

ENCLOSURE 4:
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE





UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON

APR 1 2014

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (PERSONNEL AND
READINESS)

SUBJECT: FY13 Annual Report on Sexual Assault

As directed by the Section 1631 of Public Law 111-383, I am forwarding the enclosed AF SAPR Annual report to provide numerical data and statistics regarding sexual assault within the Air Force. The Air Force received 1052 reports of sexual assault; 635 were unrestricted and 412 were restricted. These totals include 30 reports from the deployed area; 19 of which were unrestricted and 11 which were restricted.

We remain committed to eliminating sexual assault from the Air Force and continue to enhance sexual assault prevention methods and programs, investigations, accountability, victim support, and assessment methods.


Eric K. Fanning

Attachment:
Air Force SAPR Annual Report for FY 13

Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Review Data Call: United States Air Force

Executive Summary

In an effort to synchronize efforts across the service, the Air Force disbanded its four-person Sexual Assault Prevent and Response (SAPR) Office, which had been aligned under the Air Force's Manpower and Personnel Directorate, and stood up a stand-alone, directorate-level office in June, 2013, led by a general officer who reports directly to the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff. The new Headquarters Air Force SAPR Office is authorized a cross-functional staff of 32 people with a broad range of relevant expertise such as operational command; research and analysis; education and training; victim assistance; investigation and law enforcement; legal procedure; mental health; public affairs; and legislative relations. Embedded Judge Advocate General's Corps, Surgeon General, and Office of Special Investigations representatives act as force multipliers by opening direct lines of communication to their respective functional organizations. This structure is facilitating streamlined, agile, and cross-functional policy development, data collection and analysis, and actionable advice for Air Force leaders to effect the elimination of sexual assault in the Air Force.

On November 15, 2012, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Air Force Chief of Staff, and the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force issued a letter to all Airmen stating there is no place in the Air Force for sexual assault, and every Airman needs to take action and be part of the solution. In the first two weeks of December, 2012, the Air Force conducted a service-wide health and welfare inspection designed to eliminate environments conducive to sexual harassment or unprofessional relationships, both possible leading indicators of sexual misconduct. Following that inspection, the Chief of Staff issued a letter to all Airmen on January 2, 2013, reinforcing the message that images, songs, stories, or so-called "traditions" that are obscene, vulgar, or that denigrate or fail to show proper respect to all Airmen, are not part of Air Force heritage and will not be accepted as part of Air Force culture.

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force embarked on a number of initiatives to reach out to Airmen, support victims, and foster command climates of dignity and respect. The Air Force SAPR Office conducted focus groups at 14 bases with more than 1,400 Airmen to gather information about their perceptions on sexual assault and the Air Force's efforts to eradicate it. The Air Force stood up a groundbreaking Special Victims' Counsel program in which victims of sexual assault are offered personal legal representation. The Air Force began implementation of a Special Victims Capability ahead of expected guidance from the Department of Defense. This initiative identified and brought together specially trained investigators and judge advocates to more effectively hold perpetrators accountable. Every Airman in the Air Force participated in a SAPR Stand-Down Day, a scenario-based, small-group training focusing on bystander intervention and fostering cultures of dignity and respect. The Air Force also started a comprehensive revision of the Air Force's SAPR policy guidance and training curriculum.

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force also significantly enhanced its SAPR victim

support with the addition of 91 full-time victim advocates to the standing force of 114 full-time installation SARCs and 2,307 trained and certified volunteer military and civilian victim advocates.

In Fiscal Year 2013, investigators opened 635 investigations into allegations of sexual assault in which a servicemember was either a subject or a victim. Based upon the method directed for calculating investigations for this report, this number of investigations does not include those conducted by other services' investigative agencies, nor does it include investigations involving only civilian subjects and victims (e.g., a report by a dependent spouse that he/she was sexually assaulted by a government civilian employee). Additionally, this number specifically excludes investigations into so-called "intimate partner" cases, which fall under the Family Advocacy program (this includes assaults between spouses, cohabitating intimate partners, people who have a common child, and people who have been in an intimate dating relationship for more than 30 days). Finally, sexual assault allegations involving child victims are outside the scope of this report. For purposes of this report, these 635 investigations are considered to be proxies for unrestricted reports of sexual assault. Based upon the DoD Annual Report methodology, a single investigation is treated as a single report, regardless of the number of subjects and victims involved in the investigation. For the sake of consistency, this report will refer to the 635 as "unrestricted reports."

The Air Force also received 488 restricted reports of sexual assault (reports falling under the Family Advocacy program are not included here). Of these, 76 converted from restricted to unrestricted at the request of the victims, resulting in the initiation of an investigation. Thus, of the 488 initially restricted reports received in Fiscal Year 2013, 412 remained restricted at the end of Fiscal Year 2013.

This represents an increase of 186 unrestricted reports (increase of 41.4%) and an increase of 71 restricted reports (20.8%) from the number of reports received in Fiscal Year 2012. In 2012, there were 790 total reports; 449 were unrestricted; and 341 remained restricted after 58 converted to unrestricted. The Fiscal Year 2013 totals include 30 reports from the Combat Areas of Interest (an increase of 6 from Fiscal Year 2012, when there were 24), 19 of which were investigations considered to be unrestricted reports as described in Section 1.1. There was an increase of 9 unrestricted and a decrease of 3 remaining restricted reports. In Fiscal Year 2013, 2 restricted reports converted to unrestricted, while none converted in Fiscal Year 2012.

1. Line of Effort (LOE) 1—Prevention—The objective of prevention is to “deliver consistent and effective prevention methods and programs.”

1.1 Summarize your Service or Component’s efforts to achieve the Prevention Endstate: “cultural imperatives of mutual respect and trust, professional values, and team commitment are reinforced to create an environment where sexual assault is not tolerated, condoned, or ignored.”

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force implemented major initiatives in support of the prevention line of effort beginning with a Secretary of the Air Force, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force letter, sent on November 15, 2012, to all Airmen stating there is no place in the Air Force for sexual assault, and every Airman

needs to take action and be part of the solution. This letter was immediately followed by an Air Force service-wide health and welfare inspection during the first two weeks of December, 2012, that was designed to eliminate environments conducive to sexual harassment or unprofessional relationships, which studies suggest are leading indicators of sexual misconduct. Following that inspection, the Chief of Staff issued a follow up letter to all Airmen on January 2, 2013, reinforcing the message that images, songs, stories, or so-called “traditions” that are obscene, vulgar, or that denigrate or fail to show proper respect to all Airmen, are not part of Air Force heritage and will not be accepted as part of Air Force culture. While the inspections are complete, the effort to promote a climate of dignity and respect for all Airmen continues. Commanders at every level are empowered to initiate repeat health and welfare inspections for their units at any time.

Progress in the prevention line also was made through a number of other Air Force SAPR efforts to include:

- The enactment of the Airman’s “Bill of Rights” which is provided to all newly accessed Airmen – ensuring they understand how they should be treated and how they should treat others.
- Enhancement of the dialogue on sexual assault among Airmen through a variety of initiatives.
 - The Air Force SAPR Office engaged with Airmen during focus groups at 14 installations globally to assess the SAPR climate and the effectiveness of headquarters initiatives. The focus groups, which included more than 1,400 personnel from junior enlisted Airmen to senior Air Force officers, provided feedback for the ongoing transformation of the AF SAPR Program.
 - The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force launched an “Every Airman Counts” Campaign seeking innovative ideas on how best to tackle the issue of sexual assault through a public-facing blog. The blog initiative kicked off on July 16, 2013, receiving more than 56,000 visits and roughly 875 comments by the end of Fiscal Year 2013.
 - The initiation of Senior Leader web chats with senior leaders and experts in the field of sexual assault prevention and response, personally hosted by the Vice Chief of Staff, allowing Airmen of all ranks and their SARCs the ability to ask questions and share concerns on sexual assault with one of the Air Force's top leaders. During Fiscal Year 2013 one web chat was conducted with Airmen from Holloman AFB and another with all MAJCOM and Installation SARCs.
- Established and filled 91 full-time victim advocate positions.
- Increased the number of Full Time SARC positions from 89 to 121.
- Revamped the training courses for wing commanders, vice wing commanders,

group commanders, and Senior NCOs to reflect the Air Force's increased emphasis on establishing a climate of dignity and respect.

- Executed an Air Force Wide SAPR "Stand Down" day for all AF military and civilian personnel whereby:
 - Commanders were given tools and instructions to facilitate group-participation education such as scenario-based training examples for small-group discussion; information on identifying environments tolerant of sexual harassment; role-playing scenarios and bystander intervention strategies
 - Instructors used examples of real-life sexual assault cases and discussed intervention opportunities
 - Materials, including twenty-three videos addressing such topics as: male victims, bystander intervention, response to trauma, and offender characteristics and tactics, were made available to units to help ensure topics covered included the following: ethics, bystander intervention, zero-tolerance policy, creating a climate of respect, male sexual assault victims, rape myths, definition of consent, and risk-reduction measures.
 - Individual Major Commands initiated programs and events that focused on the prevention of sexual assault. For example, vice wing commanders in United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE), spoke at all SAPR Annual Training sessions to reinforce the importance of this critical issue and the importance of prevention.
 - All participants receive training on: professional values, trust, mutual dignity and respect, and a team commitment to an environment where sexual assault is not tolerated, condoned, or ignored.
- Air Force senior leaders encouraged subordinate commanders to reach out to non-military experts in the sexual assault arena in order to obtain fresh perspectives and a deeper understanding of this issue which led to:
 - Air Combat Command (ACC) organized a lunchtime learning session with Dr. Alan Berkowitz, a nationally recognized trainer and lecturer on rape prevention programs and techniques for fostering healthy communities and workplaces. He also is a proponent of bystander intervention in collaboration with Northern State University in Aberdeen, South Dakota. The session was conducted with the Ellsworth Air Force Base first sergeants and covered such topics as barriers to reporting, allegedly "false" reports, victim reaction to trauma, and other critical issues relevant to the military community and sexual assault.
 - The Commander at the 70th Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance Wing at Fort Meade, Maryland, brought in the program "Can I Kiss You" conducted by the nationally recognized presenter Mike Domitrz. A discussion of consent, bystander intervention and how to support sexual assault survivors was conducted in several sessions with Airmen under the age of 25

as well as with the Defense Information School trainees. This interactive presentation allowed for candid discussion of Airmen's roles in sexual assault prevention and response.

1.2 Identify the ways you are changing organizational prevention-based practices.

The Air Force transformed its SAPR strategy in concert with the revised Department of Defense strategy published in May 2013. A major portion of this strategic shift focuses on efforts to improve awareness regarding the scope and complexity of the problem. The quantity and quality of information regarding sexual assault in the Air Force will be increased by getting more victims to come forward and cooperate in investigative and judicial actions. This information will, in turn, help the Air Force to better understand and prevent sexual assault either by deterring perpetrators or by identifying and holding them appropriately accountable as soon as possible. Finally, the Air Force will emphasize a climate of dignity and respect that is intolerant of inappropriate sexual behavior. In keeping with this updated strategic vision, the Air Force had various prevention-based initiatives underway in Fiscal Year 2013 that will continue into next year.

In support of that strategy, the Air Force has also made substantial progress transforming its SAPR training in other programs, ranging from entry-level venues – such as Basic Military Training, Reserve Officer Training Corps detachments, and the Air Force Academy – up through and including the Transition Assistance Program courses required for those separating or retiring from the Air Force to help ensure that each Airman is exposed to SAPR principles regularly throughout their careers. By the end of Fiscal Year 2013, reviews were scheduled or underway for all Air Force SAPR training which included aligning the transformed training curricula with the new strategy.

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force SAPR Office planned a SAPR Leadership Summit for subject-matter experts to present information on prevention-based practices, offender dynamics and grooming behaviors to all Wing Commanders, Major Command (MAJCOM) and Installation SARCs, as well as MAJCOM Command Chiefs, to educate them on concepts such as the neurobiology of trauma and understanding recovery.

Prevention curricula were rebuilt incorporating adult learning theory that allows for discussion and personalization of materials to include more interactive scenarios and personal stories in order to improve knowledge and understanding of key issues such as consent and communication. The Air Force continues to emphasize bystander intervention in its formal training and small group discussions as an effective prevention strategy that all Airmen can practice. The Air Force also launched mentorship programs (e.g. Flight Lead Program, Men's Roundtable, "Let's Connect") designed to provide mentors to Airmen younger than 26 years old to help them understand measures for preventing sexual assault and alcohol-related incidents.

During Fiscal Year 2013, a series of steps were taken to transform the climate toward sexual assault within the Air Force. The Chief of Staff directed a force-wide health and welfare inspection focused on removing inappropriate sexually oriented material from the work place. In June, 2013, the Air Force conducted a service-wide SAPR "Stand-

Down” Day with a focus on prevention. Participation in the “Stand-Down” Day was mandatory for all Airmen. These events will become regular Air Force events, with two scheduled for Fiscal Year 2014. Each “Stand-Down” Day will focus on different aspects of the prevention strategy. For example, the spring Fiscal Year 2014 “Stand-Down” Day will focus on offenders and bystanders, while the second “Stand-Down” Day will address trauma and victim empathy.

1.3 Describe your efforts to comply with Department of Defense SAPR core competencies for all SAPR training to ensure consistency. Include Professional Military Education, Pre-Command, and Senior Enlisted training.

The Air Force launched a number of highly successful efforts in the SAPR training arena. These included:

- The creation of an Integrated Product Team (IPT) to review and assess SAPR curricula for pre-command and senior enlisted training. Part of that assessment included reviewing sister service and university materials and best practices. The IPT identified the need to develop a framework to deliver standardized SAPR curricula to meet Secretary of Defense requirements. Considerations included: class size – minimum to maximum number of participants; timing – when training should be provided and length of each course; content – what topics should be included in initial and refresher training, and who should develop the training; delivery – how content should be presented in initial and refresher training, and who should provide the training; and assessment – how training effectiveness should be assessed.
- The review of its annual refresher training, accessions, pre-deployment, post-deployment, chaplain, professional military, as well as SARC and victim advocate training to help ensure compliance with DOD SAPR core competencies guidelines. The Air Force is comparing these learning objectives against the training curricula currently in place.
- The development of a new pre-command course that is conducted at the wing, group, and squadron levels. The course is discussion-based and allows leaders to work through a variety of scenarios they are likely to encounter. The curriculum highlights specifically what leaders can do to foster climates based on respect and dignity for all. This course emphasizes the relationship between a unit’s climate and the incidence of sexual assault. Leaders are encouraged to make prevention a part of their daily message to their subordinates. Additionally, attendees of both the Major Command squadron commanders’ courses and Major Command Wing Commander Conferences received SAPR briefings.
- The establishment of two working groups to transform the SAPR curricula in Air Force senior enlisted military education and training. The professional military education courses include the Senior NCO Academy and the First Sergeant’s Academy. Other senior enlisted training opportunities include the Chief’s Leadership Course and Command Chief Course. Different methods of delivery such as

scenario-based training are being reviewed. The review will help ensure the Air Force meets the core competencies and learning objectives and updates curriculum.

- Enhancing education at the First Term Airmen Centers across the Air Force. The education focuses on creating/maintaining an environment of respect, bystander intervention, risk reduction, sexual harassment and sexual assault. The Air Force revised its SAPR training briefings to standardize the material in order to fully align with the Department of Defense.
- The Air Force employed training programs focused on courses that service members attend at career milestones, such as professional military education and senior enlisted training, as well as pre-command training. Some specific examples of initiatives intended to address the “describe sexual assault and its impact on the military” core competency include increasing Airman awareness of the impact on victims, increasing their exposure to the data on prevalence, and increasing awareness regarding the types and amount of resources available to respond to incidents. During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force introduced several videos into SAPR training curricula as a mechanism to improve Airman awareness of the impact on victims. The Air Force also began to provide Airmen across the board with a more clear sense of the prevalence of sexual assault within the Air Force by providing that data during training events. SARC also supported leadership immersion sessions for incoming leaders.

For the “describe strategies to prevent sexual assaults” core competency the Air Force introduced efforts intended to help Airmen better understand prevention strategies, arm them with the ability to talk about sexual assault, and provided a better understanding of leadership roles in the SAPR program. SAPR “exercise injects” were used at some events to test proper response from the various groups, squadrons, and supervisors. Where possible, the Air Force supplemented training with assigned and contracted subject matter experts.

For the core competency of “identify support resources available to victims of sexual assault,” the Air Force focused on making Airmen more aware of the policies and procedures in place and in improving their understanding of how to gain access to those resources. During the June mandatory Air Force-wide SAPR stand down for all military and civilian personnel, the message was delivered by unit SARCs as a means to put a face with the program. The training included discussions about what services are available to victims, such as the Special Victims’ Counsel program and the availability of expedited transfers.

1.4 Describe your progress in implementing the findings and recommendations from the SAPR Initial Military Training reviews. Include your efforts to enhance accession training by including SAPR policies and implementation of SAPR training within 14 days of entrance to active duty.

A multi-disciplinary SAPR training Integrated Product Team (IPT), comprised of 16 members with subject matter expertise as well as diverse professional field experience, which met in January, 2013, made outstanding progress in implementing the findings

and recommendations from the SAPR Initial Military Training reviews. The team included a forensic consultant, a professor from a civilian university, a former prosecutor, a senior social scientist, as well as several Air Force curriculum development and SAPR specialists. The overarching goal of the IPT was to establish an appropriate framework to deliver a Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Prevention and Response curriculum at all venues of accessions training. Additionally, the IPT sought to help ensure that all Airmen depart accessions training with the same basic level of understanding of the Air Force's core values and their personal responsibility as a member of the Air Force to treat all Airmen with dignity and respect. Specifically, the Team assessed timing, content and method of delivery of sexual harassment and SAPR-related materials, and determined the availability of student feedback mechanisms on the effectiveness of that training. The IPT also reviewed whether curricula included facets related to Air Force culture and gender dynamics, such as unprofessional relationships. The team reviewed curricula for Basic Military Training, Officer Training School, Basic Officer Training, the United States Air Force Academy, Reserve Officer Training Corps, initial occupational training, technical training, and flying training. The Officer Training School program also includes: Commissioned Officer Training course (4 ½ weeks), Air National Guard Academy of Military Science (6 weeks), and Reserve Officer Commissioned Officer Training courses (2 ½ weeks).

