penalties listed in Article 54(c)(2),

UCMJ, a complete record of trial was not required. (Appellee's Br. at 20). But the statute and regulations do not support that position.

Regardless of the sentence adjudged, this case was before the Army Court and now this Honorable Court under Article 67. Because Appellant asserted his right, he must be provided with the same review under the provisions of Article 66(d)(1), whether the route to jurisdiction was Article 66(b)(1) or (b)(3).

B. Failing to Mark the Transcripts of Prosecution Exhibit 6 and 12 as Appellate Exhibits and Include Them in the Record of Trial is a Substantial Omission.

Documents considered by a military judge in making a ruling that affects the rights of the accused at trial must be included in the record as appellate exhibits for the reviewing court to properly evaluate the military judge's decision. *United States v. Abrams*, 50 M.J. 361, 364 (C.A.A.F. 1999). The transcript for Pros. Ex. 6, which was considered by the military judge and relied on by the military judge, must be included in the record as an appellate exhibit. *United States v. Embry*, 60 M.J. 976, 979 (C.M.A. 2005) (finding that the military judge relied on the intake notes in making his ruling and his failure to attach intake notes to the record of trial as an appellate exhibit was a substantial omission).

The Government also produced a transcript for Pros. Ex. 12 which was provided to the panel as a "guide." (R. at 492). The military judge noted during the publication of Pros. Ex. 12 since it was so difficult to hear the recording. (R. at


492). Based off the surrounding circumstances, this transcript was doing more than “guiding” the panel. It was used to establish what the actual recordings said. Yet, the record does not contain that transcript. The military judge’s failure to mark the transcripts for Pros. Ex. 6 and 12 as appellate exhibits resulted in a substantial omission and Appellant’s record of trial is incomplete.

C. The Government Has Failed to Overcome the Presumption of Prejudice.

It is the military judge’s responsibility to ensure the record is complete. Contrary to what the Government argued below, the underlying evidence includes the unmarked transcripts, which are not available for appellate review. (Appellee Br. at 27). While Prosecution Exhibits 6 and 12 are available for this Court to hear, the military judge noted the difficulty of understanding the prosecution exhibits without the accompanying transcripts. The transcripts were foundational to what the military judge and panel thought they heard and are likewise necessary for an appellate court. The Government, who had the burden to overcome prejudice, cannot. *United States v. Henry*, 53 M.J. 108, 111 (C.A.A.F. 2000).

Conclusion

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests this Court grant his petition.



JESSICA A. ADLER
Captain, Judge Advocate
Defense Appellate Attorney
Defense Appellate Division
U.S. Army Legal Services Agency
9725 Gunston Road
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060
(703) 695-9858
USCAAF Bar No. 38047



KELSEY MOWATT-LARSEN
Major, Judge Advocate
Branch Chief
Defense Appellate Division
USCAAF Bar No. 38204



KYLE C. SPRAGUE
Lieutenant Colonel, Judge Advocate
Deputy Chief
Defense Appellate Division
USCAAF Bar No. 36867



GRANT A. OLAN
Captain, Judge Advocate
Defense Appellate Attorney
Defense Appellate Division
USCAAF Bar No. 38257



JONATHAN F. POTTER
Senior Appellate Counsel
Defense Appellate Division
USCAAF Bar No. 26450



FRANK E. KOSTIK, JR.
Colonel, Judge Advocate
Chief
Defense Appellate Division
USCAAF Bar No. 35108

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Before
FLOR, POND, and STEELE
Appellate Military Judges

UNITED STATES, Appellee
v.
Chief Warrant Officer Two BRENTON R. HUDGENS
United States Army, Appellant

ARMY 20240257

Headquarters, Fort Campbell
John R. Maloney and Frederic P. Gallun, Military Judges
Colonel Jason A. Coats, Staff Judge Advocate

For Appellant: Lieutenant Colonel Autumn R. Porter, JA; Major Robert W. Rodriguez, JA; Captain Jessica A. Adler, JA (on brief); Colonel Frank E. Kostik, Jr., JA; Lieutenant Colonel Kyle C. Sprague, JA; Major Kelsey Mowatt-Larssen, JA; Jessica A. Adler, JA (on reply brief).

