

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

**Before  
J.R. MCFARLANE, M.C. HOLIFIELD, K.J. BRUBAKER  
Appellate Military Judges**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**CHRISTOPHER D. WILSON  
AVIATION ELECTRONICS TECHNICIAN AIRMAN (E-3), U.S. NAVY**

**NMCCA 201400222  
GENERAL COURT-MARTIAL**

**Sentence Adjudged:** 26 February 2014.

**Military Judge:** CAPT Bethany Payton-O'Brien, JAGC, USN.

**Convening Authority:** Commander, Electronic Attack Wing,  
U.S. Pacific Fleet, Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Oak  
Harbor, WA.

**Staff Judge Advocate's Recommendation:** LT A. Jennings,  
JAGC, USN.

**For Appellant:** CDR Christopher E. Roper, JAGC, USN.

**For Appellee:** Maj Suzanne M. Dempsey, USMC; LT Ann Dingle,  
JAGC, USN.

**28 October 2014**

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

**THIS OPINION DOES NOT SERVE AS BINDING PRECEDENT, BUT MAY BE CITED AS  
PERSUASIVE AUTHORITY UNDER NMCCA RULE OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE 18.2.**

PER CURIAM:

A military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, convicted the appellant, pursuant to his pleas, of use of cocaine on divers occasions, introduction of cocaine with intent to distribute, introduction of marijuana, and disorderly conduct

in violation of Articles 112a and 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. §§ 912a and 934. The military judge sentenced the appellant to confinement for eight months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a bad-conduct discharge. The convening authority (CA) approved the adjudged sentence and, except for the discharge, ordered it executed.

In his sole assignment of error, the appellant notes that the promulgating order signed by the CA misidentifies Charge I as a violation of Article 120, UCMJ, instead of Article 112a. We find no prejudice to the appellant with regard to this error, but he is entitled to have his records accurately reflect the results of his court-martial. *United States v. Crumpley*, 49 M.J. 538, 539 (N.M.Ct.Crim.App. 1998).

We conclude that the findings and the sentence are correct in law and fact and that no error materially prejudicial to the substantial rights of the appellant was committed. Arts. 59(a) and 66(c), UCMJ. The findings and the sentence are therefore affirmed. We direct that the supplemental court-martial order accurately reflect Charge I as a violation of Article 112a, UCMJ.

For the Court

R.H. TROIDL  
Clerk of Court