All accessions and initial skills venues conduct sexual harassment and SAPR education. All initial skills venues now "frontload" sexual harassment and SAPR curriculum to help ensure students fully understand, at the beginning of their training, what constitutes improper or criminal behavior and what avenues for reporting and assistance are available to them. At the Air Force Academy, extensive additional mandatory training on sexual harassment, sexual assault, and related concepts is provided. There, cadets engage these concepts in greater depth over the course of four years. The foundations of sexual harassment and SAPR education are provided during initial training, with the understanding that greater depth on these topics will be addressed through developmental education across an Airman's career (e.g., that enlisted Airmen will learn more about how SAPR relates to their leadership roles when they attend Airman Leadership School and the NCO Academy). A new course, "Forbidden Relationships," was added to Basic Military Training. This course is designed to help new accessions understand Air Force expectations for their behavior as well as the behavior of their superiors. The course further provides information on how trainees can report concerns and misconduct, as well as available services. Three Basic Military Training SAPR trainers were added to the faculty in July, 2013, and these trainers teach the SAPR curriculum. Additional scenario-based training was added to all technical training locations' SAPR training in 2013. Although standardization of Air Force training on sexual assault and SAPR is important, a single lesson plan for all accession sources was deemed unwise due to the varying length of training time and the differing demographic of students at each venue. Therefore, the Integrated Product Team recommended a tailored versus a standardized curriculum.

1.5 Identify specific SAPR monitoring, measures, and education that impart individual skills associated with bystander intervention and appropriate risk reduction that does not blame victims.

The Air Force implemented several initiatives to impart bystander-intervention and risk-reduction skills that avoid victim blaming, which included providing video clips which depicted both men and women (actors) in public locations (bars, clubs, restaurants, etc.) where bystanders had the opportunity to intervene in a potentially risky situation involving both strangers and non-strangers. Airmen in the training were asked to discuss what they would do in those circumstances in order to highlight bystander intervention principles and methods.

As part of the Air Force SAPR “Stand-Down” day and to keep training aligned with Air Force strategy and policies, the Air Force SAPR office also made several resources available on the Air Force portal website that commanders could use to train personnel on bystander intervention and risk reduction. The training items which were made available included materials on bystander intervention (including four videos), consent, and risk reduction, as well as scenario-based training which included sexual assault icebreaker, role play scenarios, and intervention strategies.

Installation SAPR personnel were not limited in how to use these training materials, but were directed to have interactive and open conversations with Airmen about intervention strategies. Some installations used concepts from the "bystander" videos and created locally relevant role playing scenarios where audience members participated and then discussed intervention strategies afterward in small group discussions.

Small groups further addressed how alcohol is frequently a tool used by perpetrators, sometimes to target under-aged victims who may be reluctant to report. In an effort to reduce victim blaming, SAPR personnel conducted mentoring sessions with Airmen and senior leaders, fostering small group discussions about familiar situations which can lead to sexual assault and personalizing the scenario by encouraging Airmen to picture a family member or friend in these situations. One recurring theme in the training is reminding Airmen that even when victims have engaged in collateral misconduct, the perpetrator – not the victim – remains the person responsible for the sexual assault. Some bases have also produced installation based videos to make them location specific.

Interactive training sessions on bystander intervention focused on how to intervene safely, why a person should intervene, and what the potential consequences of not intervening are. All training discussions ask participants to develop risk-reduction strategies. Discussion focused on whether such strategies could be used to blame a victim and/or how they can help prevent an incident. Societal views on provocative clothing and alcohol use by women in social situations were also addressed. Depictions challenged audiences to discuss whether males who dress provocatively and drink excessively heightened their risk for sexual assault. This teaching method is intended to overcome societal biases and victim blaming.

One Major Command used “Welcome to the Party” – a full teaching curriculum centered on 30-minute film/drama designed for young adults that portrays three incidents/scenarios. The curriculum is designed to be presented by a qualified professional with experience in sexual assault prevention education. The detailed curriculum includes eight classroom activities, extensive lecture materials, supplemental student handouts, thorough background information, as well as resources and reference guides. The film includes multi-format viewing designed to allow the instructor many options for presenting the film and structuring discussions and lectures. The participants were separated into groups to discuss the scenarios and were given a victim-blaming statement. The statements were read and discussion ensued regarding the veracity of victim-blaming myths.

Another Major Command used a leader’s training module which focused on building victim empathy, informing leadership of military SAPR principles, and inspiring leaders to enlist all Airmen to proactively intervene and advocate for victims. A trained, savvy, compassionate leader is vital to establishing a climate of dignity and respect in which bystanders feel empowered to intervene.

The Air Force Academy created a cadet-specific bystander intervention training program. The training was reinforced through various venues and programs that emphasize skills associated with bystander intervention to include Cadet PEERs (Personal Ethics and Education Representative), the Women’s Forum (women cadet-to-cadet mentoring with faculty mentorship), and Cadet Wingman Days. Additionally, the Air Force Academy SAPR office focused on leadership and first responders training to help ensure victims were cared for in a manner free of blame and an environment consistent with the Department of Defense’s vision.

The Air Force makes a clear distinction between risk-reduction measures and primary prevention of sexual assault, and stresses the victim is never to blame for a crime that someone else chose to commit.

1.6 Describe your efforts to establish policies that create and sustain safe environments free of sexual assault. Include policies and practices that address alcohol consumption and barracks/dormitories visitation.

Air Force senior leaders determined a service-wide policy regarding alcohol in the dormitories was not warranted at this time, and that commanders should retain the authority to choose and implement policies best suited for their commands.

A number of installations have established structured dormitory walk-through programs. In a typical program, a First Sergeant or a senior noncommissioned officer heads a team of volunteers, normally consisting of senior noncommissioned officers but may include officers or junior noncommissioned officers. The team picks random days to walk through the dormitories typically between 8 p.m. and midnight during the week or at any time on the weekend. Most walk-throughs will occur over the weekend or known down times if there are shift workers. They engage in conversations with Airmen they encounter, assess the overall climate and conditions in the dormitories and take

immediate action to address safety issues. Other installations have variations of the same program.

Several installations have been successful in integrating victim advocates into the training cadre as Airman Leadership School instructors. This benefits both programs, as SAPR expertise is delivered in seminars, and it also puts emphasis on the students' leadership responsibility as they become noncommissioned officers. Instructors introduce students to SAPR volunteer opportunities both on- and off-base, leadership engagement, and cultural change.

Some Air Force bases have prohibited alcohol in dormitories. Many have installed security cameras. One major command requires PIN access for all dormitory rooms and common areas.

The Air Force has encouraged installation commanders to offer results of alcohol policies employed for consideration service-wide. Some commanders have made all dormitories alcohol-free, another instituted a no-alcohol policy in contingency dormitories (used for transient personnel who are on their way to, or returning from, the deployed environment) due to close barracks-style sleeping quarters. Select overseas locations have used the "Airman Assisting Airman" initiative, a voluntary foot patrol, which helps identify Airmen who have over-consumed alcohol and might be a threat to fellow Airmen. This is especially useful in locations where Airmen congregate in groups, which is often the case at overseas bases and some stateside bases. The flexibility of local commander discretion to adapt these policies to the population they serve has been an important tool for them and source of feedback for headquarters level consideration. The Air Force focus has been on providing work environments that promote dignity and respect while holding each other accountable for inappropriate behavior. Dorm room inspections are performed regularly and concerns are addressed.

1.7 Describe progress, assessment, efforts, and/or approved plans for requiring commanders to conduct an organizational climate assessment within 120 days of assuming command and annually thereafter. Include policy for providing results to the next level in the chain of command.

In accordance with the July 25, 2013, Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness memorandum, which incorporates the requirements from the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, the Air Force Directorate of Manpower, Personnel, and Services published guidance requiring commanders of each military command and commanders of subordinate units of 50 or more persons to conduct a climate assessment within 120 days after assumption of command, and annually thereafter. Additionally, the memo directed that the results and analysis of annual climate surveys must be provided to the commander requesting the survey and to the commander at the next level in the chain of command as soon as possible, but no later than 30 days after receiving the survey results.

1.8 Describe collaboration efforts concerning prevention with external experts, federal partners (e.g. NATO), advocacy organizations, and educational institutions, to include prevention subject matter experts. Describe results and/or implementations of lessons learned from collaboration efforts.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force SAPR office had tremendous success interacting and collaborating with 33 subject matter experts and 14 agencies in the fields of legal, psychology and behavior, organizational culture, medical and forensics, and a variety of domestic and sexual violence advocacy groups. The Air Force furthered efforts to enhance SAPR education and training by conducting several Integrated Product Team (IPTs) meetings with university experts and other subject matter experts to assess the pre-command, senior enlisted and accession-level SAPR education and training curricula. As a result of the IPTs, the Air Force SAPR office incorporated changes in the pre-command and accession-level training. Prevention efforts are focused on educating Airman to sustain an environment of mutual respect and dignity while holding personnel accountable.

A few of the experts not previously noted that the Air Force worked with this year include:

- Dr. Anthony Hassan from the School of Social Work at the University of Southern California. The Air Force discussed the use of avatars (digitally simulated people which trainees interact with) as a means to enhance and engage personnel during SAPR training. Dr. Hassan was appointed clinical associate professor at the USC School of Social Work in 2009, serving as the inaugural director of the Center for Innovation and Research on Veterans and Military Families (CIR) and chair for the military social work program. A retired Air Force officer, he brings 25 years of experience in military social work and leadership development.
- Mr. Steve Kovalenka, the Area Director for Franklin Covey. The Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force and other senior leaders met with Mr. Kovalenka to explore whether the Franklin Covey model can be effectively used to enhance the positive culture in the Air Force. These discussions assisted the Air Force in assessing the wisdom and feasibility of fielding an additional training segment following Basic Military Training designed to establish long term behavioral changes.
- Ms. Gail Stern, M. Ed., who has been a sexual assault prevention educator since 1991 and is the co-author of the non-stranger rape prevention program, Sex Signals, which educates Airmen on the common misconceptions of sexual assault/rape and how to handle unwanted sexual advances. In August the first training session occurred at the United States Air Force Academy as part of a curriculum focusing on dating, male and female communication, intimacy, and sexual assault prevention. Additionally, Officer Training School and Reserve Officer Training Corps incorporated Sex Signals into their commissioning programs.
- Dr. Joel Milner of Northern Illinois University. Dr. Milner has written more than 200 scholarly publications primarily focused on family violence and sexual assault. He is

also the founding director of the Center for the Study of Family Violence and Sexual Assault. This center promotes research that “informs prevention, intervention, and treatment of family violence and sexual assault.” The Air Force SAPR office met with Dr. Milner to discuss various methodologies and studies regarding perpetrators and perpetrator behaviors. The Air Force SAPR office used information from the meetings to begin creating the Air Force’s long-term SAPR strategy.

- Dr. Rebecca J. Macy and Dr. Sandra L. Martin of the University of North Carolina. The Air Force SAPR office met with these professionals to discuss effective research in risk reduction of sexual assault and preventing re-victimization and the use of epidemiological strategies to understand the prevalence of the problem of sexual assault in the USAF. This consultation assisted the Air Force in exploring the utility of using an epidemiological “vector-based” approach to combating sexual assault.
- The National Crime Victim Law Institute and Victim Rights Law Center. The Air Force consulted with both of these organizations when standing up the Special Victims’ Counsel program. The organizations provided expertise during the process of developing initial policies and instructors at Special Victims’ Counsel training courses throughout the year. The National Crime Victim Law Institute filed an amicus brief in a case that was appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. In that case, the court held victims have the right to be heard through their Special Victims’ Counsel with respect to pre-trial evidentiary motions on rape-shield, psychotherapist-patient communications, and victim advocate-victim communications.

At the installation-level units furthered prevention efforts by strengthening local partnerships with advocacy groups, first responder and law enforcement professionals while also targeting education and prevention programs throughout the military and civilian communities. Some examples include:

- Partnering with local civilian Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) and local coalitions to develop a SART Cooperative Working agreement bringing together law enforcement, victim service providers, medical and legal resources to work towards improving services and awareness of issues that can reduce risk.
- Partnering with the Department of Justice Office for Victims of Crime to facilitate a training event which included the topic “Strengthening Military-Civilian Community Partnerships to Respond to Sexual Assault. This topic is a broader Department of Defense and Department of Justice initiative. Approximately 40 community and law enforcement victim service providers learned how to better serve both family members and active duty military sexual assault victims.
- A sexual assault survivor and motivational speaker discussed the relationship between alcohol and sexual assault while another speaker from The Date Safe Project addressed overseas high school students at Department of Defense Schools

and young Airmen about communication of respect in social relationships.

- Training with local law enforcement/advocacy groups who educated military legal, law enforcement and leadership on awareness of drug-facilitated sexual assaults, self-defense, the realities of sexual assault as it pertains to offender behavior and societal perception of the crime and how to maintain healthy environments.
- Partnering with local rape crisis centers fostering collaborative efforts for victim support and sharing of training resources to include prevention programs. Additionally, Air Force Reserve command focused on partnering with state sexual assault coalitions to expand resource availability for geographically separated reserve sexual assault victims.
- Working with TESSA (Trust, Education, Safety, Support, and Action), a multi-faceted agency that includes a confidential Safe house, Victim Advocacy, Counseling and Children's Programs, a 24/7 Crisis Line, and Community Outreach and Education programs in Colorado Springs, the Air Force Academy presented a "Basic Victimology" course for all Academy Cadet Wing permanent party, Air Officer Commanders, and squadron military trainers. Activities provided front-line supervision with additional tools and experience to use when mentoring and talking to cadets about sexual assault prevention and response.

1.9 Describe your efforts to establish and implement policies that prevent individuals convicted of a Federal or State offense of rape, sexual abuse, sexual assault, incest, or other sexual offenses, from being provided a waiver for commissioning or enlistment in the Armed Forces.

The Air Force has not granted waivers for these offenses. Air Force Policy Document 36-60, *SAPR Program*, states that it is Air Force policy to prohibit the enlistment or commissioning of personnel in the active duty Air Force, Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve components when the person has a qualifying conviction for a crime of sexual assault. "Qualifying conviction" is defined as "a State or Federal conviction for a felony crime of sexual assault and any general or special court-martial conviction for a Uniform Code of Military Justice offense which otherwise meets the elements of a crime of sexual assault, even though not classified as a felony or misdemeanor." Sexual assault, for purposes of this policy, is defined as: "intentional sexual contact, characterized by use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority or when the victim does not or cannot consent. It includes rape, nonconsensual sodomy, indecent assault, or attempts to commit these acts."

1.10 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to delivering consistent and effective prevention methods and programs, including how these efforts will help your Service plan, resource, and make progress in your SAPR program.

During Fiscal Year 2014, the Air Force SAPR Office will complete its transformation within the Air Staff to become an independent 32-person office led by a general officer reporting to the Vice Chief of Staff. In addition, the Air Force will complete a full review of its training programs to help ensure that they are compliant with Department of Defense requirements and are consistent with Air Force strategic goals.

Once full operating capability has been reached, the Air Force SAPR Office will be composed of a Policy Division and an Operations, Research and Analysis Division. The Policy Division will be comprised of subject matter experts from the legal, investigative, medical, legislative, and SAPR communities. The role of the Policy Division is to develop and review SAPR strategy and guidance in support of leadership objectives. The Operations, Research and Analysis Division will oversee the execution of SAPR programs, assess their effectiveness and investigate innovative ways to improve SAPR program effectiveness.

The first Air Force updates made to the SAPR training program for Airmen were focused on the annual refresher training program delivered via SAPR Stand-Down Days. These changes provided the swiftest avenue to bring information to all Airmen. In keeping with the Air Force strategy, the themes of “victims come forward,” “perpetrators are neutralized,” and “transforming the Air Force Climate” will be stressed during the two SAPR “Stand-Down” Days scheduled for Fiscal Year 2014. The spring “Stand-Down” Day will focus on presenting research about offender dynamics and grooming. Understanding how offenders operate, Airmen will learn what to watch out for, when to intervene and why victim support is every Airman's mission. The fall “Stand-Down” Day will focus on the neurobiology of trauma and victim empathy. The Air Force will help ensure all Airmen receive about reactions to trauma, which in turn, will allow them to better support victims and encourage them to seek assistance when needed. These “Stand-Down” Days will be facilitated by local base level leaders using a concept of operations developed by the Headquarters SAPR Office.

A new, week-long Basic Military Training Capstone course will incorporate Sexual Assault Prevention and Response topics in a discussion based learning experience. After the Capstone course, every new Airman will be able to distinguish the difference between risk reduction and prevention and be comfortable openly talking about sexual assault and their role in prevention.

All levels of professional military education are being reviewed by the Air Force SAPR Office with the intent to standardize training across the force. Training will be centered on evidenced-based materials that are well-researched and proven to be effective. Standardizing all materials will help ensure a consistent message and approach in the field. All training will incorporate adult learning theory which allows for personalized learning. Presentations will encourage discussion, create deeper understanding and ignite action.

All SAPR training will incorporate the core competencies provided by the Department of Defense SAPR Office. Airmen will be able to explain the nature of sexual assault in the military environment using scenario-based, real-life situations to demonstrate the entire cycle of prevention, reporting, response, and accountability procedures. Airmen will be able to articulate their personal interest and commitment to the issue of prevention and response. The Air Force SAPR Office will partner with prevention specialists and organizations such as The University of North Carolina, the University of New Hampshire and the End Violence Against Women in the civilian community to help

ensure the use of appropriate and evidence-based prevention practices.