For Appellee: Colonel Richard E. Gorini, JA; Major Isaac J. Dickson, JA; Captain Meghan E. Moore, JA (on brief).


9 March 2026

DECISION

Per Curiam:

On consideration of the entire record, including consideration of the issues personally specified by the appellant, we hold the findings of guilty and the sentence, as entered in the Judgment, correct in law and fact. Accordingly, those findings of guilty and the sentence are AFFIRMED.

FOR THE COURT:


James W. Herring, Jr.
JAMES W. HERRING, JR.
Clerk of Court

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Before
FLOR, POND, and STEELE
Appellate Military Judges

UNITED STATES, Appellee

v.

**Chief Warrant Officer Two BRENTON R. HUDGENS
United States Army, Appellant**

ARMY 20240257

Headquarters, Fort Campbell
John R. Maloney, William Ramsey, and Frederic P. Gallun, Military Judges
Colonel Jason A. Coats, Staff Judge Advocate

For Appellant: Lieutenant Colonel Autumn R. Porter, JA; Major Robert W. Rodriguez, JA; Captain Jessica A. Adler, JA (on brief); Colonel Frank E. Kostik, Jr., JA; Lieutenant Colonel Kyle C. Sprague, JA; Major Kelsey Mowatt-Larssen, JA; Captain Jessica A. Adler, JA (on reply brief).

For Appellee: Colonel Richard E. Gorini, JA; Major Isaac J. Dickson, JA; Captain Meghan E. Moore, JA (on brief).

21 April 2026

SUMMARY DISPOSITION ON RECONSIDERATION

STEELE, Judge:

This court previously affirmed the findings of guilty and the sentence in appellant's case. *United States v. Hudgens*, ARMY 20240257 (Army Ct. Crim, App. 9 March 2026). On 3 April 2026, appellant filed a motion for reconsideration and suggestion for *en banc* reconsideration on the issue of whether appellant's record of trial was substantially incomplete. The court did not adopt appellant's suggestion for *en banc* reconsideration. We, however, grant appellant's request for reconsideration and once again, affirm the findings and sentence.

An officer panel, sitting as a general court-martial, convicted appellant, contrary to his pleas, of two specifications of domestic violence, in violation of

Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b [UCMJ].¹ The officer panel sentenced appellant to fifteen days of confinement, forfeiture of \$3,128 pay per month for two months, and a reprimand.

Previously before this court, appellant raised two assignments of error in addition to matters submitted personally pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A 1982).² Initially, appellant argued (1) the military judge abused his discretion by admitting Prosecution Exhibit (PE) 4, an audio recording of an argument, as rebuttal evidence; and (2) the record of trial is substantially incomplete since the panel and the military judge reviewed transcripts of PE's 6 and 12, but those transcripts were not marked as Appellate Exhibits (AEs) nor included in the record of trial. Appellant has only requested this court reconsider the second assigned error.

For the reasons set forth below, we conclude that a complete record was transmitted to this court for review and again affirm the findings and sentence.

BACKGROUND

During the course of their marriage, appellant and his wife, the victim, engaged in numerous arguments that included incidents of domestic violence. The victim recorded several of these arguments on her cell phone and provided the recordings to the government, which were copied onto numerous compact discs and admitted into evidence at trial. At the military judge's request, the government prepared transcripts of each recording, which were used by the military judge, counsel and the panel as guides to aid them as they listened to the audio recordings published in open court. The defense did not object to the transcripts and did not raise any concerns that they were inaccurate, misleading, or prejudicial in any way. Each of the transcripts, except for those accompanying the audio recordings admitted as PEs 6 and 12, were marked as AEs and included in the record of trial.

