

AMENDMENTS

1992—Pub. L. 102-484 substituted “approved” for “imposed” in second sentence and inserted “approved” before last reference to “sentence” in third sentence.

1983—Pub. L. 98-209 struck out subsec. (a) which provided that if the convening authority disapproved the findings and sentence of a court-martial he could, except where there was lack of sufficient evidence in the record to support the findings, order a rehearing, stating the reasons for disapproval, and that if he disapproved the findings without reordering a rehearing, he had to dismiss the charges, and redesignated former subsec. (b) as entire section, and, as so redesignated, inserted “under this chapter” after “Each rehearing”, and inserted provision that if the sentence approved after the first court-martial was in accordance with a pretrial agreement and the accused at the rehearing changes his plea with respect to the charges or specifications upon which the pretrial agreement was based, or otherwise does not comply with the pretrial agreement, the sentence as to those charges or specifications may include any punishment not in excess of that lawfully adjudged at the first court-martial.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1992 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 102-484 effective Oct. 23, 1992, and applicable with respect to offenses committed on or after that date, see section 1067 of Pub. L. 102-484, set out as a note under section 803 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1983 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98-209 effective first day of eighth calendar month beginning after Dec. 6, 1983, but not to apply to any case in which the findings and sentence were adjudged by a court-martial before that date, and the proceedings in any such case to be held in the same manner and with the same effect as if such amendments had not been enacted, see section 12(a)(1), (4) of Pub. L. 98-209, set out as a note under section 801 of this title.

§ 864. Art. 64. Review by a judge advocate

(a) Each case in which there has been a finding of guilty that is not reviewed under section 866 or 869(a) of this title (article 66 or 69(a)) shall be reviewed by a judge advocate under regulations of the Secretary concerned. A judge advocate may not review a case under this subsection if he has acted in the same case as an accuser, investigating officer, member of the court, military judge, or counsel or has otherwise acted on behalf of the prosecution or defense. The judge advocate’s review shall be in writing and shall contain the following:

- (1) Conclusions as to whether—
 - (A) the court had jurisdiction over the accused and the offense;
 - (B) the charge and specification stated an offense; and
 - (C) the sentence was within the limits prescribed as a matter of law.

(2) A response to each allegation of error made in writing by the accused.

(3) If the case is sent for action under subsection (b), a recommendation as to the appropriate action to be taken and an opinion as to whether corrective action is required as a matter of law.

(b) The record of trial and related documents in each case reviewed under subsection (a) shall be sent for action to the person exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the accused at the time the court was convened (or to that person’s successor in command) if—

(1) the judge advocate who reviewed the case recommends corrective action;

(2) the sentence approved under section 860(c) of this title (article 60(c)) extends to dismissal, a bad-conduct or dishonorable discharge, or confinement for more than six months; or

(3) such action is otherwise required by regulations of the Secretary concerned.

(c)(1) The person to whom the record of trial and related documents are sent under subsection (b) may—

(A) disapprove or approve the findings or sentence, in whole or in part;

(B) remit, commute, or suspend the sentence in whole or in part;

(C) except where the evidence was insufficient at the trial to support the findings, order a rehearing on the findings, on the sentence, or on both; or

(D) dismiss the charges.

(2) If a rehearing is ordered but the convening authority finds a rehearing impracticable, he shall dismiss the charges.

(3) If the opinion of the judge advocate in the judge advocate’s review under subsection (a) is that corrective action is required as a matter of law and if the person required to take action under subsection (b) does not take action that is at least as favorable to the accused as that recommended by the judge advocate, the record of trial and action thereon shall be sent to the Judge Advocate General for review under section 869(b) of this title (article 69(b)).

(Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 58; Pub. L. 98-209, §7(a)(1), Dec. 6, 1983, 97 Stat. 1401.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Revised section	Source (U.S. Code)	Source (Statutes at Large)
864	50:651.	May 5, 1950, ch. 169, §1 (Art. 64), 64 Stat. 128.

The word “may” is substituted for the word “shall”. The word “is” is substituted for the words “shall constitute”.

AMENDMENTS

1983—Pub. L. 98-209 amended section generally, substituting “Review by a judge advocate” for “Approval by the convening authority” in section catchline, and, in text, substituting provisions relating to review by a judge advocate for provision that in acting on the findings and sentence of a court-martial, the convening authority could approve only such findings of guilty, and the sentence or such part or amount of the sentence, as he found correct in law and fact and as he in his discretion determined should be approved, and that unless he indicated otherwise, approval of the sentence was approval of the findings and sentence.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1983 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98-209 effective first day of eighth calendar month beginning after Dec. 6, 1983, but not to apply to any case in which the findings and sentence were adjudged by a court-martial before that date, and the proceedings in any such case to be held in the same manner and with the same effect as if such amendments had not been enacted, see section 12(a)(1), (4) of Pub. L. 98-209, set out as a note under section 801 of this title.