Assessment has become a critical part of the Air Force SAPR program and each training event will, therefore, use feedback and/or assessment to help ensure effective and consistent messaging. Some of the other events or products that the SAPR office intends to lead, sponsor or develop in Fiscal Year 2014 include a Chief of Staff of the Air Force SAPR Leadership Summit, a day-long Three-Star General SAPR discussion; monthly SAPR Council meetings, a Judge Advocate General's Corps SAPR Summit, Sexual Assault Awareness Month activities, Informational Displays, and the publication of a revised Commanders Guide.

The SARC's course has been extended to an eight-day course to allow for more in-depth knowledge to arm SAPR personnel to conduct their duties. The course was developed by experienced SARCs based on recommendations for a course review by the Department of Defense SAPR Office. The updated training will include hands-on exercises, role playing and presentation of job specific knowledge. The Air Force SAPR Office intends to conduct a pilot application of the revised SARC course in January 2014. Future victim advocate training conducted at Air Force installations will be based on this course.

Finally, Air Force SAPR interactions with Airmen will be developed to change the culture regarding sexual assault. The Air Force will continue educating Airmen that there is a difference between prevention and risk reduction, changing attitudes regarding acceptable versus unacceptable behavior, and convincing leaders and bystanders to intervene early and appropriately. These concepts will be key elements of the modifications to Air Force training programs. In addition, the Air Force will make healthy command climates an important element of each commander's performance evaluation.

2. LOE 2—Investigation—The objective of investigation is to “achieve high competence in the investigation of sexual assault.”

2.1 Summarize your Service or Component’s efforts to achieve the Investigation Endstate: “investigative resources yield timely and accurate results.”

AFOSI field units use a Sexual Assault Investigative Plan Worksheet and Sufficiency Assessment Tool to develop written investigative plans. The tool facilitates the required initial and periodic collaboration between agents and military justice attorneys, as it integrates legal sufficiency (Articles 120, 125 and 80 elements of proof) with investigative sufficiency. Also, each staff at AFOSI’s seven intermediate headquarters conducts 100 percent reviews of sexual assault investigations conducted by its subordinate field units. In turn, Headquarters AFOSI randomly selects and reviews 10-15% of all sexual assault investigations closed each month. These reviews focus on ensuring sexual assault cases are of high quality. Cases determined to have deficiencies are returned for additional investigative work. Headquarters AFOSI’s random case review results are briefed monthly to senior AFOSI leaders, including the AFOSI region commanders responsible for field investigations. AFOSI senior leaders receive regular data pertaining to the timeliness of investigations. Case assessment information, together with timeliness data, helps AFOSI commanders maintain the necessary oversight needed to help ensure high quality, timely investigations.

2.2 Describe your Service or Component's implementation plan for the establishment of a Special Victim Capability (SVC), comprised of specially trained investigators, judge advocates, administrative paralegal support, and victim-witness assistance personnel.

Sexual Assault Investigators

AFOSI and representatives of The Judge Advocate General have participated in working groups led by Department of Defense Inspector General to develop Department of Defense policy and procedures for the implementation of a Special Victim Capability by the Military Criminal Investigation Organizations. Meanwhile, AFOSI and The Judge Advocate General have established a policy of early and frequent collaboration on major criminal cases, including sexual assault, domestic violence and child abuse. The Secretary of the Air Force approved the hiring of 24 additional civilian special agents to investigate sexual offenses. These 24 Sexual Assault investigators have all received training specifically tailored to the investigation of sexual assault allegations and have been stationed at locations with high sexual offense caseloads. They serve as AFOSI's primary Special Victim Capability investigators and sexual assault investigation subject-matter experts. To the greatest extent possible, these investigators are the lead agents on sexual assault investigations within their units. All specially designated Sexual Assault Investigators are required to attend advanced sexual assault investigations training designated by Headquarters AFOSI within 180 days of assuming their duties.

One of the 24 Sexual Assault Investigator billets has been designated as the AFOSI Sexual Assault Investigation and Operations Consultant and is located at AFOSI 2 Field Investigations Squadron, Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The individual assigned to this billet is available to provide all AFOSI units with guidance on sexual assault investigation tools, techniques, and best practices. This agent also serves as the command's point of contact for special victim capabilities and services and works closely with the Air Force Judge Advocate's Special Victims Unit Chief of Policy and Coordination. This agent may review recently opened, high-interest sexual assault cases to determine whether the owning unit's investigative plan is sufficiently scoped to address all pertinent aspects of the allegation. The agent may also provide detailed advice and on-scene assistance for particularly complicated cases (e.g., those with serial offenders) or especially serious sexual assault allegations. AFOSI has other operational consultants who assist field agents in conducting violent crime investigations, to include sexual assault cases; but the Sexual Assault operational consultant serves as the primary AFOSI subject-matter expert for sexual offenses and focuses his or her field assistance on those investigative activities most likely to result in probative information or evidence for these sexual cases.

Another Sexual Assault Investigator is assigned to the Air Force Special Investigations Academy, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and provides both basic and advanced sexual assault investigations training to AFOSI and judge advocate personnel. The remaining 22 Sexual Assault Investigators are currently assigned to 18 different locations, including three sites outside the continental United States. The

locations are adjusted as needed, based upon recent sexual assault case loads. Sexual Assault Investigators are supported by specialists (psychologists, forensic science consultants, polygraph examiners, criminal analysts, technical services, etc.) assigned to various AFOSI specialty centers throughout the world.

All AFOSI special agents received instruction on the sexual assault investigations training requirements set forth in Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures*, and Department of Defense Instruction 5505.18, *Investigation of Adult Sexual Assault in the Department of Defense*. In addition, AFOSI established a new Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program in August 2012 to train agents in advanced sexual assault investigation topics and techniques. To be certified as a Sexual Assault Investigator, AFOSI special agents received advanced sexual assault investigation instruction during the Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program. The program is an eight-day, 64-hour course designed to provide advanced specialized training for criminal investigators and prosecutors. The advanced topics taught at the program included cognitive bias, cognitive interviewing, topics on better understanding and treatment of victims of sexual assault, advanced topics on predatory behaviors of sexual assault perpetrators, advanced crime scene processing, special investigative techniques, domestic violence, and other topics. Investigators meeting the Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program training requirements will be identified in the Air Force personnel system as having a Special Experience Identifier designated for Special Victim Capability. The extensive curriculum is preparing for evaluation to receive Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation.

Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program attendees included AFOSI special agents and Air Force prosecutors. Each class consists of 24 students (18 special agents and six attorneys). The intermixing of AFOSI agents and judge advocates fostered collaboration, enabled students to discuss Air Force-specific policies, procedures and challenges throughout the course, and was critical to building a Special Victim Capability across the Air Force. As of the end of Fiscal Year 2013, four iterations of the program have been held with 72 AFOSI special agents and 24 Air Force judge advocates graduating from the program. Three iterations of the program are planned for Fiscal Year 2014.

An AFOSI Operational Psychologist provided instruction to each Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program class on the cognitive interview technique, designed to empower victims and improve their ability to provide detailed information. This technique was developed by Dr. Ronald Fisher, a Professor of Psychology at Florida International University, and is backed by years of peer-reviewed scientific research. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is planning to incorporate cognitive interviewing into the entry-level instruction they provide federal law enforcement officials on interviewing. All incoming agents must graduate from the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in order to receive their AFOSI Agent badge and credentials. AFOSI is also teaching this technique in several of its advanced criminal investigations courses and currently has more than 100 agents trained.

Additionally, AFOSI supervisory special agents attend the Advanced General Criminal Investigation Course. This course was designed as a train-the-trainer course geared towards Superintendents and Criminal Investigations Branch Chiefs who, as local installation leaders, will train personnel under their supervision. This advanced training incorporates the eight essential task requirements identified in Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, and includes the participation of judge advocates, forensic scientists, and clinical psychologists, who serve as course instructors.

Special Victims Unit Senior Trial Counsel

All Air Force judge advocates receive significant trial advocacy training and preparatory moot court experience during the Judge Advocate (JA) Staff Officer Course, the initial training course to become judge advocates. To become certified as trial and defense counsel, judge advocates must graduate from the course, serve effectively as trial or assistant trial counsel at courts-martial, and be recommended for certification by his or her supervisory Staff Judge Advocate and by a military judge.

Experienced trial counsel are selected to serve as Senior Trial Counsel as expert prosecutors who specialize in prosecuting complex cases. These counsel typically serve in this position for a three-year period in which their responsibilities entail assisting local counsel with reviewing evidence and drafting charges, consulting with investigators, and serving as lead counsel in court. There are currently 16 Senior Trial Counsel. Of these 16, a team of 10 are part of the Special Victims Unit, specializing in the prosecution of particularly complex cases including sexual assault, crimes against children, and homicides. Two of these attorneys serve additional roles. One acts as a liaison to the Defense Computer Forensics Laboratory, ensuring expeditious analysis of forensic evidence and providing expert consultation to local trial counsel on issues of digital evidence. The other, the Chief of Policy and Coordination, liaises with HQ AFOSI to improve Judge Advocate General-AFOSI teaming at the headquarters and local level; provides expert reach-back capability to local judge advocate offices; and leads training of judge advocates worldwide in all aspects of sexual assault prosecution.

The Chief, Government Trial and Appellate Counsel Division, makes the final decision as to which Senior Trial Counsel will be designated as a member of the Special Victims Unit, taking into account completion of one year as either Senior Trial or Senior Defense Counsel, attendance at two or more advanced litigation-skills-focused courses, specialized training in prosecuting sexual assaults, and demonstrated ability to prosecute a variety of sexual assault and/or complex cases. There is no minimum number/type of cases required to meet this criteria. Abilities considered include mastery of court rules and law, ability to handle expert witnesses, and ability to appropriately support victims.

Integration of AFOSI and Judge Advocate Capabilities

At the case level, investigators and trial counsel work together from the start of the case through completion. Staff Judge Advocates at the installation level develop local

procedures with their servicing AFOSI detachment commander to coordinate with agents as early as possible in the investigative stages of a case. AFOSI notifies the legal office when substantive criminal investigations are initiated, and the Staff Judge Advocate designates an attorney along with an investigative support team to provide initial counsel to the AFOSI case agent on the new investigation.

The Staff Judge Advocate designates an investigative support team as early as practicable in the investigative process. The team is composed of attorneys, and paralegals when appropriate, who work with the AFOSI case agent during the investigation to provide legal support.

AFOSI briefs the judge advocate on initial investigative steps. The collaborative process continues during the development of the Investigative Plan and the investigative support team works with the AFOSI case agent in identifying potential criminal offenses for investigation, comparing evidence in the case with the elements of proof for a given offense. The judge advocate coordinates with the AFOSI case agent on subject interviews.

As appropriate, investigative support team members or judge advocate staff members attend AFOSI case review meetings and AFOSI personnel attend relevant judge advocate military justice meetings.

The investigative support team reviews and updates the initial proof analysis crafted by trial counsel to address the elements, evidence, anticipated objections, and potential defenses for each specification. The judge advocate assigned to the team will discuss the results of the analysis with AFOSI.

Within 30 days of the conclusion of trial, the SJA and members of the trial team conduct case reviews with AFOSI to review case lessons learned. The previously mentioned AFOSI Sexual Assault IOC and the Judge Advocate General's Corps Special Victims Unit Chief of Policy and Coordination collaborate to help ensure productive integration between AFOSI and judge advocate personnel working at the case level.

Paralegal Support Personnel

Air Force Special Victim Capability paralegal support personnel will be selected from assigned legal personnel by the local Staff Judge Advocate. Special Victim Capability paralegals provide support to Special Victim Units and trial counsel in all sexual assault cases arising in their jurisdiction. Paralegals selected for Special Victim Capability duties will have completed the Paralegal Apprenticeship Course and/or Paralegal Craftsman Course at the Air Force Judge Advocate General's School. These intensive 9- to 11-week courses are designed to prepare paralegals to provide general military justice support, while providing additional training in legal research and writing, as well as witness interviewing skills. In addition to these courses' training requirements, paralegals who are selected to serve as a Noncommissioned Officer in Charge of a

Military Justice section in a base legal office will also attend the Military Justice Administration Course offered at The Judge Advocate General's School. The Military Justice Administration Course provides training in the management of base legal offices' military justice sections to judge advocates and paralegals that are currently or soon will be the Chief of Military Justice (attorney) or the Noncommissioned Officer in Charge of Military Justice (paralegal). Students learn to manage a base-level military justice section, including how to administratively process a case from the initial stages of the investigation through the post-trial phase.

Paralegals may also receive distance education and on-the-job training on topics such as post-traumatic stress disorder, counterintuitive behavior, sex offender registration, expedited transfer, Department of Defense Victim Service Standards, rights of crime victims, victim support agencies, the SAPR program, and SARC and SAPR victim advocate privileges. Paralegals assigned to Special Victim Capability positions will be capable of providing a full spectrum of pretrial and trial support for the Special Victims Unit Senior Trial Counsel, including interviewing witnesses, preparing courts-martial documents, drafting charges and specifications, managing military justice actions, providing technical and administrative support, and recording and transcribing judicial and administrative proceedings and investigations, as required. Paralegals will also facilitate witness and court member appearance, and coordinate and provide logistical support for all legal proceedings and hearings.

Victim and Witness Assistance Program Personnel

Each base legal office has a Victim and Witness Assistance Program coordinator and at least one victim/witness liaison appointed to assist victims during the military justice process. The victim liaison assigned to the victim in each particular case will be a member of the Special Victims Unit for purposes of that case. Currently judge advocates and paralegals receive Victim and Witness Assistance Program training through the respective military justice courses they attend.

In Fiscal Year 2013, The Air Force Judge Advocate General's School began developing a Victim and Witness Assistance Program distance education course which will be implemented in Fiscal Year 2014. This five-week course focuses on teaching victim liaisons how to discuss the military justice process with victims, enhance their understanding of the neurobiology of trauma and counterintuitive behavior, and help ensure every victim liaison is familiar with Air Force and civilian resources available to victims of crime. The Victim and Witness Assistance Program distance education course will be fielded multiple times a year, enhancing the installation-level training and reach-back support for judge advocates and paralegals who serve as victim liaisons in base legal offices so that they will be prepared to support victims throughout the military justice process and work with SAPR and Family Advocacy Program personnel and Special Victims' Counsel to help ensure victims have access to the support and resources they need to get through the military justice process and work towards recovery.

Training, Selection, and Certification Standards

For attorneys, the Air Force litigation training roadmap includes foundational courses offered by The Air Force Judge Advocate General's School, which include: the Judge Advocate Staff Officer Course, the Trial and Defense Advocacy Course, and the Advanced Trial Advocacy Course. The Air Force Judge Advocate General's School implemented the Advanced Sexual Assault Litigation Course in 2013, incorporating course material focused on sexual assault, domestic violence, and child abuse. All Special Victim Unit Senior Trial Counsel were required to attend this course annually. The Air Force Judge Advocate General's School also provided continuing litigation training through its Training by Reservists in Advocacy and Litigation Skills program which visits multiple Air Force legal offices each year, and trial advocacy courses, which are held at regional locations so that Judge Advocate General Corps personnel may receive updated training. In order to foster a collaborative approach to Special Victims Capability investigations and prosecutions, judge advocates are attending Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program jointly with AFOSI agents at Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. Agents and judge advocates also jointly attend the Advanced Sexual Assault Litigation Course at The Air Force Judge Advocate General's School. In Fiscal Year 2013, nearly 30 judge advocates attended three Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program courses and six AFOSI agents attended the first iteration of Advanced Sexual Assault Litigation Course.

In addition to the courses discussed above, trial counsel and Senior Trial Counsel may also take advantage of the advanced training courses offered by the other Military Departments and interagency partners. Examples include the Army's Sexual Assault Investigations and Prosecution Course, Army Military Police Special Victims Unit Investigations Course, Prosecuting Complex Cases, Air Force Advanced Trial Advocacy Course, Air Force's Intermediate and Advanced Sexual Assault Litigation Courses and the National District Attorney's Association Prosecution of Sexual Assault Course. These courses hone the skill sets of both trial counsel and AFOSI investigators while facilitating effective partnership in investigating and prosecuting special victim cases.

2.3 Describe your efforts to enhance training and/or plans for enhanced training for investigators of sexual violence. Include your measures of effectiveness or means by which you are measuring enhancements.

In 2012, AFOSI established a new Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program, specifically to train Air Force investigators and attorneys in advanced sexual assault investigation topics and techniques, discussed in more detail above. Advanced topics at the course include those discussed above, as well as advanced topics on predatory behaviors of some sexual assault perpetrators, advanced crime scene processing, special investigative techniques, domestic violence, and other related areas. Four iterations of the course have been held (one in 2012 and three in 2013) with 72 AFOSI special agents and 24 Air Force judge advocates graduating from the program. Three iterations of course are planned to be held in Fiscal Year 2014.

AFOSI uses a multi-pronged approach to measure the effectiveness of training. Staff members at the Air Force Special Investigations Academy use both written and practical

exams to test students' grasp of the material during training and hand out end-of-course critiques. They also solicit feedback from students' supervisors six months after the course ends on the effect training has had on each student's ability to conduct investigations. Additionally, Headquarters AFOSI reviews ten percent of the investigations closed each month and reports whether or not they meet/exceed AFOSI's published standards. Issues identified during case reviews are resolved with direct feedback to the field through a variety of venues and through changes to AFOSI policy and training, as appropriate.

2.4 Describe your Service's efforts to participate in Defense Enterprise Working Group of Military Criminal Investigation Organizations and Defense Criminal Investigative Services to assess and validate joint investigative technology, best practices, and resource efficiencies benchmarked against external law enforcement agencies.

The AFOSI Forensics Program Manager is the chair of the requirements working Group for some technology initiatives being developed at the Department of Defense level, as well as an active member of the Defense Forensic Enterprise Research, Development, Test and Evaluation working groups. AFOSI has also partnered with the FBI to look at possible solutions to technology requirements within the Department of Defense.