Appellant was convicted of two specifications of domestic violence, one for communicating a threat (Specification 1 of Charge III) and the other for committing an assault consummated by a battery (Specification 2 of Charge III), both of which arose from a domestic dispute at Fort Bliss, Texas on 14 May 2020 regarding a rescued dog [hereinafter, "dog incident"]. The victim recorded the argument of the "dog incident" with appellant on the date of the incident, reflected in PEs 3 and 4

¹ Appellant was found not guilty of one specification of wrongfully interfering with adverse administrative proceeding and four specifications of domestic violence in violation of Article's 131g and 128b, UCMJ.

² We have given full and fair consideration to the matter personally raised by appellant and determine that it warrants neither discussion nor relief.

and admitted at trial. The transcripts that accompanied PEs 3 and 4 were marked as AEs and included with the record of trial. A few months later, during another argument with appellant, the victim purportedly recorded appellant admitting to the threatening comments he made previously during the “dog incident.” This audio recording was admitted as PE 6. Prosecution Exhibits 3, 4, and 6 corroborated both the victim’s and appellant’s testimony at trial. Prosecution Exhibit 12 contained a partial clip of a recorded conversation between the victim and appellant offered as evidence of Specification 4 of Charge II, of which appellant was found not guilty. Although defense counsel objected to the admission of PEs 4 and 6 at trial, they did not object to the usage of the transcripts as an aid when each of the recordings were published, nor did they indicate they contained a material omission or misrepresentation. The military judge also stated he would provide a limiting instruction that the transcript was not evidence: “those guides, those transcripts will not go back and are not evidence. It’s simply an aid to help the members in hearing it for the first time.” However, the military judge did not mark or include the transcripts for PEs 6 and 12 in the record of trial.

Appellant alleges this case presents a matter of first impression, specifically, whether Article 54(c)(2), UCMJ, requiring the preparation of a complete record of trial, applies to this court’s review under Article 66(b)(1), UCMJ. Appellant argues this court must resolve: (1) whether reviews pursuant to Article 66(b)(1), UCMJ require this court to have a complete record pursuant to Article 54(c)(2), UCMJ; (2) whether this case had omissions from the record of trial making it incomplete; (3) whether those omissions were substantial; and (4) if the omissions were substantial, did the government meet its burden to show appellant was not prejudiced? For the reasons discussed below, we ultimately conclude that the record is substantially complete.

LAW AND DISCUSSION

Article 54, UCMJ requires, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, the preparation of a complete record of proceedings and testimony in any case of a sentence of death, dismissal, discharge, confinement for more than six months, or forfeiture of pay for more than six months. UCMJ art. 54(c)(2). For all other cases, the record shall contain such matters as the President may prescribe by regulation. UCMJ art. 54(c)(1). The President promulgated Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.). 1112, which states that a record of trial is complete if it complies with the requirements of subparagraph (b) of that rule. R.C.M. 1112(d)(2). Subparagraph (b) provides that the contents of the record of trial “includes any evidence or exhibits considered by the court-martial in determining the findings or sentence” and “shall include. . . [e]xhibits, or, if permitted by the military judge, copies, photographs, or descriptions of any exhibits that were received in evidence and any appellate exhibits.” R.C.M. 1112(b)(5). Attachments for appellate review include “[e]xhibits

or, with the permission of the military judge, copies, photographs, or descriptions of any exhibits which were marked for and referred to on the record but not received in evidence.” R.C.M. 1112(f)(2).

