

**UNITED STATES NAVY-MARINE CORPS  
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**Before  
J.K. CARBERRY, L.T. BOOKER, T.R. ZIMMERMANN  
Appellate Military Judges**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**ANDREW J. WRIGHT  
AVIATION STRUCTURAL MECHANIC SECOND CLASS (E-5), U.S. NAVY**

**NMCCA 201100053  
GENERAL COURT-MARTIAL**

**Sentence Adjudged:** 15 October 2010.

**Military Judge:** CAPT Carole J. Gaasch, JAGC, USN.

**Convening Authority:** Commander, Navy Region Southwest, San Diego, CA.

**Staff Judge Advocate's Recommendation:** CDR L.B. Sullivan, JAGC, USN.

**For Appellant:** CDR Michelle M. Pettit, JAGC, USN.

**For Appellee:** Mr. Brian K. Keller, Esq.

**12 July 2011**

-----  
**OPINION OF THE COURT**  
-----

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 18.2, NMCCA RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, THIS  
OPINION DOES NOT SERVE AS A PRECEDENT.**

PER CURIAM:

A military judge sitting as a general court-martial convicted the appellant, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of possessing images of child pornography, one specification of receiving images of child pornography, and one specification of possession an electronic device containing images of child pornography, violations of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. The military judge sentenced the appellant to seven years confinement, total forfeiture of pay and allowances, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a dishonorable discharge. The convening authority approved the sentence as adjudged.

Although not assigned as an error, we note that the court-martial order fails correctly to state the findings. While the appellant was not prejudiced by this error, he is entitled to correction of his official records. Art. 59(a), UCMJ; *United States v. Glover*, 57 M.J. 696, 697-98 (N.M.Ct.Crim App. 2002); *United States v. Crumpley*, 49 M.J. 538, 539 (N.M.Ct.Crim.App. 1998). We will order appropriate relief in our decretal paragraph.

The supplemental court-martial order will reflect that in announcing findings, the military judge excepted the words "video files" contained in Specification 1 and excepted the word "devices" and substituted therefore the word "device" in Specification 3 of the Charge. With those corrections, the findings and the approved sentence are affirmed. Arts. 59(a) and 66(c), UCMJ.

For the Court

R.H. TROIDL  
Clerk of Court