2.5 Describe your Military Criminal Investigative Organization's (MCIO) progress on establishment of a Working Group to review initial baseline, periodic refresher, and advanced sexual assault investigation training in order to establish common criteria, measures of effectiveness, and leverage training resources and expertise. If already in progress or completed, briefly describe recommendations, results, and ongoing efforts.

Senior headquarters staff from AFOSI, USACID and NCIS held several working group sessions in 2013 to assess MCIO baseline, periodic refresher and advanced sexual assault training. The working group is also assessing the extent to which training resources and expertise is being appropriately cross-utilized in advanced training. This working group was established in response to a recommendation in Department of Defense Inspector General Report 2013-043, pertaining to "Evaluation of the Military Criminal Investigative Organizations' Sexual Assault Investigation Training." The working group anticipates completing its assessment in early 2014.

2.6 Describe and provide documentation of your Service or Component's implementation of policy for retention of sexual assault documentation (e.g. DD Forms 2910 and 2911). Documentation should be included as an appendix.

The Air Force is rewriting AF Instruction 36-6001, *SAPR Program*, requiring retention of DD Forms 2910 and 2911 for 50 years in both restricted and unrestricted cases. AFOSI has published policy requiring retention of DD Forms 2910 and 2911 in AFOSI investigative case files and the retention of those files for 50 years. Specifically, AFOSIMAN 71-122, Volume 1, paragraph 4.3.3.9. mandates that agents "file hardcopies of the DD Form 2910 and DD Form 2911 in the AF Form 3986 of the case file, and attach electronic copies of the DD Forms 2910 and 2911 in I2MS." I2MS is AFOSI's electronic investigative information management system. In addition, AFOSI Manual 71-121, paragraph 3.1.9.7 directs "all adult sexual assault investigative reports will be retained for a period of 50 years."

2.7 Describe your efforts to review and implement policies and procedures that ensure all Unrestricted Reports of sexual assault (and attempts) against adults will be immediately reported to the MCIO, regardless of the severity of the allegation.

AFOSI investigates all allegations of rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and attempts to commit any of these offenses. Under Air Force Instruction 36-6001, para. 6.1.1, commanders notified of a sexual assault must take immediate steps to notify AFOSI or the appropriate criminal investigative agency. Paragraph 2.12 of the Air Force Instruction states that any Air Force military member or civilian employee (other than those authorized to receive confidential communications) who receives a report of a sexual assault incident about a subordinate in the individual's supervisory chain, shall, "as soon as possible, report the matter to the AFOSI." A violation of this provision may be punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (Article 92, failure to obey a lawful order) for military members or by administrative disciplinary action for civilian members.

Per Air Force Instruction 71-101, Volume 1, paragraph 1.5, "Commanders/Directors at all levels shall ensure that criminal allegations or suspected criminal allegations involving persons affiliated with the Department of Defense or any property or programs under their control or authority are referred to the appropriate Military Criminal Investigative Organization or law enforcement organization. Action authorities, or designees, will not order or permit any type of commander directed investigation or inquiry when there is an ongoing AFOSI investigation without coordinating with AFOSI and the servicing Staff Judge Advocate."

2.8 Describe efforts, policies, and/or programmatic changes undertaken to improve Service member confidence and/or victim participation in the investigative and military justice process, as well as how you are addressing the number of victims declining to participate. Include rate of conversion from Restricted to Unrestricted reporting.

AFOSI continued its efforts to improve its Sexual Crimes Investigations Training Program Course. The course curriculum was specifically developed to improve how investigators work with victims and, in turn, the overall quality of investigative products. Investigators receive training to help them better appreciate the challenges victims face in reporting sexual assaults; better understand how memory and recall are affected by trauma; and better enable them to appreciate how their own cognitive biases affect how they receive, process and integrate information into their case assessments and investigative theories. Additionally, investigators received both classroom and practical training in the use of cognitive interviewing, an interviewing technique proven through peer-reviewed research to result in a significant increase in both the quantity and quality of information received from victims and witnesses. Cognitive interviewing, a more open and less direct style of eliciting information, helps victims feel less pressured and more at ease in providing their recollection of events related to the criminal event.

In January, 2013, the Air Force established the federal government's first, large-scale Special Victims' Counsel program to provide victims of sexual assault with independent, military attorneys to represent them through all aspects of their case. The

establishment of the Special Victims' Counsel program has dramatically increased the support for Airmen who have been impacted by the crime of sexual assault. At the end of Fiscal Year 2013, of those Airmen who have been represented by Special Victims' Counsel whose cases have closed, 91% were "extremely satisfied" with the advice and support the Special Victims' Counsel provided during the Article 32 hearing and court-martial (the other 9% were satisfied) and 98% would recommend other victims request a Special Victims' Counsel. More information about the Special Victims' Counsel program is at section 3.3.

The Fiscal Year 2013 rate of conversion is 15.6%, which is an 1.1% more than the Fiscal Year 2012 rate of 14.5%.

2.9 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to the achievement of high competence in the investigation of sexual assault.

In Fiscal Year 2014, AFOSI will continue to use two improvement processes initiated in 2012: random quality case reviews and advanced sexual assault training.

In 2012, AFOSI started mandatory intermediate level (AFOSI Region) quality case reviews of all sexual assault investigations. Headquarters AFOSI also initiated a ten-percent random case review of recently completed sexual assault investigations. The Headquarters AFOSI case review results are reported to senior Headquarters AFOSI and field leaders on a monthly basis. These quality case review processes emphasize the importance of investigative sufficiency. AFOSI leadership will continue random case reviews in 2014.

AFOSI will also continue to provide advanced sexual assault training through its Sexual Crimes Investigation Training Program discussed in section 2.3, above. In Fiscal Year 2014, AFOSI will hold three additional courses that will train 54 additional agents and 18 additional military prosecutors. The course has received excellent end-of-course reviews and is one of AFOSI's most sought-after in-residence training courses.

The Department of Defense Inspector General has already announced its intention to conduct another comprehensive assessment in Fiscal Year 2014 of sexual assault cases closed in 2013. Comparison of the Fiscal Year 2014 assessment with Department of Defense Inspector General's 2012 assessment will allow us to see if progress has been made in improving case quality.

3. LOE 3—Accountability—The objective of accountability is to “achieve high competence in holding offenders appropriately accountable.”

3.1 Summarize your Service or Component's efforts to achieve the Accountability Endstate: “perpetrators are held appropriately accountable.”

The Air Force took a number of steps in Fiscal Year 2013 to enhance efforts to hold perpetrators accountable.

On May 16, 2013, Change 1 to Air Force Instruction 71-101, Volume 1, *Special Investigations*, was published. This change made the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI) the responsible investigative authority for all offenses of adult sexual assault. Prior to this, sexual assault allegations were divided between AFOSI

and Security Forces investigators. Although the Security Forces investigators are professional and effective criminal investigators, the consolidation of sexual assault investigations under AFOSI will facilitate greater information sharing and expertise, yielding thorough, accurate, and expert investigations. High-quality investigations are essential to successful prosecutions and administrative actions, which facilitate holding perpetrators accountable.

On June 17, 2013, the acting Secretary of the Air Force directed that – in all cases involving rape under Article 120(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, sexual assault (Article 120(b)), forcible sodomy (Article 125) and attempts to commit those offenses (Article 80) – the special court-martial convening authority would be required to provide the general court-martial convening authority (in the grade of brigadier general or higher) written notice of the initial disposition action taken within 30 days of taking such action. This notification increases the visibility of actions taken on sexual assault offenses by ensuring the general court-martial convening authorities are notified of the initial disposition of these cases by their subordinate commanders. This additional level of oversight contributes to holding perpetrators appropriately accountable.

In addition to the foregoing, the acting Secretary of the Air Force also directed on June 17, 2013, that AFOSI may not close out investigative files in cases of sexual assault until the general court-martial convening authority has signed a written report of command action for those cases. This additional requirement ensures AFOSI investigations are not inadvertently or prematurely closed. The requirement also creates a feedback mechanism whereby AFOSI is notified of the command action taken in each case. This mechanism facilitates the tracking of cases from investigation to resolution rather than having portions of cases worked by discrete offices.

As discussed above, the Air Force initiated implementation of a robust special victim's capability, which includes enhanced litigation and investigation training. In addition to this training, the Air Force has designated Special Victims Unit Senior Trial Counsel and specially trained Sexual Assault Investigators. The integration of these counsel and investigators help ensure high-quality investigations and prosecutions of perpetrators.

The Air Force embarked on an effort to publish sexual assault convictions to help ensure that the conclusions of perpetrators' cases are known to offenders' units, as well as the larger Air Force population. The Air Force synopsis cases resulting in conviction, providing a short overview of the cases and the result at trial. The synopses further identify the convicted perpetrator by name and base of assignment. These results were published on the Air Force's Judge Advocate General's website, and were publicly available. The Air Force partnered with *Air Force Times* in which *Air Force Times* agreed to publish the case synopses in both print and electronic formats. The first such publication is scheduled for early Fiscal Year 2014.

The Air Force has also adopted an aggressive administrative discharge policy, ensuring the commencement of discharge proceedings against any Airman found to have committed a sexual assault. Section 572 of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense

Authorization Act requires discharge processing for anyone convicted of – but did not receive a punitive discharge for – rape under Article 120(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, sexual assault (Article 120(b)), forcible sodomy (Article 125) and attempts to commit those offenses (Article 80). On July 2, 2013, the Air Force adopted a substantially broader and more stringent policy than required by the National Defense Authorization Act by publishing Interim Change 7 to both Air Force Instruction 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, and Air Force Instruction 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*. These instructions now require mandatory discharge processing for any Airman who commits a sexual-assault type offense, regardless of whether that person was tried by court-martial. Thus, an administrative action for a sexual-assault type offense will trigger the automatic discharge processing. Moreover, the range of offenses mandating administrative discharge processing is much broader than the four Uniform Code of Military Justice provisions cited in the National Defense Authorization Act. The Air Force Instruction provisions instead reach members who have committed the “touching” offenses of aggravated sexual contact and abusive sexual contact, in addition to the provisions listed in the National Defense Authorization Act. The discharge process is discussed in greater detail, below.

3.2 Describe your efforts to enhance training and/or plans for enhanced SAPR training for attorneys and military judges. Include your efforts to monitor training requirements to ensure the optimal number receive enhanced SAPR training and your measures of effectiveness.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program Procedures are governed by Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *SAPR Program Procedures*, which includes training requirements in four categories that apply to judge advocates: 1) annual training that is mandatory for all service members; 2) responder training that is required for judge advocates and Victim And Witness Assistance Program personnel; and 3) judge advocate training for judge advocates who are responsible for advising commanders on the investigation or disposition of, or who prosecute or defend, sexual assault cases; and 4) legal assistance attorney training to help ensure judge advocates have the capability to provide legal assistance to sexual assault victims.

Annual training is completed at the installation level under training programs established through the Air Force SAPR Office and installation SARCs. The Air Force Judge Advocate Corps has completed a training module that combines the requirements of responder training, judge advocate training, and legal assistance attorney training. A webcast to initially field this training is scheduled for December 11, 2013. Additionally, different Major Commands and installation legal offices are using the expertise and experience of their personnel to help ensure SAPR training requirements are met. All SAPR training requirements are monitored by unit training monitors. Additionally, SAPR training is an inspection item so that installations undergoing inspections pursuant to Article 6 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice are inspected on whether they are fulfilling SAPR training requirements.

All 25 active duty and reserve Air Force trial judges completed live SAPR training in 2013. In April, 2013, the nine newly appointed Air Force trial judges graduated from the

Army Judge Advocate General's School's 3-week Judges Course, which contained seminars and training on all aspects of sexual assault litigation. In addition, in Fiscal Year 2014, the Air Force Trial Judiciary will make sexual assault the keynote topic for its 3-day Joint Military Judges Annual Training, which will be attended by judges in all the services.

3.3 Describe your Service's efforts to conduct an assessment of Department of Defense Pilot Program for Special Victims' Counsel. If an assessment has been completed, explain findings and recommendations.

The Air Force, as the first service to implement the Special Victims' Counsel program, proactively initiated a Victim Impact Survey, with feedback from several civilian subject matter experts incorporated into the questions and format, that was fielded on March 20, 2013 in order to measure program effectiveness as a whole. The survey measures whether Special Victims' Counsel are effectively assisting their clients with various military justice matters, including assisting them with understanding the investigative and courts-martial processes, their rights as crime victims, and whether they were able to exercise their rights as crime victims. The survey also measures victims' subjective feelings on whether they felt supported throughout the military justice process. The survey is provided to all sexual assault victims involved in the military justice process, including those represented by a Special Victims' Counsel and those who are not.

Results at the end of Fiscal Year 2013 include:

- 91% "extremely satisfied" with the advice and support Special Victims' Counsel provided during the Article 32 hearing and court-martial;
- 98% would recommend other victims request an Special Victims' Counsel;
- 93% indicated their Special Victims' Counsel advocated effectively on their behalf;
- 95% indicated their Special Victims' Counsel helped them understand the investigation and court-martial processes

The Special Victims' Counsel program provided a report on the first six months of the program's operation to the Department of Defense's General Counsel on September 1, 2013. The report provided an initial review of the Special Victims' Counsel program and included information on: 1) the statutory and policy background on the establishment of the program, 2) demographics of victim-clients represented, 3) structure and resources of the program, 4) training for Special Victims' Counsel, 5) training and outreach efforts Special Victims' Counsel have conducted around the Air Force, 6) feedback from victim-clients, and 7) successes and challenges Special Victims' Counsel have had in carrying out their duties. The report also provided an initial assessment of whether Special Victims' Counsel Program objectives are being met and found based on the feedback in the Victim Impact Surveys that the Special Victims' Counsel program is meeting these objectives of providing independent representation, empowering victims, building and sustaining victim resiliency, and increasing the level of legal assistance provided to victims. The conclusion also pointed out the disparity in demand between victims who sought assistance from the Special Victims' Counsel program and those who sought legal assistance under the Air Force traditional legal assistance program. In its first six months of operation, 489 victims of sexual assault requested Special Victims' Counsel

assistance, compared to the 14 victims who sought legal assistance under the Air Force traditional legal assistance program in Fiscal Year 2012.

The report described above was completed by the Special Victims' Counsel program itself. Separately, the Joint Service Committee on Military Justice completed an independent assessment of the Air Force Special Victims' Counsel Program for the General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

3.4 Describe your efforts to expand the availability, sequencing, and scope of commander's legal courses. Include your measures of effectiveness.

Commanders receive legal training at the Wing Commanders Course, Group Commanders Course, Squadron Commanders Course, and from their Staff Judge Advocate and servicing legal office throughout their command time. Further, as officers, these commanders have received various levels of professional military education which include training and discussions of many of the personnel and command issues which they face. These courses include Squadron Officer School as a junior officer, Staff College as a mid-grade officer and War College as a senior officer.

Commanders receive a briefing from a Judge Advocate General's Corps representative during their initial orientation period when they assume command. This is followed by regular training and interactions such as quarterly Status of Discipline meetings. Issues discussed at Status of Discipline meetings, in accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-201, *Administration of Military Justice*, include courts-martial and nonjudicial punishment processing times, types of offenses, and demographic data for closed cases. The Status of Discipline meetings provide an opportunity for commanders to hear how their fellow commanders handled cases, and it is an opportunity for the Staff Judge Advocate to provide lessons learned and training as necessary.

3.5 Describe your efforts to assess the effectiveness of the policy to elevate initial disposition authority to a Special Court Martial Convening Authority in the grade of O-6 or higher. Provide documentation in the appendix. If assessment complete, briefly describe results and recommendations.

The Air Force requires Special Court-Martial Convening Authorities who serve as initial disposition authorities for sexual assault cases to notify the General Court-Martial Convening Authority, in writing, of the initial disposition decision in such cases within 30 days of the initial disposition. Doing so ensures the General Court-Martial Convening Authority is aware of the actions taken with the command and allows the General Court-Martial Convening Authority to intervene and take jurisdiction over a case if he/she deems it necessary in the interests of justice.

In an April, 2012, memorandum, the Secretary of Defense directed that, effective June 28, 2012, in certain sexual assault cases, the initial disposition authority under the Uniform Code of Military Justice be elevated to commanders who possess at least special court-martial convening authority and who are in the O-6 grade or higher. The Air Force has implemented this directive through education of The Judge Advocate General's Corps and the provision of templates for legal offices. The Air Force cites the April, 2012, memorandum as authority for the elevated initial disposition authority.

In Fiscal Year 2014, the Air Force will seek input from legal offices, SARCs, and commanders in order to do so. Once this feedback has been collected and evaluated, the Air Force will be better able to assess the effectiveness and the impacts of the elevation of initial disposition authority.

3.6 Describe any treatment or rehabilitation programs implemented by your Service or Component for those members who have been convicted of a sexual assault. Include any pertinent referrals such as drug and alcohol counseling, or other types of counseling or intervention.

Members convicted of a sexual assault offense who are sentenced to confinement lengths qualifying for incarceration at larger confinement facilities (e.g., Miramar Naval Confinement Facility or Leavenworth) may receive appropriate counseling and intervention, to include drug and alcohol counseling. While the Air Force does not operate those facilities, it supports them with assigned medical personnel.

3.7 List updates or efforts to update policies requiring the processing for administrative separation of any member convicted of a sexual assault. Include documentation in the appendix.

The Air Force initiated new administrative discharge provisions to enhance efforts to hold perpetrators appropriately accountable. Involuntary discharge proceedings will now be initiated for Air Force members who commit sexual assault (including contact offenses), sexual assault of a child, or attempt to commit these offenses, unless a waiver is granted. If discharge action is warranted, the process must start promptly. Discharge action may be waived only if the commander determines the member meets certain limited retention criteria and the request for a waiver of mandatory discharge processing is approved by the General Court-Martial Convening Authority.