Separate from the Rules for Courts-Martial, Army Regulation defines “exhibits within a record of trial” as including prosecution and defense exhibits admitted into evidence, exhibits offered and not admitted into evidence, exhibits pre-marked for identification but not offered or admitted into evidence, appellate exhibits, and any sealed exhibits.” See Army reg. 27-10, Legal Services: Military Justice, Appendix E-2 (8 Jan. 2025) [AR 27-10]. Rules of Practice before Army Courts-Martial require counsel (1) to provide original exhibits to the court reporter who will mark them “for identification” prior to trial and (2) to show them to the opposing party before trial, with those considered on the merits or sentencing marked as either prosecution or defense exhibits and all others as appellate exhibits. See *U.S. Army Trial Judiciary, Rules of Practice before Army Courts-Martial*, Rule 17.4 (1 Dec. 2025) [Rules of Court]. The Rules of Court also provide that “Demonstrative Evidence” such as “copies of photographs or other aids (including electronically presented exhibits) may be furnished to each trial participant in the sole discretion of the judge, when appropriate.” Rules of Court, Rule 17.3.

The test for determining whether the record is incomplete is whether the omitted matter constitutes a “substantial” omission from the record. *United States v. McCullah*, 11 M.J. 234, 237 (C.M.A. 1981). Whether or not an omission is substantial “is analyzed on a case-by-case basis”. *United States v. Embry*, 60 M.J. 976, 979 (Army Ct. Crim. App. 2005) (citing *United States v. Abrams*, 50 M.J. 361, 363 (C.A.A.F. 1999)) (internal quotation marks omitted). Omissions from the record of trial which affect the rights of the accused at trial or make proper appellate review impossible are substantial omissions. See *Abrams*, 50 M.J. at 363. To evaluate whether an omission from the record is substantial, the court must “ascertain whether the omitted material was ‘substantial,’ either qualitatively or quantitatively[,]” when considered in light of the rest of the record. *United States v. Lashley*, 14 M.J. 7, 9 (C.M.A. 1982). A substantial omission from the record “raises a presumption of prejudice which the government must rebut.” *United States v. Cudini*, 36 M.J. 572, 573 (A.C.M.R. 1992) (citing *United States v. Gray*, 7 M.J. 296 (C.M.A. 1979)). “Conversely, an insubstantial omission does not raise the presumption and does not change a record's characterization as complete.” *Id.* (citing *McCullah*, 11 M.J. at 237). Thus, before affirming any record of trial from which an exhibit is missing, this court must determine, first, whether the absence of the omitted exhibit is substantial, rendering the record of trial incomplete, and second, if so, whether the government has successfully rebutted the presumption of prejudice to the accused—which automatically arises once a substantial omission is established.

This court has jurisdiction under Article 66, UCMJ to review courts-martial appeals in not only cases involving sentences of death, dismissal, discharge, confinement for more than six months, or forfeiture of pay for more than six months—which trigger the Article 54(c)(2) requirement for a complete record of trial—but this court also has jurisdiction to review the appeal of any general or special court-martial judgment including a finding of guilty. UCMJ, art. 66(b)(1) and (3). Thus, appellant argues his case presents an issue of first impression—whether this court’s review of a discretionary appeal under Article 66(b)(1) requires the review of a complete record of trial under Article 54(c)(2)—and asserts he must be provided the same review this court provides to cases on automatic review under Article 66(b)(3). However, based upon our review of the record, we do not find that the record is incomplete, nor that the “missing” transcripts for PEs 6 and 12 constitute a substantial omission from the record. Because we find that the record is complete, we find appellant’s question moot.

Although the transcripts of PEs 6 and 12 were referred to on the record and copies were provided to the panel, the transcripts were neither marked nor received into evidence.³ In this case, defense counsel did not object to the transcripts at trial and did not raise concerns that they were inaccurate, misleading or prejudicial. Moreover, the transcripts were not admitted into evidence but, instead, were merely used to aid the panel in listening to the audio recordings admitted as PEs 6 and 12 when they were published in open court. Consequently, the transcripts did not go back with the panel during their deliberations. While it would have been a preferred practice for the military judge to mark and include the transcripts as appellate exhibits, under these facts, their omission does not make the record incomplete. Even assuming error, where the transcripts merely reflected the audio of the recordings already admitted into evidence, their omission from the record of trial is not substantial. Furthermore, this court is able to conduct its Article 66, UCMJ review of appellant’s record, which includes PEs 6 and 12 admitted at trial. Appellant has failed to demonstrate prejudice from the omission of the two transcripts.⁴

CONCLUSION


The findings of guilty and the sentence are AFFIRMED.

