

**UNITED STATES COAST GUARD COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

**UNITED STATES**

**v.**

**Jesse P. WILSON**  
**Boatswain's Mate Third Class (E-4), U.S. Coast Guard**

**CGCMG 0334**  
**Docket No. 1435**

**01 May 2017**

General Court-Martial convened by Commander, Coast Guard Pacific Area. Tried at Boston, Massachusetts, and Alameda, California, on 09 April 2015 and 07 July 2015.

Military Judge:	CAPT Christine N. Cutter, USCG
Trial Counsel:	LCDR Joel C. Coito, USCG
Assistant Trial Counsel;	LCDR Geralyn L. van de Krol, USCG
Assistant Trial Counsel:	LT Kristen N. Baker, USCG
Defense Counsel:	LT Steven A. Macias, USCGR
Assistant Defense Counsel:	LT Timothy C. Ceder, JAGC, USN
Appellate Defense Counsel:	LT Philip A. Jones, USCGR
Appellate Government Counsel:	LT Sharyl L. Pels, USCGR
	LT Lars T. Okmark, USCGR

**BEFORE**  
**McCLELLAND, JUDGE & HERMAN**  
Appellate Military Judges

Per curiam:

Appellant was tried by general court-martial, military judge alone. Pursuant to his pleas of guilty, entered in accordance with a pretrial agreement, Appellant was convicted of one specification of false official statements, in violation of Article 107, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ); one specification of sexual abuse of a child and two specifications of sexual assault of a child, in violation of Article 120b, UCMJ; one specification of extortion, in violation of Article 127, UCMJ; two specifications of assault and battery, in violation of Article 128, UCMJ; and one specification of wrongfully failing to register firearms in violation of state law, and one specification of possessing a nude image of a child, both in violation of Article 134,

**United States v. Jesse P. WILSON, No. 1435 (C.G.Ct.Crim.App. 2017)**

UCMJ. The military judge sentenced Appellant to nine years confinement, reduction to E-1, and a dishonorable discharge. The Convening Authority approved the sentence, but suspended confinement in excess of 100 months, in accordance with the pretrial agreement.

Before this court, Appellant has assigned the following errors:

- I. Appellant's sentence is inappropriately severe.
- II. Appellant was subjected to illegal pretrial punishment in pretrial confinement, for which he should receive credit.
- III. Appellant's pretrial restriction was tantamount to confinement, for which he should have received credit.

We do not consider Appellant's sentence inappropriately severe. We summarily reject the other two issues, and affirm.

**Decision**

We have reviewed the record in accordance with Article 66, UCMJ. Upon such review, the findings and sentence are determined to be correct in law and fact and, on the basis of the entire record, should be approved. Accordingly, the findings of guilty and the sentence, as approved below, are affirmed.



For the Court,

Sarah P. Valdes  
Clerk of the Court