The discharge procedures for officers found in Air Force Instruction 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, were amended with Interim Change 7 on July 2, 2013. Paragraph 3.3 of this instruction now addresses administrative discharge processing for officers who have committed a sexual assault, without regard to whether or not they were convicted in court of the assault. The discharge procedures for enlisted members are found in Air Force Instruction 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*. This instruction was amended on July 2, 2013 with Interim Change 7, and paragraph 5.55 addresses discharge processing for enlisted members who have committed sexual assault.

Under these instructions, members who commit sexual assault (consisting of rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, or attempts to commit any of those offenses) against an adult or child are subject to administrative discharge processing. When a commander receives information indicating the service member committed an act rendering the service member subject to discharge, the commander will either initiate discharge proceedings or initiate a waiver of the discharge proceedings. In deciding whether or not to recommend a waiver, commanders must give full consideration to the victim's views on retention of the service member, the nature of the offense, all the circumstances surrounding the offense, any matters in extenuation, the member's military record, and the member's potential for future productive service. The commander must also determine that the

following specific retention criteria are met before recommending a waiver of discharge processing:

- The conduct surrounding and including the sexual assault is a departure from the member's usual and customary behavior;
- The conduct surrounding and including the sexual assault under all circumstances is not likely to recur;
- The sexual assault did not involve the penetration, however slight, of the vulva or anus or mouth of another by any part of the body or by any object, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, or degrade any person or to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;
- The sexual assault was not committed by:
 - using force causing or likely to cause death or grievous bodily harm to any person,
 - threatening or placing the other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, grievous bodily harm, or kidnapping,
 - first rendering the other person unconscious, or
 - administering to the other person by force or threat of force, or without the knowledge or consent of the person, a drug, intoxicant, or other similar substance and thereby substantially impairing the ability of the other person to appraise or control conduct;
- The sexual assault was not the result of an abuse of rank, grade, authority or position.
- Under the particular circumstances of the case, the service member's continued presence in the Air Force is consistent with the interest of the Air Force in maintaining proper discipline, good order, leadership and morale.

In addition to the above criteria, the victim's views on retention and the impact on the victim must be considered.

3.8 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to the achievement of high competence in holding offenders appropriately accountable.

During Fiscal Year 2014, the Air Force will conduct several research programs to better understand perpetrators. Collectively, the research will provide data on grooming tactics of perpetrators, their approaches to manipulation and boundary testing, and their methods for selecting victims. The studies will look for patterns among offenders' behaviors and characteristics, as well as prior accusations of sexual assault or other crimes. If these studies identify actionable information, Air Force policies and training will be adjusted to incorporate the study results.

AFOSI plans to continue efforts to improve the quality of its investigative products by conducting random quality reviews of investigations, and by providing high quality basic and advanced training to its investigators.

The Air Force SAPR Office will address nearly every wing commander in the Air Force at the Air Force Chief of Staff's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Leadership Summit, scheduled for December 11-12, 2013. The purpose of this Summit is not only to reinforce the importance of eradicating sexual assault from the military, but also to address specific concepts, such as commanders' roles in ensuring offenders are held accountable. The Summit will cover such issues as biases and misconceptions that have interfered with Air Force efforts to hold offenders accountable and the connection between sexual harassment and sexual assault. Similarly, the Air Force SAPR Office intends to deliver the same message to The Judge Advocate General's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Summit, scheduled for December 17-18, 2013.

The Air Force intends to continue publishing synopses of sexual assault convictions both on publicly available websites, as well as in *Air Force Times*, throughout Fiscal Year 2014, on a monthly basis.

4. LOE 4—Advocacy/Victim Assistance--The objective of advocacy/victim assistance is to “deliver consistent and effective victim support, response, and reporting options.”

4.1 Summarize your Service or Component's efforts to achieve the Advocacy/Victim Assistance Endstate: “Department of Defense provides high quality services and support to instill confidence and trust, strengthen resilience, and inspire victims to report.”

The Air Force delivers high quality services and victim support with a comprehensive approach to its response system. The Air Force ensures its SAPR personnel are properly trained and equipped to provide services to victims, educate commanders and Airmen, and to collect meaningful data about the crime of sexual assault. The SARC course is designed to thoroughly prepare these critical front-line personnel.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force embarked on a comprehensive validation and revision of its SARC course, which is conducted at Air University's Ira C. Eaker Center for professional Development at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. This review incorporated the findings and recommendations in the Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office report, “Observation of SARC and Victim Advocate Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Training,” published on January 31, 2013. The new course will be fielded in Fiscal Year 2014 and will be expanded from five days to eight days. The new course curriculum is focused on providing students information that specifically relates to their responsibilities as a SARC or full time Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. The new course will create an active learning environment that is based on adult learning theory. Students will process new information and apply new concepts and skills with enhanced interactive role plays, small group discussions, and exercises that allow for application of their learning. SARCs and sexual assault victim advocates will practice completing forms, conducting intakes, completing DSAID entries, and conducting training. Focus will be placed on interpersonal communication, facilitation skills, and instruction by requiring students to create and deliver a presentation for critique by course faculty and fellow students. In addition, the SARC course will include a pre- and post-assessment of the students' knowledge.

The Air Force has seen tremendous success with the Special Victims' Counsel program. The feedback from victims represented by Special Victims' Counsel has shown that Special Victims' Counsels are extremely well received by their clients, with 98% of the clients saying they would recommend Special Victims' Counsel to other victims. By the end of Fiscal Year 2013, 489 Airmen had requested Special Victims' Counsel services. Special Victims' Counsel are highly competent, trained legal professionals that achieved an immediate and substantial victory early in the program when the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces ruled that victims had the right to be heard through their Special Victims' Counsel, at least with respect to pre-trial evidentiary hearings. Special Victims' Counsel enabled their clients to participate intelligently and effectively in the investigation and prosecution processes with confidence in their decision to make a report. Special Victims' Counsels are not in the installation chain of command, but have direct access to that chain allowing them the opportunity to advocate directly on their client's behalf. The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force issued a memorandum to all Staff Judge Advocates on October 7, 2013, reemphasizing the importance of victims of sexual assault having meaningful access to convening authorities. The memorandum specifically states that "where practical, Staff Judge Advocates and trial counsel should seek to help ensure victims of sexual assault and/or their Special Victims' Counsel are given meaningful opportunities to consult with convening authorities, either in writing, telephonically, or in person, prior to any decision concerning whether or not to prosecute, pursue a disposition by plea, or dismiss charges involving the victim." The visibility and proven professional competence of the Special Victims' Counsel program is designed to inspire victims to report, knowing that they will be supported not only by SAPR personnel, but also through legal representation by a Special Victims' Counsel.

Senior Air Force leaders have employed interactive technology to communicate with Airmen about the importance of preventing sexual assault, maintaining climates of dignity and respect, and holding offenders accountable. On July 16, 2013, the Vice Chief of Staff launched the "Every Airman Counts" initiative. Part of this initiative includes an outward-facing blog in which Airmen and members of the public can both view content about the issue of sexual assault in the military as well as engage in frank, open discussion about these topics. The Air Force purposely adopted a liberal comment policy in which only egregious comments that violate the site's terms of service are rejected (e.g., using profanity, defamation, and so on) in order to facilitate discussion. Senior leaders and SAPR professionals have been able to monitor these discussions to more clearly understand common biases, mindsets, and opinions about sexual assault.

The Vice Chief of Staff has also embarked on an initiative to host "senior leader web chats" between Air Force senior leaders and Airmen in the field. These real-time, two-way broadcasts will use technology that allows senior leaders to both communicate Air Force visions and initiatives to Airmen, but also to take questions from the Airmen. The first of these web chats is planned for early Fiscal Year 2014.

The Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office conducted focus groups

at 14 bases from July 22 to September 27, 2013, in order to provide an assessment on attitudes and experiences regarding sexual assault in the Air Force. The focus group teams met with more than 1,400 Airmen from multiple rank demographics and all Major Commands. Focus groups were also held with commanders at the installations as well as survivors of sexual assault who agreed to meet with select focus group leaders. About half of the Airmen in the focus groups were volunteers, while the rest were randomly selected and directed to participate. Participants included civilians and Air Force Reservists. The focus groups helped the Air Force understand misconceptions about sexual assault and allowed Airmen to express their thoughts about Air Force climate and leadership. The focus groups provided additional feedback about sexual assault training as well as indicators of best practices regarding sexual assault prevention and awareness at the installation level. Meeting with Airmen face-to-face allowed the Air Force to both demonstrate high-level commitment to this issue and senior-leader empathy for and commitment to victims. These small group discussions allowed the Air Force to learn about challenges victims face to further inform specific initiatives to strengthen their resilience and inspire victims to report.

The Air Force requires forensic examiner training that meets Department of Justice recommendations. Privileged providers and sexual assault nurse examiners are used to perform sexual assault forensic examinations at selected military treatment facilities, typically where 24-hour emergency services are available. In many Air Force locations, civilian facilities and examiners are available and possess the appropriate expertise. If civilian facilities are used, then the Air Force military treatment facilities will complete a memorandum of understanding with that civilian facility. Of the 74 Air Force facilities, 22 provide examiners in-house or use nearby Department of Defense facilities, with the remaining 52 using civilian facilities. One Air Force installation contracts with a specific provider to come onto the installation to perform exams on an as-needed basis. The Air Force has also updated the mental health patient informed consent document to include a specific reference to the patient's right to obtain a second opinion upon receiving certain mental health diagnoses. Finally, the Air Force has established a policy/execution working group to identify and address issues and facilitate information flow to and from military treatment facilities.

The Air Force SAPR Office has partnered with the Air Force Aid Society to provide specific forms of victim support. In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force Aid Society agreed to provide financial assistance to ten victims by facilitating travel of family members to support victims, facilitating travel of victims to see their families, replacing items confiscated by investigators (such as phones, laptops, bed linens, and similar items). The Air Force SAPR Office was also able to create a process in which the Air Force Aid Society can provide support to victims through the installation SARC, allowing the victim to maximize their privacy and minimize the dissemination of personally identifying information.

4.2 List the total number of full-time SARC/SAPR victim advocates serving at brigade or equivalent level. If not at 100%, describe your efforts to achieve 100% fill.

Full-time SARCs: 114 (84 are required).

Victim Advocates: 221 (84 are required).

4.3 List the total number SARCs and SAPR victim advocates certified in Fiscal Year 2013. If not at 100%, describe your efforts to achieve 100% certified.

The Air Force has 114 certified SARCs (some are serving in deputy/alternate SARC positions), and 2,306 certified SAPR victim advocates (these include full-time and part-time volunteer victim advocates).

4.4 Describe your efforts to develop victim continuity of care protocol in collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs and external Veterans Service Organizations.

Every Airman who is separating or retiring from the Air Force receives a briefing on his or her Veterans Affairs benefits, to specifically include the availability of medical treatment for victims of military sexual trauma.

Air Force SAPR leadership has formed a strong relationship with the Department of Veterans Affairs' National Military Sexual Trauma Team. The team's goal is to help ensure service members who are transitioning out of the military and those who are newly discharged Veterans from the military are aware of Veterans Affairs' services and benefits.

The Air Force Medical Service has Executive Staff Oversight of every Military Treatment Facility responsible for care coordination of service members transitioning out of the military in need of Veterans Affairs' services.

4.5 Describe your efforts to improve the portability and availability of victim services in deployed environments, ensuring continuity of victim care. Include a description of the steps taken during that year to ensure that trained personnel, appropriate supplies, and transportation resources are accessible to deployed units in order to provide an appropriate and timely response in any case of reported sexual assault in a deployed unit, location, or environment.

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force maintained six deployed SARCs, one at each Air Expeditionary Wing (based in Kyrgyzstan, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, and two in Afghanistan). Deployed Air Force SARCs provide a wide array of support to the deployed environment, including data-collection and reporting efforts, such as weekly activity reports, after-action reports, and quarterly statistics. The headquarters holds a monthly teleconference with the SARCs who service the deployed environment in order to provide real-time updates on policy changes and revisions. The deployed-environment SARCs regularly report on trips they make to the Forward Operating Bases in the deployed environment and the ongoing efforts to help ensure that Airmen have access to reporting channels and support services. SAPR Operations continues to use USAFCENT points of contact for administrative issues regarding SARC deployments.

All six of these SARCs, as well as their associated victim advocates, are trained prior to deployment and are credentialed through the National Organization of Victims Assistance. While deployed, personnel are required to complete refresher training and limited victim advocate training. Victim services include medical, mental health, legal, chaplain/spiritual support, Special Victims' Counsel services, and victim advocacy.

During Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force Medical Service staffed six remote sites in the deployed environment with sexual assault forensic examiners, trained to Department of Justice standards. Stationing examiners in the field both expedites care and minimizes transportation challenges.

In conjunction with the Department of Defense mandated SAPR Stand-Down Day, all six Air Expeditionary Wings met the requirements set by the Secretary of the Air Force, even during ongoing combat operations. The Combined Forces Air Component Commander also created a 15-minute video that illustrated his and the Command Chief's conviction in eradicating sexual assault from Air Force ranks. All six Air Expeditionary Wing commanders mandated all Air Force flight commanders and chiefs to join them in viewing the video. The wing commanders then led group discussions about the material with their Airmen. This video helped ensure deployed Airmen knew when/how to receive SAPR services in theater and how to act as active bystanders. 100% of these wings' populations participated.

All deployed Airmen going into the deployed environment receive pre-deployment training. Airmen deploying within Air Expeditionary Wing confines are met and briefed by the Air Expeditionary Wing SARC. The Airmen are provided with name of the SARC, location of SARC Office and a detailed description of how the SARC ensures care in the AOR. Airmen deploying in support of Joint operations are provided the same information through email and telephone since they are at locations where the Air Force is not the Service lead.

The Air Force has taken first steps to add to services available to Department of Defense civilian employees and their family dependents (18 years and older) and Department of Defense contractors in support of overseas contingency operations who are victims of sexual assault. The policy provides limited emergency care medical services at a medical treatment facility for personnel otherwise not authorized to receive such care. However, all victims of sexual assault in deployed locations are transported to an appropriate evaluation site, evaluated, treated for injuries (if any), and offered SARC and victim advocate assistance, along with the option of a Sexual Assault Forensic Exam as quickly as possible. It is Air Force policy to respond to sexual assault victims not otherwise entitled to care services at a standard equal to that allowed by law in response to any medical emergency care given.

4.6 Describe revised policies and/or procedures developed that allow Reserve Component Service members who are victims of sexual assault while on active duty to remain on active duty status to obtain the treatment and support afforded active duty members. Include documentation in the appendix.

Medical continuation – allowing Reserve Component members to remain on active duty past the normal expiration of Reserve orders – authorizes medical care for members who incur or aggravate an injury in the line of duty, and to provide pay and allowances while they are being evaluated, treated for, or recovering from a service-connected injury. Air Force Instruction 36-2910, *Line of Duty Determination, Medical Continuation, and Incapacitation Pay*, is in draft and should be finalized by March, 2014. Injuries and illnesses incurred as a result of sexual assault while performing active service or

inactive duty training are specifically included as injuries and illnesses qualifying for medical continuation. The draft Air Force Instruction explains that continued medical entitlements beyond initial treatment remain dependent on a line of duty determination as to whether or not the sexual assault incident occurred in an active status or inactive duty training status. If the member is found to have been in the line of duty at the time of the assault, Reserve Component members may be entitled to medical continuation orders for the purpose of military treatment. Members who meet eligibility criteria for medical continuation must volunteer for retention or recall to duty under 10 U.S. Code Sec. 12301(h), *Reserve Components Generally*, or Title 32, U.S. Code.

4.7 Describe your efforts to enhance sexual assault training for health care providers. Include requirements that ensure training conforms to "A National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adults/Adolescents"; how to handle a Restricted Report; and how to conduct the SAFE exam.

The Air Force Medical Operations Agency partnered with the Air Force SAPR Office and civilian experts to develop a computer-based training with small group discussion questions for mental health staff on sexual assault awareness and treatment. It is scheduled for completion in March, 2014. Training will be focused on increasing sensitivity/knowledge of mental health staff about sexual assault victims, explaining the neurobiology of trauma, and specific treatment considerations for sexual assault victims.

In addition to all other SAPR training and along with all health care personnel, all providers must take SAPR First Responder Training for Health Care Personnel. This training was revised to include updated Department of Defense Instruction requirements and emphasize the Restricted Reporting process. Air Force Instruction 44-102, *Medical Care Management*, establishes the requirement for provider training in reference to performing sexual assault exams; the training must conform to "A National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adults/Adolescents." Providers performing sexual assault examinations are required to complete refresher training annually and repeat initial training requirements every five years, at a minimum.

To facilitate knowledge and help ensure appropriate guidance is readily available, military treatment facilities providing sexual assault exams must help ensure examiners have access to and are familiar with the guidance found in: U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, "*A National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adults/Adolescents*"; Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures*; and Air Force Instruction 36-6001, *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR)*.

4.8 Describe sexual assault related health care initiatives undertaken by your Service in Fiscal Year 2013. Include mental health treatment programs and follow-up procedures that are gender-responsive, culturally competent, and recovery-oriented.

The Air Force Medical Operations Agency partnered with the Air Force SAPR Office and civilian experts to develop an enhanced computer-based educational module with small group discussion questions for mental health staff on sexual assault awareness and treatment. It is scheduled for completion in March, 2014. Training will focus on

increasing sensitivity/knowledge of mental health staff about sexual assault victims, explaining the neurobiology of trauma, and specific treatment considerations for sexual assault victims.

In addition, the Air Force Medical Operations Agency, in partnership with the Air Force SAPR Office, initiated a revision of Air Force Instruction 44-172, *Mental Health*, provisions regarding the patient informed consent document to clearly inform patients about the option of obtaining a second opinion regarding diagnosis or treatment recommendations (policy already exists in Air Force Instruction 10-203, *Duty Limiting Conditions*).