Chief Judge FLOR and Senior Judge POND concur.

³ We note, however, that Rules of Court, Rule 17.3, allows demonstrative aids.

⁴ We also note that appellant was found not guilty of the offense for which PE 12 was admitted.

FOR THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. P. Haight", written over a horizontal line.

STEVEN P. HAIGHT
Acting Clerk of Court

APPENDIX C

Appendix C: Matters Submitted Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*

Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982),

Appellant, through appellate defense counsel, personally requests that this Court consider the following matter:

I. WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ABUSED HIS DISCRETION BY ADMITTING PROSECUTION EXHIBIT 4, AN AUDIO RECORDING OF UNCHARGED MISCONDUCT AS REBUTTAL EVIDENCE.

II. WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ABUSED HIS DISCRETION WHEN ALLOWING THE CRIME VICTIM TO DISCUSS CONDUCT APPELLANT WAS AQUITTED OF AND UNCHARGED MISCONDUCT DURING HER UNSWORN STATEMENT AT SENTENCING.

III. WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ERRED WHEN HE DENIED A REQUEST FROM DEFENSE FOR A 39(a) OUTSIDE OF THE PANEL'S PRESENCE TO BE HEARD ON ADDITIONAL INTIMATE VIDEOS INVOLVING THE APPELLANT AND THE CRIME VICTIM.

IV. WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ERRED WHEN HE ONLY APPLIED THE DEFENSE OF VOLUNTARY INTOXICATION TO THE LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSE OF SPECIFICATION 2 OF CHARGE II AND NOT THE GREATER OFFENSE.

V. WHETHER THE MILITARY JUDGE ERRED WHEN HE DID NOT APPLY INSTRUCTION 5-11-1 TO

**COMMUNICATING A THREAT, SPECIFICATION 1 OF
CHARGE II.**


**VI. WHETHER THE INABILITY OF DEFENSE WITNESS
SEREGANT FIRST CLASS RW TO TESTIFY ABOUT THE
FALSE ALLEGATIONS THE ALLEGED VICTIM FILED
DURING THEIR MARRIAGE, WHICH ARE SIMILAR TO
THE ALLEGATIONS MADE AGAINST APPELLANT,
PREJUDICED APPELLANT.**

**VII. WHETHER THE ALLEGED VICTIM INFLUENCED
THE INVESTIGATION BY BEFRIENDING A CID AGENT IN
ORDER TO GET THIS CASE MOVED FORWARD.**

**VIII. WHETHER THE ALLEGED VICTIM INFLUENCED
MAJ RP'S COMMANDER'S RECOMMENDATION FOR
COURT-MARTIAL BY COMMUNICATING WITH MAJ RP'S
WIFE REGARDING THE ALLEGATIONS.**

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 24 AND RULE 37

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 24(b): this brief contains 2288 words.
2. This brief complies with the typeface and type style requirements of Rule 37 because it has been prepared in Times New Roman font, using 14-point type with one-inch margins.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Jessica A. Adler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

JESSICA A. ADLER
Captain, Judge Advocate
Appellate Defense Counsel
Defense Appellate Division
9275 Gunston Road
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060
703-495-3762
USCAAF Bar No. 38047

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing in the case of United States v.
Hudgens, Crim. App. Dkt. No. 20240257, USCA Dkt. No. 26-0222/AR
was electronically filed with the Court and Government Appellate
Division on July 20, 2026.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Melinda J. Johnson".

MELINDA J. JOHNSON
Paralegal Specialist
Defense Appellate Division
(703) 693-0736