§ 865. Art. 65. Disposition of records

(a) In a case subject to appellate review under section 866 or 869(a) of this title (article 66 or 69(a)) in which the right to such review is not waived, or an appeal is not withdrawn, under section 861 of this title (article 61), the record of trial and action thereon shall be transmitted to the Judge Advocate General for appropriate action.

(b) Except as otherwise required by this chapter, all other records of trial and related documents shall be transmitted and disposed of as the Secretary concerned may prescribe by regulation.

(Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 59; Pub. L. 90-179, §1(6), Dec. 8, 1967, 81 Stat. 546; Pub. L. 90-632, §2(26), Oct. 24, 1968, 82 Stat. 1341; Pub. L. 96-513, title V, §511(25), Dec. 12, 1980, 94 Stat. 2922; Pub. L. 98-209, §6(d)(1), Dec. 6, 1983, 97 Stat. 1401.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Revised section	Source (U.S. Code)	Source (Statutes at Large)
865(a)	50:652(a).	May 5, 1950, ch. 169, §1 (Art. 65), 64 Stat. 128.
865(b)	50:652(b).	
865(c)	50:652(c).	

In subsection (b), the word "If" is substituted for the word "Where".

In subsections (a) and (b), the words "send" and "sent" are substituted for the words "forward" and "forwarded", respectively.

In subsection (c), the words "Secretary concerned" are substituted for the words "Secretary of the Department".

AMENDMENTS

1983—Pub. L. 98-209 amended section generally, substituting "Disposition of records" for "Disposition of records after review by the convening authority" in section catchline, and, in text, substituting provisions relating to disposition of records for prior provisions relating to disposition of records that required when the convening authority had taken final action in a general court-martial case, he had to send the entire record, including his action thereon and the opinion or opinions of the staff judge advocate or legal officer, to the appropriate Judge Advocate General, required that where sentences of special courts-martial included a bad-conduct discharge, the record had to be sent for review either to the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command to be reviewed or directly to the appropriate Judge Advocate General to be reviewed by a Court of Military Review, and required that all other special and summary court-martial records had to be reviewed by a judge advocate of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, or a law specialist or lawyer of the Coast Guard or Department of Transportation, and had to be transmitted and disposed of as the Secretary concerned might prescribe by regulation.

1980—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 96-513 substituted "Department of Transportation" for "Department of the Treasury".

1968—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 90-632 substituted "Court of Military Review" for "board of review" wherever appearing.

1967—Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 90-179 inserted reference to judge advocate of the Marine Corps and substituted reference to judge advocate of the Navy for reference to law specialist of the Navy.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1983 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98-209 effective first day of eighth calendar month beginning after Dec. 6, 1983, but

not to apply to any case in which the findings and sentence were adjudged by a court-martial before that date, and the proceedings in any such case to be held in the same manner and with the same effect as if such amendments had not been enacted, see section 12(a)(1), (4) of Pub. L. 98-209, set out as a note under section 801 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1980 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 96-513 effective Dec. 12, 1980, see section 701(b)(3) of Pub. L. 96-513, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1968 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 90-632 effective first day of tenth month following October 1968, see section 4 of Pub. L. 90-632, set out as a note under section 801 of this title.

§ 866. Art. 66. Review by Court of Criminal Appeals

(a) Each Judge Advocate General shall establish a Court of Criminal Appeals which shall be composed of one or more panels, and each such panel shall be composed of not less than three appellate military judges. For the purpose of reviewing court-martial cases, the court may sit in panels or as a whole in accordance with rules prescribed under subsection (f). Any decision of a panel may be reconsidered by the court sitting as a whole in accordance with such rules. Appellate military judges who are assigned to a Court of Criminal Appeals may be commissioned officers or civilians, each of whom must be a member of a bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State. The Judge Advocate General shall designate as chief judge one of the appellate military judges of the Court of Criminal Appeals established by him. The chief judge shall determine on which panels of the court the appellate judges assigned to the court will serve and which military judge assigned to the court will act as the senior judge on each panel.

(b) The Judge Advocate General shall refer to a Court of Criminal Appeals the record in each case of trial by court-martial—

(1) in which the sentence, as approved, extends to death, dismissal of a commissioned officer, cadet, or midshipman, dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge, or confinement for one year or more; and

(2) except in the case of a sentence extending to death, the right to appellate review has not been waived or an appeal has not been withdrawn under section 861 of this title (article 61).

(c) In a case referred to it, the Court of Criminal Appeals may act only with respect to the findings and sentence as approved by the convening authority. It may affirm only such findings of guilty, and the sentence or such part or amount of the sentence, as it finds correct in law and fact and determines, on the basis of the entire record, should be approved. In considering the record, it may weigh the evidence, judge the credibility of witnesses, and determine controverted questions of fact, recognizing that the trial court saw and heard the witnesses.

(d) If the Court of Criminal Appeals sets aside the findings and sentence, it may, except where the setting aside is based on lack of sufficient evidence in the record to support the findings,