Also, the Air Force Surgeon General, in partnership with the Air Force SAPR Office developed a procedure for medical review of mental health recommendations for administrative separations for victims of sexual assault. Once approved by Air Force leadership, guidance will be disseminated; reviews may begin as early as Spring 2014.

4.9 List the number of victims, if any, whose care was hindered due to lack of SAFE kits or timely access to appropriate laboratory testing resources and describe the measures you took to remedy the situation.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force did not have victims whose care was hindered due to lack of SAFE kits or timely access to appropriate laboratory testing resources.

4.10 List initiatives and programs implemented to reduce the stigma and overcome barriers associated with reporting sexual assault.

A critical component to reducing the stigma and overcoming barriers associated with reporting sexual assault is the establishment of command climates of dignity and respect. The Air Force formed a cross-functional working group to assess methods in which the Air Force could assess the performance of commanders in establishing command climates of dignity and respect, to require commanders to incorporate SAPR prevention and victim care principles in their commands, and to hold those commanders accountable. The working group created proposals which will be adopted in Fiscal Year 2014. The proposals include changing feedback and performance report forms for all Airmen so that their contributions to healthy climates are specifically considered and captured in official records used for promotion and assignment decisions. Moreover, commanders will conduct unit climate assessments within 120 days of taking command, and annually thereafter. The results will be provided to the commander's superior officer, as well as be briefed to the unit members. Finally, an Inspector General Special Interest Item was proposed to specifically address commanders' implementation of prevention and victim care principles.

In order for Airmen to be more comfortable reporting, the Air Force SAPR Office provided instruction at the squadron commander courses in Fiscal Year 2013 through the Major Command SARCs. The focus of the education was to teach squadron commanders how to interact with victims. A large part of the fear of reporting is the shame/stigma. By educating commanders, Air Force leadership should become better equipped to handle reports of sexual assault, to create environments supportive of victims, and to encourage Airmen to report incidents of sexual assault. The instruction is conducted by teams of judge advocates, AFOSI investigators, and SAPR personnel.

The instruction teams teach commanders to recognize their own biases and what command actions can interfere with reporting. The team further addresses the problem of victim-blaming, characteristics of perpetrators, and the impact of sexual assault (as well as the investigative and judicial processes) on victims.

The Air Force has also worked to partner with survivors of sexual assault to produce short videos about their experiences. These videos were posted on the Every Airman Counts blog, discussed above. One purpose of these videos was to highlight the services victims are able to receive by coming forward and reporting their assaults. Similarly, the Air Force has been identifying victims who are willing to speak publicly about their experiences so that they can educate Air Force leaders and Airmen about removing barriers to and the stigma attached to reporting.

Currently the Air Force has three survivor videos and one survivor article posted on the blog. These videos plus the article had 15,304 hits on the day of their release. In the first video, the survivor recounts being raped and shares her experience with a message of empowering other survivors to come forward for the emotional, medical and legal support they need. In the other two videos, the survivors' message is the importance of educating Airmen on sexual assault and how to recognize it. The survivor article was written by an anonymous survivor who communicates the message that recovery services are available through SARCs, no matter how far in the past the assault occurred.

4.11 Describe what measures have been taken by your Service to ensure that Service members are informed in a timely manner of the member's option to request a Military Protective Order (Military Protective Order) from the command of assignment. Include documentation that requires law enforcement agents to document Military Protective Orders in their investigative case files, to include documentation for Reserve Component personnel in title 10 status.

When a service member makes an initial election to make an unrestricted report of sexual assault, Air Force SARCs advise – and the member annotates on the DD Form 2910, *Victim Reporting Preference Statement* – that, “depending on the facts of [the] case, [the member] may request a Military Protective Order,” and that the member “also [has] the option of requesting a Civilian Protective Order from civilian courts.” If the service member elects to make a restricted report, Air Force SARCs advise – and the member annotates on the DD Form 2910 – that, the member “understand[s] that certain protective actions, such as a Military Protective Order and/or Civilian Protective Order against the offender ... will NOT be available.” Likewise, the Commander's Checklist for Unrestricted Reports included in AFI 36-6001, *SAPR Program, Attachment 2*, requires the commander to determine if the victim desires or needs a protective order, particularly if the victim and alleged perpetrator are assigned to the same command, unit, duty location, or living quarters.

Air Force judge advocates who serve at the base level work hand-in-hand with commanders and investigators from the initiation of sexual assault cases. The judge advocates explain the utility and limitations of the protective orders to commanders, as well as assist in drafting the orders.

As discussed above, the establishment of Special Victims' Counsel to represent and protect victims and their rights has also enhanced a victim's ability to seek and request a Military Protective Order. Special Victims' Counsels are likewise experienced judge advocates and will discuss whether a Military Protective Order would be advantageous with their clients.

Headquarters Air Force OSI has inserted all Military Protective Order requirements levied on the Military Criminal Investigation Organizations by Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *SAPR Program Procedures*, into the newest re-write of AFOSI Manual 71-121. AFOSI Manual 71-121 is still in review, pending publication. Once published, it will require agents to document Military Protective Orders and Civilian Protective Orders for both active duty personnel and Reserve Component personnel in Title 10 status in their reports of investigation for sexual assault offenses. It will also require agents to inform the local Case Management Group chair and co-chair on the existence of any known Military Protective Orders.

4.12 Describe and provide documentation of your Service or Component's expedited victim transfer request policy, including measures taken to ensure victims are informed in a timely manner of their right to request an expedited transfer. Documentation should be included as an appendix.

When a service member is first electing whether to make an unrestricted or restricted report of sexual assault, Air Force SARCs will advise and victims will annotate on the DD Form 2910 that they understand members making an unrestricted report may request an expedited transfer (temporary or permanent) to a different installation or to a different location on the same installation. Similarly, victims annotate they understand that restricted reporting does not provide this opportunity.

To help ensure Airmen are being properly cared for, the Air Force drafted a policy clarification ahead of the permanent policy revision. The guidance details the steps a SARC, victim advocate, and the requesting commander will take during the expedited transfer process. Included are sample memorandums to be completed, what the victim needs to be counseled on prior to granting the request, timelines that must be followed, alleged offender movement options, use of the Case Management Group for aid in making the decision, and a processing checklist.

4.12.1 Pertaining to temporary and/or permanent local expedited transfers (a different location within their assigned command or installation), provide:

- The number requested - 17
- The number approved as the victim requested - 17
- The number approved different than the victim requested - 0
- The number denied and a summary of why - NA
- The number moved within 30 days of approval - Air Force does not track
- The number moved after 30 days of approval - Air Force does not track

4.12.2 Pertaining to permanent requested expedited transfers (from their assigned command or installation), provide:

- The number requested - 118

- The number approved as the victim requested - 109
- The number approved different than the victim requested - 0
- The number denied and a summary of why – 9
 - Expedited transfers denied were typically denied due to conflicts with other personnel actions. For example, one individual requesting an expedited transfer was pending trial by court-martial. In most cases, however, the requesters were facing a Medical Evaluation Board with the potential for a medical separation. The Air Force SAPR Office is investigating ways to avoid denials of expedited transfer requests based upon personnel processes.
- The number moved within 30 days of approval – Air Force does not track
- The number moved after 30 days of approval – Air Force does not track

The Air Force SAPR Office has identified areas for improvement with respect to tracking the expedited transfer application process. The Air Force will be strengthening data collection practices in this area in Fiscal Year 2014.

4.13 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to delivering consistent and effective victim support, response, and reporting options.

The Air Force plans to finalize a new strategic plan complementary to the Department of Defense’s strategy for preventing and responding to sexual assault. The Air Force has identified three fundamental effects this strategy is intended to produce: victims come forward, perpetrators are neutralized, and Air Force climate is transformed. In order to encourage victims to come forward, the Air Force must foster an environment where Airmen believe reports of sexual assault will be taken seriously; their privacy and legal rights will be protected at all levels; and victims who do come forward will be provided realistic and accurate information explaining the process to assist them in establishing expectations.

The Air Force will conduct four iterations of the revamped and expanded SARC course at Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama. Courses are scheduled for January, February, April, and September.

The Air Force Chief of Staff will host a Leadership Summit to be attended by all wing commanders, command chiefs, and SARCs. Blocks of instruction will cover such issues as victim trauma and recovery and victim perspectives.

The Judge Advocate General will host a SAPR Summit to be attended by all Staff Judge Advocates and law office superintendents. The Summit will feature blocks of instruction on the neurobiology of trauma, Special Victim Counsel support, common victim legal issues, and victim collateral misconduct.

The Air Force will conduct two service-wide SAPR “Stand-Down” Days in Fiscal Year 2014. The training will include scenario-based discussions, subject-matter expert education on Victimology and victim care, and in-depth indoctrination of legal responsibilities of commanders handling sexual assault cases.

The Air Force plans to expand the Special Victims’ Counsel program by adding five additional attorneys and assessing whether efficiencies can be achieved by moving

some counsel to different installations.

The Air Force will continue to work with the Air Force Aid Society in an effort to expand support available to victims. Specific initiatives include funding for safe rooms and replacement of items seized by investigators (such as phones, laptops, and bed linens).

The Air Force will start specifically assessing Airmen on how they contributed to climates of dignity and respect. Feedback and evaluation forms for every Airman will be modified to help ensure organizational climate is discussed during feedback sessions. Climate assessments will be mandated within the first 120 days of a commander assuming command and annually thereafter. The results of these assessments will be briefed to the commander's superior officer, as well as to the members of the unit. A Special Interest Item for the Inspector General's new Unit Effectiveness System will be established to assess to what degree commanders have developed a command climate of dignity and respect, and to what degree SAPR prevention and victim care principles have been implemented within their commands.

To measure the effectiveness of Air Force efforts in supporting victims, the Air Force will field a new Victim Experiences Survey, replacing the existing Victim Impact Survey. This expanded survey will evaluate each individual and/or agency the victim deals with during the reporting, investigative, and judicial processes, to include first responders and the medical community. The Victim Experiences Survey will further ask victims specific questions about the climate in their unit.

5. LOE 5—Assessment—The objective of assessment is to “effectively standardize, measure, analyze, assess, and report program progress.”

5.1 Summarize your Service or Component's efforts to achieve the Assessment Endstate: “Department of Defense incorporates responsive, meaningful, and accurate systems of measurement and evaluation into every aspect of the SAPR program.”

The Air Force initiated a variety of assessments to achieve the Assessment Endstate. The main metric of interest, sexual assault prevalence, will be measured annually: biennially by the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty, and biennially on opposite years by the Air Force. The Air Force will also be assessing various aspects of culture/climate, such as confidence in the chain of command, willingness to intervene, and how safe the environment feels, through the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Organizational Climate Survey. This survey is fielded within 120 days of command change and annually thereafter. Additionally, training, SAPR down-days, and educational initiatives will be followed with a questionnaire to assess the efficacy of the training. Currently, The Judge Advocate General's Corps has an existing survey assessing Special Victims' Counsel efficacy and the Victim and Witness Assistance Program. The Air Force is enhancing this product to evaluate victims' experience with each individual and agency the victim deals with during the reporting, investigative, and judicial processes, to include first responders and the medical community. The victim experiences survey will further ask victims specific questions about the climate in their unit.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office published a weekly “kneeboard” set of slides which include tables and graphs of the current state of the data in the Defense Sexual Assault Institute Database. This “kneeboard” is designed to provide a synopsis of the current state of sexual assault in the Air Force on a week-to-week basis in an accessible, easy-to-read format. The kneeboard is delivered to Air Force wing commanders and Major Command Staff Judge Advocates each week. Examples of data include the number of reports (restricted and unrestricted); the gender of the victims and subjects; the number of cases involving alcohol; and the length of time between the incident and the report being made.

Lastly, the Air Force works alongside the other Services to provide data for the Department of Defense sexual assault-related metrics which include reporting, military justice, and investigative process data.

5.2 Describe oversight activities during Fiscal Year 2013 that assess the SAPR program effectiveness. Include frequency, methods used, findings and recommendations, corrective action taken (e.g., program management review and Inspector General inspections), and other activities. Include documentation of published reports in appendix.

The Air Force improved the relevancy of its Unit Climate Assessment in Fiscal Year 2013 by embedding six questions focusing on four dimensions of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response climate factors. These factors and results detailed areas for further work in 2014 and beyond, namely, the need to develop more information geared towards junior enlisted and civilians and to reduce the perceived barriers to reporting sexual assault.

The Air Force Inspector General fielded two Special Interest Item inspection assessment requirements in January, 2013. The first assessment directed all units to complete a Self-Assessment Checklist no later than January 31, 2013. The second directive required United States Air Forces in Europe to complete an inspection between January 18 and February 15, 2013, to determine the effectiveness of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program at each installation.

Major Command SARCs conducted staff-assistance visits to installations they have oversight of. During these visits, the Major Command SARCs assess the installations’ SAPR programs in terms of effectiveness, visibility, and adherence to higher headquarters’ guidance.

The Air Force conducted the Internal Communication Assessment Group survey to measure Airman’s knowledge of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response principles; 1,923 respondents completed survey in July-August, 2013. The results provided the Air Force the Airmen’s perspective with respect to the SAPR training. The results of this survey supported the Air Force’s move away from computer-based SAPR training to small-group, scenario-based training.

The Air Force Audit Agency assessed whether or not SAPR personnel met the personnel training and qualification requirements set out in Air Force Instruction 36-

6001, *SAPR Program*, and the additional requirements identified by the Air Force SAPR office. Qualification deficiencies were corrected during the assessment. The Air Force Audit Agency's recommendation to supplement Air Force guidance with respect to training and qualification requirements is being included in the upcoming revision of Air Force Instruction 36-6001.

In early Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force conducted a service-wide Health and Welfare Inspection covering every Air Force installation, and almost 600,000 workplaces. The inspection resulted in 32,216 findings, ranging from romance novels to pornographic magazines and electronic files which could be construed as detrimental to healthy Air Force climates. Corrective action was taken on the spot as these items were discovered. More information about this inspection can be found in Section 7.4.

Formal Military Equal Opportunity complaints have been on a downward trend. Compared to complaints filed per year, substantiated complaints are low. Of those formal complaints filed, the top three allegations are based on race, gender, and sexual harassment. Informal Military Equal Opportunity complaints have also been on a downward trend, and the resolution rate of those complaints is high. Anecdotal information from informal out-and-about inspections indicates that military personnel are accustomed to addressing concerns and complaints through their chain of command.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Air Force determined that Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program effectiveness can be measured by the degree to which healthy climates have been fostered and maintained. Criteria for measuring this include whether the climate promotes diversity; increases awareness and knowledge; increases understanding and implementation of bystander intervention principles; increases opportunities for dialogue/discussion/debate; empowers victims to come forward; and increases accountability. The Air Force is revising the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Inspector General checklist to include new compliance inspection requirements, such as monitoring SARC call-lines, to capture measurable results.

5.3 Describe any and all implementations of Government Accountability Office (GAO) and Defense Task Force-Sexual Assault in the Military Services (DTF-SAMS) recommendations. Include any assessments of implementation.

The GAO report for Air Force SAPR will not be released until January 2014. The Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services has been disbanded. The task force's report was published on December 1, 2009. Among other things, the task force recommended enhancing the medical and mental health care for servicewomen who are victims of sexual assault, and that the Department of Defense (1) develop department-level guidance on the provision of care to victims of sexual assault; and (2) take steps to improve first responders' compliance with the department's requirements for annual refresher training.

In addition to all other SAPR training, and along with all health care personnel, all providers must take SAPR First Responder Training for Health Care Personnel. This training was revised to include updated Department of Defense Instruction requirements and emphasize the Restricted Reporting process. Air Force Instruction 44-102, *Medical*

Care Management, establishes the requirement for provider training in reference to performing sexual assault exams; the training must conform to “A National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adults/Adolescents.” These standards are used to select training venues. Providers performing sexual assault examinations are required to complete refresher training annually and repeat initial training requirements every five years, at a minimum.

To facilitate knowledge and help ensure appropriate guidance is readily available, military treatment facilities providing sexual assault exams must ensure examiners have access to and are familiar with the guidance found in: U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, “A National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations, Adults/Adolescents”; Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *SAPR Program Procedures*; and Air Force Instruction 36-6001, *SAPR Program*.

The task force recommended Congress should, as a permanent measure, enact a comprehensive military justice privilege for communications between a victim advocate and a victim of sexual assault. This was accomplished in Military Rule of Evidence 514, also known as the victim-victim advocate privilege, which gives SARCs and victim advocates the ability to receive and not disclose communications from victims pertaining to the sexual assault. The Air Force has fully implemented Military Rule of Evidence 514 and includes a block of instruction on the privilege at the Air Force SARC course, which is required for all new SARCs, deputy/assistant SARCs, and full-time victim advocates.

The task force also recommended ensuring service members who report they were sexually assaulted are afforded the assistance of a nationally certified victim advocate. This is complied with through National Organization for Victim Assistance credentialing which was required by October, 2013.

The task force recommended ensuring victims understand their rights, including the opportunity to consult with legal counsel to minimize victim confusion during the investigative process. This is accomplished both through the completion of the DD Form 2910 and SARC guidance to the victim during the completion of the form. The Air Force’s Special Victims’ Counsel program further ensures legal support is available at any time to help victims with any legal concerns.

The task force called for improving medical care for victims of sexual assault, particularly those in deployed areas. SAPR services are crucial in deployed environments, and deployed commanders are responsible for providing home-station level care to victims. The Air Force has six deployed SARCs providing services in the deployed environment.

The task force recommended informing victims and service members of disciplinary actions related to sexual assault. Commanders are taught how to work with victims of sexual assault who also have collateral misconduct in command courses. The

commanders' authority to decide whether to defer action on collateral misconduct is also addressed at the SARC course and is addressed in Department of Defense Instruction 6495.02, *SAPR Program Procedures*.

5.4 Describe your efforts to ensure integrity of data collected in the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database.

