|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Commander  U.S. Coast Guard  Unit Name | Staff Symbol:  Phone:  Fax:  Email: |

|  |
| --- |
| 5814 |
| 03 Feb 2019 |

**MEMORANDUM**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |
| From: | Reviewing JAG’s Name Here, Rank, USCG  Judge Advocate |  | ~Reply~Reply to  Attn of: |  |
| To: | The Office of Military Justice (CG-LMJ) |  |  |  |
| Thru: | [Enter Thru] |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subj: | JUDGE ADVOCATE REVIEW UNDER R.C.M. 1201 IN THE SPECIAL [GENERAL] COURT-MARTIAL CASE OF UNITED STATES v. ACCUSED’S NAME HERE | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| Ref: | 1. Article 65(d), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). 2. Rules for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1201. | | | |

1. Per R.C.M. 1201(a)(1), I reviewed the attached record of trial in the special [general] court-martial case of United States v. Accused Name, USCG.
2. Pursuant to R.C.M. 1201(d) and based on my review of the record I conclude that:
   1. The court-martial had jurisdiction over the accused and the offenses as to which there is a finding of guilty;
   2. The charge and specification(s) as to which there is a finding of guilty state an offense under the UCMJ.
   3. The sentence approved by the Convening Authority was within the limits prescribed by law.
3. The accused did not submit any matters alleging error. Accordingly, the response required by R.C.M. 1201(d)(4) is unnecessary in this case.

#

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Enclosure: | | 1. [Optional Enclosure] |
| Dist: | [Optional Dist] | |
| Copy: | Accused Name Here | |
| Blind Copy: | | [Optional Blind Copy] |