SARCs are required to enter all adult sexual assault cases (other than those cases tracked by Family Advocacy) into the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database within 48 hours of a report. Only those SARCs who are credentialed, with a cleared background check, and have completed Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database training are authorized access to the system. Logging in to the system requires the use of a common access card, and users are directed to log out whenever they are not using the database or when they walk away from their terminal. SARCs are trained to complete all mandated fields with information regarding the incident, victim, and subject. The Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response office reviews Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database data to help ensure it is complete and accurate.

5.5 Describe any measures your Service or Component has established to assess and manage your SAPR program. If you have begun assessing your program based on these measures, describe your findings thus far and actions taken.

The Air Force has been developing questionnaires to assess the efficacy of training events, SAPR Down-Days, and educational initiatives, to be fielded in Fiscal Year 2014. The Air Force SAPR Office is also developing plans and methodologies for assessing various aspects of Air Force culture and climate, such as confidence in the chain of command, willingness to intervene, and how safe the environment is perceived to be by Airmen. These assessments will be fielded through the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Organizational Climate Survey which will be used within 120 days of a commander assuming command and annually thereafter. Additionally, prevalence of sexual assault will be measured annually.

The goals of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response program are to effectively educate Airmen about sexual assault, foster a climate of dignity and respect, and ultimately decrease the prevalence of sexual assault in the Air Force. The survey will build on the Victim Impact Survey that The Judge Advocate General's Corps implemented in Fiscal Year 2013 to help ensure that victims only receive one survey regarding their experiences with support individuals and agencies. The survey will further ask victims about their satisfaction with each individual and agency with whom they had contact. The survey will also include specific questions about the climate in their unit.

To improve management of the SAPR program, the Air Force SAPR Office was transformed into a stand-alone, directorate-level organization that reports directly to the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff. The new Headquarters Air Force SAPR Office is now led by a general officer and is authorized a cross-functional staff of 32 people with a broad range of relevant expertise.

5.6 Provide a summary of your research and data collection activities conducted in Fiscal Year 2013. Include documentation in the appendix.

With the purpose of providing an assessment on sexual assault in the Air Force, the Air Force SAPR Office conducted focus groups at 14 bases from July 22 to September 27, 2013. The Air Force SAPR Office representatives met with more than 1,400 Airmen from multiple rank demographics and all Major Commands. About half of the Airmen in the focus groups were volunteers, while the rest were randomly selected and directed to participate. Some of the volunteers included civilians and reserve component members. As a result, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response training efficacy was specifically raised.

On a weekly basis, the Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office publishes a “kneeboard” set of slides which includes tables and graphs of the current state of the data in the Defense Sexual Assault Institute Database. Examples of data include the gender of the subjects and victims, whether alcohol was involved, and how much time elapsed between the incident and the date the incident was reported to the authorities.

5.6.1 Describe your efforts to develop and harmonize sexual assault focused survey efforts to align with Department of Defense and other Services.

Department of Defense implemented biennial Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty, to measure, among other things, sexual assault prevalence and incident specifics. The Air Force will implement additional biennial surveys to measure these topics of interest on opposite years of the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty. The definitions and terminology used by the Department of Defense survey have been incorporated into the planned Air Force survey to help ensure the two surveys are acting in harmony. Further, the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty will include an Air Force-specific module at the end of the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty so that the Air Force may ask questions specific to Air Force initiatives each year either through the Air Force contracted survey or the Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty.

5.7 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to effectively standardizing, measuring, analyzing, assessing, and reporting program progress.

The Air Force will assess prevalence and reporting through the biennial Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty and biennial Air Force surveys. Both surveys will use common Department of Defense definitions for unwanted sexual contact and sexual assault behaviors in order to be directly comparable. These surveys will continue to be used on alternate years to provide annual prevalence data. Climate will be assessed with the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Organizational Climate Survey within 120 days of a command change and then annually thereafter; this is implemented through Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute and is standardized across the Department of Defense. Training and education initiatives’ efficacy are assessed through Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response surveys as well as post-training questionnaires distributed following all formal Air Force Training and SAPR Stand-Down days. The Judge Advocate General’s Corps has an

existing survey assessing the extent to which victims are satisfied with their representation and services received from the Victim Witness Assistance Program. The Air Force is enhancing this product to evaluate each individual and/or agency dealt with during the reporting and investigative/judicial process, to include first responders and the medical community. The victim experiences survey will further ask victims specific questions about the climate in their unit. The Air Force will continue to work alongside the other Services to provide data for the Department of Defense sexual assault-related metrics which include reporting, military justice, and investigative process data.

6. Overarching Tenet: Communication and Policy

6.1 Summarize your Service or Component's efforts to synchronize and standardize the SAPR program across the Joint Force (from Joint/Service basing to forward stationed deployed units worldwide).

The Joint Force sexual assault prevention efforts are harmonized in the effects-based goal of primary prevention. The Air Force takes into account the lessons learned from its sister service experiences, both benchmarks and setbacks, to inform the Air Force SAPR program's policy development and ongoing operation. The mechanism to facilitate this crosstalk ranges from daily informal interactions among the various Service and Department teams to formal processes in Department of Defense and the Joint Staff to achieve program harmony. The Secretary of Defense holds a weekly meeting with all the SAPR directors covering policy topics progressing through each element of Department of Defense strategy and reporting on progress and challenges implementing the respective initiatives in an open forum. Ahead of these Department of Defense meetings, the Joint Staff facilitates a process to reach consensus among the respective Services with escalating rounds of dialogue from the functional directors to the Service Operational Deputies and culminating with a Joint Staff position on a given proposal prior to presenting it to the Secretary of Defense for a decision.

6.2 Describe your efforts to post and widely disseminate sexual assault information (e.g., hotline phone numbers and internet websites) to Service members, eligible dependents, and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense.

The Air Force conducted an extensive internal and external media campaign as the new SAPR office was standing up. The director of the Air Force SAPR office conducted interviews with *Air Force Times* and the office's internal public affairs teams. Those articles were posted on the Air Force website. In each of the articles there was a "for more information" contact line so readers had a place to find additional information. Additionally, the Air Force had wide-reaching stories in *The New York Times*, and on National Public Radio's (NPR), "All Things Considered;" and Public Broadcasting Service's (PBS), "To the Contrary." Additionally stories were published in *Air Force Times* and on the Air Force's website outlining Air Force efforts on tackling this issue for the Service. Lastly, *Christian Science Monitor* and the *American Bar Association Journal* published lengthy positive stories on the Special Victims' Counsel program. There have been smaller, subsequent stories that continue to highlight the great success of that program.

The Air Force SAPR Office issued public affairs guidance to all wing vice commanders and public affairs officers. This guidance advised installation webmasters to include a

prominent SAPR link on their wing websites. The links direct Airmen to local SAPR information to include, but not limited to, definitions, education material, Special Victims' Counsel information, reporting options, and contact information for local SARCs.

All Air Force bases are required, per Air Force Instruction 36-2624, *The Career Assistance Advisor, First Term Airmen Center and Enlisted Professional Enhancement Programs*, to have a First Term Airmen Center. The center provides a structured program to transition Airmen from a training mindset to a mission-oriented environment. First Term Airmen Center students were issued class folders developed by installation SARCs. The folders contain pertinent numbers and information concerning the SAPR program.

All SARCs participated in base events throughout the year and especially in April during Sexual Assault Awareness Month. During these events, SARCs disseminate information and promotional items containing hotline numbers, email addresses, and websites to service members, eligible dependents, and civilian personnel of the DoD.

SARCs and Victim Advocates routinely used various briefings as opportunities to educate Airmen on SAPR contact numbers, reporting options and eligibility information. Additionally, fliers, pamphlets and posters were distributed across installations with contact information and eligibility information. Briefings included annual training, Commander's Calls, base newcomers orientations and other venues as requested by installation leaders. The Air Force has also disseminated information about the availability of and access to SARC services and the Special Victims' Counsel program on the American Forces Network (for overseas installations).

The Air Force placed particular focus for education has been at the accession stage – that is, the initial recruitment and training of the service's newest Airmen. Prior to initial processing at the Military Entrance Processing Station, Air Force applicants watch an Air Force Recruiting Service video featuring the service's commander and command chief. The video addresses appropriate and inappropriate professional relationships. In addition, applicants are presented with a copy of the Applicant Rights/Responsibilities card. After an applicant watches the video, recruiters are required to discuss the video with the applicant to help ensure the applicant fully understands the importance of maintaining a professional applicant-recruiter relationship. The recruiter must document the applicant's viewing of the video and the subsequent discussion in the applicant's electronic file. The applicant will also sign a professional relationship contract, with one copy provided to the applicant and another kept on file.

Sometimes, applicants must wait a significant length of time before entering the Air Force (i.e., finishing high school, waiting for a job position to open, etc.). These applicants typically enter the Delayed Enlistment Program. Each Delayed Enlistment Program member is provided with a Development Guide, which is a book created to provide each recruit with the fundamentals in becoming a professional Airman and to help facilitate their transition to military training and on to active duty in the Air Force. Recruiters use this guide as a training tool to prepare recruits for entry onto

active duty.

Just before the applicant is scheduled for physical processing at the Military Entrance Processing Station, either the Military Entrance Processing Station or the Flight Chief (depending on how the squadron/flight is set up) will review the Professional Relationship contract, ensuring it was properly completed.

Immediately before (typically the day prior to or the day) an applicant travels to attend Basic Military Training, that applicant is put on Extended Active Duty and receives a final brief from his/her recruiter. That briefing reiterates what is and is not professional behavior.

Once at Basic Military Training, trainees receive 11 1/2 hours of core training relating to gender diversity, sexual harassment and sexual assault. This is in addition to briefings conducted by the group and squadron commanders during Basic Military Training. The curriculum includes the following:

- Human Relations I (2 1/2 hours; first week): Covers DOD and AF vision regarding equal opportunity policy; creating smooth running workplace; professional, unprofessional relationships and fraternization; positive skills for building relationships; positive skills for conflict resolution; religious diversity; professional relationships, building relationships and sensitivity in dealing with other cultures.
- Human Relations II (2 hours; second week): Covers barriers to respectful human relations such as stereotyping, prejudice, disparaging terms, discrimination, hazing and sexual harassment; positive human relations skills; Air Force's viewpoint; and the interrelationship of Air Force core values, human relations and mission readiness.
- Forbidden Relationships & Sexual Predator Risk Indicators (3 hours; second week): Defines forbidden relationships (also referred to as unprofessional relationships), why they are wrong, how they may occur (sexual grooming) and be prevented or dealt with. Also covers, sexual predator risk indicators and how to protect against them.
- Accessions I Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (4 hours; fourth week): Air Education and Training Command developed accession level lesson containing detailed content on: definition of sexual assault and definition of consent; prevention; Air Force zero tolerance policy; four common sexual assault roles (perpetrator, facilitator, passive bystander and victim); culture of responsible choices program; and victim response process (victim sensitivity/reporting procedures).

In addition, trainees are given the SARC 24-hour confidential hot line number to report sexual assault or to speak to a victim advocate, and are provided the Lackland Air Force Base intranet web site in their Basic Military Training study guide. They are

also briefed that they have a hot-line phone in every trainee dormitory that provides direct access to the SARC at any time.

6.3 Describe your development and implementation of specialized medical and mental health care policy for sexual assault victims. Include a copy of your implementation plan in the appendix.

The Air Force Medical Operations Agency updated the mental health patient informed consent document to include a specific reference to the patient's right to obtain a second opinion related to diagnoses received in the mental health clinic. The Air Force Medical Operations Agency's Mental Health Division is working to establish policy which will require a higher level review of mental health recommendations for administrative separation of victims of sexual assault. Once the policy has been finalized, dissemination and implementation will be promptly carried out.

The Air Force established a policy/execution working group to identify and address issues and facilitate information to and from Air Force military treatment facilities. Working group initiatives include improved policy guidance and development of a self-assessment checklist to enhance program compliance.

6.4 Describe your efforts to review, revise, update, and issue policy pertaining to:

- **The record of dispositions of unrestricted reports.**
- **General education for correction of military records when victims experience retaliation.**

Provide documentation in the appendix.

According to the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act, records of unrestricted reports shall be kept for 50 years. The Air Force is in the process of updating records disposition schedules to reflect this change.

Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records eligibility and procedures are addressed in Air Force Instruction 36-2603, *Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records*, as well as in informational materials posted on the Air Force Personnel Center's website. Both are publicly accessible. SAPR personnel are taught to discuss correction of military records and veterans benefits with clients who are separating from the military. Additionally, transition assistance classes, which are mandatory for all Airmen separating or retiring from the service, give out instructions on how to contact

the board and directions on how to obtain information about applying to the board for relief.

6.5 Describe your efforts to establish policy for General or Flag officer review of and concurrence in adverse administrative actions and separation of victims making an Unrestricted Report of sexual assault in Fiscal Year 2013.

On July 2, 2013, Change 7 to Air Force Instruction 36-3206, *Administrative Discharge Procedures for Commissioned Officers*, and Change 7 to Air Force Instruction 36-3208, *Administrative Separation of Airmen*, were implemented. For enlisted members, Airmen who have made an unrestricted report of sexual assault within the 12 months preceding the date of notification of discharge “must be advised of the right to request review by the general court-martial authority who is a general officer if the Airman believes the recommendation for involuntary separation was initiated in retaliation for having made [the unrestricted report].” Upon request for review, the case is referred to the general court-martial convening authority for the final separation decision. If the convening authority is not a general officer, the case must be referred to the next higher level of command who is a general officer. The convening authority then reviews the circumstances and grounds for the proposed separation. If the convening authority determines the recommendation for discharge was made in retaliation for the report of sexual assault, that authority will terminate the discharge. If, however, the convening authority determines the recommendation was not made in retaliation for the report of sexual assault, the authority may approve the discharge (if there is sufficient evidence to support separation and separation is warranted). In that case, the convening authority must indicate that the recommendation for discharge was not made in retaliation for a report of sexual assault.

For officers, the policy is essentially the same, except that the request for review is elevated to the show cause authority. Show cause authority is typically the Major Command commander. Show cause authority is not generally delegable to non-general officers.

6.6 Describe your plans for Fiscal Year 2014 that pertain to synchronizing and standardizing the SAPR program across the Joint Force (from Joint/Service basing to forward stationed and deployed units worldwide).

The Department of Defense’s objective is to establish the conditions within the military which lower sexual assault prevalence and increase reporting. The Air Force and the other Services have concurred on a set of established criteria and measurement data that track a variety of different facets dealing with sexual assault data. This data will establish a baseline to track trends and help the Air Force and the Services determine whether prevalence is decreasing and reports are increasing.

The Air Force will continue to implement additional surveys to measure sexual assault prevalence, incident specifics, and other relevant data pertaining to sexual assaults in order to support assessment of the effectiveness of Air Force policies and programs. The data Air Force is collecting will mirror the DoD’s biennial Workplace and Gender Relations Survey – Active Duty, to be given on opposite years of the WGRA. Additionally, definitions and terminology used by the DoD survey have been incorporated into the Air Force survey to help ensure both surveys are acting in

harmony.

The Air Force is developing a Victim Experiences Survey to obtain feedback from victims regarding their experiences throughout the continuum of care. The survey is focused on the services (Sexual Assault and Response Coordinator, Victim Advocate, Medical Services, Special Victims' Counsel, Office of Special Investigation, and Staff Judge Advocate) victims typically interact with throughout their cases. This tool will allow the Air Force to assess victims' perception of the care and support they are receiving. This survey has been advertised at the Joint level and all the Services have expressed an interest in working concurrently to produce a Joint victim experiences survey. The Air Force will field its survey in Fiscal Year 2014.

The Air Force has issued guidance to installation vice commanders that installation web sites should have a prominent and visible link on their home pages that links to their respective local SAPR information. When a visitor clicks on the link from the home page, they are to be directed to a website that contains reporting options, definitions of sexual assault, contact information for the local SARC, as well as sexual assault conviction data for that respective installation (if applicable).

7. Secretary of Defense Initiatives

7.1 Enhancing Commander Accountability—Describe your efforts thus far to develop methods to assess the performance of military commanders in establishing command climates of dignity and respect and incorporating SAPR prevention and victim care principles in their commands, and hold them accountable.

The Secretary and Chief of Staff made it clear to commanders that they must take the lead in establishing command climates of dignity and respect and incorporating SAPR prevention and victim care principles in their commands. The Air Force has implemented an array of initiatives designed to assess the performance of commanders in establishing command climates of dignity and respect and incorporating SAPR prevention and victim care principles in their commands, and to hold them accountable.

First, the Air Force has modified the feedback and evaluation forms for every Airman to help ensure organizational climate is discussed during feedback sessions. Along with modifying the forms, Air Force Instruction 36-2406, *Officer and Enlisted Evaluation Systems*, defines the term "organizational climate" and holds all Airmen responsible for contributing to a healthy unit climate in which every member is treated with dignity and respect, and one that does not tolerate unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment, or sexual assault in any form. The instruction explains that noncommissioned and commissioned officers can build a healthy organizational climate by: communicating clear direction at all levels of supervision; adhering to and enforcing standards; not tolerating and, when necessary, appropriately responding to any form of sexual harassment, sexual assault, hazing, unlawful discrimination, or any other conduct harmful to the good order and discipline of the unit; being accountable for their actions; and cultivating an environment where teamwork, unity and cohesiveness are the standard practice. All noncommissioned officer and officer evaluators will assess ratees on what they did to help ensure a healthy organizational climate.

Second, the instruction now specifically highlights commanders' responsibility for creating a healthy climate in their command and adherence to SAPR program directives. Evaluators are now required to take commanders' special responsibility and authority into consideration when evaluating commanders' effectiveness in ensuring a healthy climate.

Third, in accordance with Section 572(a)(3) of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, unit climate assessments were increased in frequency from every two years to within the first 120 days of assuming command and annually thereafter. In addition to conducting the climate assessments, the assessed commanders must now brief both their immediate supervisors and their unit members on the results of the climate assessments. This will increase the visibility of the assessment results and provide feedback to the members of the unit.

Fourth, the Air Force has established an Inspector General Special Interest Item to assess to what degree commanders have established a command climate of dignity and respect, as well as to what degree SAPR prevention and care principles have been implemented in their commands. The Air Force further created a list of inspection items to be used by inspectors during unit inspections in order to assess commanders' adherence to the above initiatives and to what extent the commanders have been successful in establishing climates of dignity and respect within their units.

7.2 Improving Response and Victim Treatment—Describe your efforts thus far to implement and monitor methods to improve victim treatment by their peers, co-workers, and chains of command.

The Air Force SAPR Office began developing a survey focusing on victim experiences with each individual and/or agency a victim deals with during the reporting and investigative, and judicial processes. The survey will ask victims their satisfaction with each individual and agency with which they were in contact with as well as specific questions about the climate in their unit.

The Air Force has been developing questionnaires to assess the efficacy of training events, SAPR Stand-Down Days, and educational initiatives. Headquarters Air Force is also developing plans and methodologies for assessing various aspects of Air Force culture and climate, such as confidence in the chain of command, willingness to intervene, and how safe the environment is, as perceived by Airmen. These assessments will be fielded through the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute Organizational Climate Survey which will be used within 120 days of assumption of command and annually thereafter. Additionally, prevalence of sexual assault will be measured annually.

Paragraph 1.5, above, further elaborates on specific efforts taken by the Air Force to educate Airmen on improving treatment of victims by their peers, co-workers, and chains of command. Those efforts were undertaken as part of the Air Force's SAPR "Stand-Down" Day in Fiscal Year 2013, which all Air Force members were required to participate in.

7.3 Ensuring Safety—Describe your efforts to improve the effectiveness of SAPR programs in recruiting organizations, Military Entrance Processing Stations, and the Reserve Officer Training Corps. These assessments will include: 1) the selection, SAPR training, and oversight of recruiters; 2) the dissemination of SAPR program information to potential and actual recruits; and 3) the prevention and education programs in ROTC environments and curricula.

The Air Force evaluated its SAPR curriculum at all venues of training, utilizing a cross-functional recruiter analysis group and a multi-disciplinary integrated product team of subject-matter experts. Focus areas included recruiter selection, training and oversight; and Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps curricula and environments. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Military Personnel Policy, and the Military Entrance Processing Command assumed responsibility for improving effectiveness in the military entrance processing stations environment, including dissemination of SAPR program information to recruits.

The following efforts were implemented for recruiter selection, training and oversight: 1) Increased supervision of recruiters and interaction with leadership; 2) Implementation of training programs aimed at increasing deterrence; 3) Education of applicants and recruits on the Airman's Bill of Rights and empowerment; and 4) Increased emphasis that only professional relationships are acceptable in today's recruiting culture.

In Fiscal Year 2013, the Reserve Officer Training Corps curriculum was revamped to include: 1) weaving SAPR scenarios throughout lessons on leadership, Air Force core values, Air Force culture and wingman behaviors; 2) frontloading SAPR curriculum to help ensure students understand what constitutes unprofessional or criminal behavior and available avenues for reporting; 3) incorporating *Sex Signals*, a traveling sexual assault educational production; and 4) presenting all training materials, to include scenario-based training and "audience specific" videos, for subject-matter-expert review to help ensure appropriate and effective materials are being used. The presentation of the materials for review has provided the additional resource of a central repository for SAPR training course material that instructors can use in their classes.

7.4 Ensuring Appropriate Command Climate—Describe your efforts to ensure Department of Defense facilities promote an environment of dignity and respect and are free from materials that create a degrading or offensive work environment. Include findings and actions taken from regular visual inspections.

The Air Force Chief of Staff tasked commanders on November 28, 2012, to examine their work settings and better ensure Airmen at all levels consistently apply standards of professionalism and respect across the service. The purpose of this Health and Welfare Inspection was to reinforce expectations for the workplace environment, correct deficiencies, and deter conditions that may be detrimental to good order and discipline. Commanders were tasked with looking for and removing unprofessional or inappropriate items that hinder a professional working environment. The Health and Welfare Inspections yielded the following results:

Over 100 Air Force installations were inspected. Commanders inspected almost 600,000 workplaces of Air Force military and civilian personnel. The areas inspected

included all government workspaces and shared common areas such as briefing rooms, break rooms, squadron recreational areas, heritage rooms, government shared computer drives and military dormitory common areas. Commanders looked for and removed three broad categories of material: pornographic; unprofessional; or inappropriate or offensive.

The results yielded 32,216 reported findings, in the three categories: 631 instances of pornography (magazines, calendars, pictures, videos that intentionally displayed nudity or depicted acts of sexual activity); 3,987 instances of unprofessional material (discrimination, professional appearance, items specific to local military history such as patches, coins, heritage rooms, log books, song books, etc.); and 27,598 instances of inappropriate or offensive items (suggestive items, magazines, posters, pictures, calendars, vulgarity, graffiti). Identified items were documented and either removed or destroyed. In two instances commanders consulted with law enforcement, as appropriate, to determine if the items met a criminal investigative threshold.

The Air Force also uses organizational climate assessments to promote healthy climates. The assessments are designed to provide commanders information about the health of the climate the commanders' units by identifying positive and negative factors within the units, as well as how unit members perceive unit climate. Historically, the Air Force has used the Unit Climate Assessment as the primary climate organizational assessment tool, however, effective January 1, 2014, Air Force will transition from the Unit Climate Assessment to the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute's Equal Opportunity Climate Survey as the sole organizational climate assessment tool. This survey will be given within 120 days of change of command and annually thereafter. The survey results will be required to be briefed to the commander's superior officer, as well as to the members of the unit. Through organizational climate assessments, commanders are able to address any issues presented by their workforce in order to promote appropriate command climates.

In addition to formal climate assessments, installation Equal Opportunity personnel also conduct informal "out and about" assessments in which the Equal Opportunity personnel both talk to unit members and conduct visual inspections of unit work areas. The Equal Opportunity personnel brief commanders on their findings, thereby providing commanders additional information about the health of the command climate. Commanders are alerted to any inappropriate materials found during the visual inspection, affording commanders the opportunity to immediately address the issue.

Part 2 - Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Sexual Assault Statistical Report Data Call for Sexual Assaults in the Military: United States Air Force

1. Analytic Discussion

1.1. Provide an analytic discussion of your Service's Statistical Report. This section should include such information as:

- **Notable changes in the data since Fiscal Year 2012 (in percentages) and other time periods, as appropriate.**
- **Insight or suspected reasons for noted changes, or lack of change, in data**
- **Implications the data may have for programmatic planning, oversight, and/or research**
- **How Reports of Sexual Assault mesh with your Service's scientifically conducted surveys during Fiscal Year 2012 or Fiscal Year 2013 (if any)**
- **Other (Please explain)**

In Fiscal Year 2013, investigators opened 635 investigations into allegations of sexual assault in which a service member was either a subject or a victim. Based upon the method directed for calculating investigations for this report, this number of investigations does not include those conducted by other services' investigative agencies, nor does it include investigations involving only civilian subjects and victims (e.g., a report by a dependent spouse that he/she was sexually assaulted by a government civilian employee). Additionally, this number specifically excludes investigations into so-called "intimate partner" cases, which fall under the Family Advocacy program (this includes assaults between spouses, cohabitating intimate partners, people who have a common child, and people who have been in an intimate dating relationship for more than 30 days). Finally, sexual assault allegations involving child victims are outside the scope of this report. For purposes of this report, these 635 investigations are considered to be proxies for unrestricted reports of sexual assault. Based upon the DoD Annual Report methodology, a single investigation is treated as a single report, regardless of the number of subjects and victims involved in the investigation. For the sake of consistency, this report will refer to the 635 as "unrestricted reports."

The Air Force also received 488 restricted reports of sexual assault (reports falling under the Family Advocacy program are not included here). Of these, 76 converted from restricted to unrestricted at the request of the victims, resulting in the initiation of an investigation. Thus, of the 488 initially restricted reports received in Fiscal Year 2013, 412 remained restricted at the end of Fiscal Year 2013.

This represents an increase of 186 unrestricted reports (increase of 41.4%) and an increase of 71 restricted reports (20.8%) from the number of reports received in Fiscal Year 2012. In 2012, there were 790 total reports; 449 were unrestricted; and 341 remained restricted after 58 converted to unrestricted. The Fiscal Year 2013 totals include 30 reports from the Combat Areas of Interest (an increase of 6 from Fiscal Year 2012, when there were 24), 19 of which were investigations considered to be unrestricted reports as described in Section 1.1. There was an increase of 9 unrestricted and a decrease of 3 remaining restricted reports. In Fiscal Year 2013, 2

restricted reports converted to unrestricted, while none converted in Fiscal Year 2012.

The increase in the number of reports is likely due to a number of factors, including intense command focus on the issue of sexual assault, greater confidence in the chain of command, increased awareness of Air Force initiatives to enhance victim care, and Air Force efforts to hold perpetrators appropriately accountable. Air Force members are likely far better educated about what constitutes sexual assault, what reporting options are available, and what victim-care services are available than in past years due to enhanced SAPR education and outreach. These initiatives are discussed in detail earlier in this report.

At the end of Fiscal Year 2013, 412 reports remained restricted of the 488 original restricted reports made. Eighteen more restricted reports converted this year than in the previous year (76, 15.5% in Fiscal Year 2013 versus 58, 14.5% in Fiscal Year 2012). This change may indicate that individuals have better knowledge of the program and trusted command, the investigation team, the military justice system, and the overall formal processes associated with unrestricted reporting. An important note is that of the restricted reports made, 122 (25%) of the assaults occurred prior to entry in the Air Force, a 9% increase in restricted reports for pre-service assaults from Fiscal Year 2012. This may indicate that these victims wished to avail themselves of services offered by the Air Force that were not available to them as civilians.

The success of the SAPR program also continues in deployed environments as policies and procedures are refined at specific locations to provide the best available services for victims.

2. Unrestricted Reporting

2.1. Victim Data Discussion and Analysis. This section should include an overview of such information as:

- **Type of offenses**
- **Demographic trends**
- **Service referrals**
- **Experiences in Combat Areas of Interest**
- **Military Protective Orders Issued as a Result of an Unrestricted Report (e.g., Number issued, number violated)**
- **Approved expedited transfers and general reasons why transfers were not approved**
- **Others (Please explain)**

There were 635 investigations initiated as unrestricted reports (as defined in Section 1.1, above) in Fiscal Year 2013. This number includes investigations initiated pursuant to 76 individuals who converted their restricted reports to unrestricted. The total number of victims involved in these investigations is 737. There were 645 (88%) female victims and 92 (12%) male victims. There were 695 (74%) military victims and 208 (22%) civilian victims. The service affiliation of 34 victims is unknown. Of the 376 cases in which the age of the victim is known, the average age is 26. The majority (198, 53%) were between the ages of 20 and 24. There were 59 (16%) victims

between the ages of 16 and 19, 55 (15%) between 25 and 29, 35 (9%) between the ages of 30 and 34, and 17 between the ages of 35 and 39. Of the 569 military victims, 399 (70%) were in the grades of E-1 to E-4, 105 (18%) were in the grades of E-5 to E-7, and 3 were in the grades of E-8 to E-9. There were 31 (5%) victims in the grades of O-1 to O-3, and 7 in the grades of O-4 and O-5. There were 9 cadet victims (2%), and the grades of 14 individuals are unknown. These demographics are not materially different from those reported in Fiscal Year 2012. In fact, the rate of male victims remained the same (12%) as it was in Fiscal Year 2012.

The demographics for the reports in the Combat Areas of Interest (there were 23 identified victims in unrestricted reports and 13 victims in restricted reports in Fiscal Year 2013) largely track the trends above.

Forty-six victims requested military protective orders in Fiscal Year 2013, and the Air Force SAPR Office has record of 34 orders being issued. One of the orders was violated (by both the victim and the subject).

In Fiscal Year 2013, 118 requests for expedited transfers were made, and 109 of those were approved. Expedited transfers denied were typically denied due to conflicts with other personnel actions. For example, one individual requesting an expedited transfer was pending trial by court-martial. In most cases, however, the requesters were facing a Medical Evaluation Board with the potential for a medical separation.

2.2. Subject Data Discussion and Analysis. This section should include an overview of such information as:

- **Demographic trends**
- **Disposition trends**
- **Experiences in Combat Areas of Interest**
- **Other (Please explain)**

There were 658 subjects, including service members, civilians, and unidentified subjects, in the Fiscal Year 2013 investigations. The vast majority of subjects (604, 92%) were male, 31 (5%) of the subjects were female, and the remainder (23) were unknown. Of the 537 subjects with known ages, 239 (45%) were between 20 and 24 years of age, 37 (7%) between the ages of 16-19, and 119 (22%) between the ages of 25 and 29. Additionally there were 71 (13%) subjects between the ages of 30 and 34, and 24 (4%) between the ages of 35 and 39. The grade of 5 subjects is unknown, and the majority (322, 56%) are in the grades of E-1 to E-4. There were 11 cadet subjects, 173 (30%) subjects in the grades of E-5 to E-7, and 11 in the grades of E-8 and E-9. For the officer subjects, there were 34 (6%) in the grades of O-1 to O-3 and 24 (4%) in the grades of O-4 to O-6.

There were 508 subjects in cases closed in Fiscal Year 2013. Of those subjects, 60 (12%) were foreign or U.S. civilians whom the Air Force has no jurisdiction over, and 26 offenders could not be identified. Six of the subjects were from other services, and those services were responsible for taking action with respect to those subjects. Eleven service members were prosecuted by civilian authorities. Command action was precluded or declined in 89 cases. This means the evidence was insufficient to prove a crime was committed, the victim refused to participate, or the allegation was

simply unfounded. This left 283 subjects for whom evidence supported command action. Court-martial charges for sexual assault offenses were preferred in 169 of those 283 cases. In other words, court-martial proceedings on sexual assault grounds were initiated in 59.7% of the cases in which the evidence supported command action. Of the 169 cases in which charges were preferred for sexual assault offenses, 13 subjects were administratively separated in lieu of proceeding to trial. Charges were dismissed in 35 cases (in 5 of those, nonjudicial punishment was subsequently given to the subjects). The remaining 121 cases proceeded to trial, with 74 (61.2%) cases resulting in a conviction on any offense. Of those convicted, 62 (83.8%) were sentenced to confinement, and 50 (67.6%) had a punitive discharge adjudged.

Of the 35 cases in which charges were dismissed, 17 were dismissed pursuant to the recommendation of the Article 32 investigating officer, 14 were dismissed due to the victim declining to participate in the judicial process, and 3 were dismissed based upon the Staff Judge Advocate's recommendation. In the remaining case, new evidence was uncovered indicating no assault occurred.

Nonjudicial punishment was used in 29 cases for sexual offenses and 36 cases for non-sexual offenses. In 47 cases, other administrative actions were taken against subjects.

Of the 89 cases in which command action was precluded or declined 52 cases were found to have insufficient evidence of a crime, victims in 23 of the cases would not participate in the investigation and/or prosecution, and commanders determined 14 cases were unfounded.

There were no significant differences noted in combat areas of interest.

2.3. Reporting Data Discussion and Analysis. This section should include an overview of such information as:

- **Trends in descriptive information about Unrestricted Reports (e.g., Did more reported incidents occur on/off installation)**
- **Investigations**
- **Experiences in Combat Areas of Interest**
- **Other (Please explain)**

Fiscal Year 2013 saw an increase of 186 investigations considered to be unrestricted reports as described in Section 1.1. More than half of the reports investigated were service member on service member (416, 66%), followed by 144 (23%) service member on non-service member, 39 (6%) unidentified subjects on service member, and 36 (6%) non-service member subjects on service member. Reported sexual assaults occurred slightly more frequently on the installation, with 299 (47%) occurring on the installation, 286 (46%) occurring off base, and 50 (8%) occurring in unidentified locations. Of the reports, 183 (29%) were reported within 72 hours of the incident, 117 (18%) within 3 to 30 days of the event, and 172 (27%) between 31 and 365 days. Data on length of time between incident and report was unavailable in 88 (14%) cases, and 75 (12%) reports were made more than 12 months after the assault. Data on the reason for the delay in reporting is not available. Of the 383 cases when the time of occurrence was known, just under half (178) were reported as occurring between

midnight and 6 a.m. Two hundred ninety three (46%) of the reported assaults occurred on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday.

3. Restricted Reporting

3.1. Victim Data Discussion. This section should include such information as:

- **Demographics trends**
- **Service referrals**
- **Experiences in Combat Areas of Interest**
- **Other (Please explain)**

Fiscal Year 2013 also saw an increase of 89 of restricted reports, from 399 in Fiscal Year 2012 to 488 in Fiscal Year 2013. Four hundred five women (83%) and 60 men (12%) filed restricted reports of sexual assault, showing an increase of 16% in female reporting and an increase of 22% in male reporting for reports with known victim gender. Of the total number of restricted reports, 303 (62%) were service member on service member, 69 (14%) were non-service member on service member, 35 (7%) were service member on non-service member and 81 (17%) were unidentified subject on a service member assaults. The grades of service member victims, from the highest number of reports to the lowest were E-1 to E-4 (309, 63%), E-5 to E-9 (56, 11%), cadet (24, 5%), O-1 to O-3 (29, 6%), O-4 to O-5 (5, 1%), with 22 victims whose grades were not recorded (5%). The age group reporting, from highest to lowest was 20-24 (187, 38%), 16-19 (105, 21%), 25-34 (91, 19%), and 35-49 (20, 4%), with 41 of unknown age. The majority of the restricted reports indicate the assault occurred during the hours of 6:00 p.m. and midnight (165, 34%) and midnight to 6:00 a.m. (162, 33%); the other assaults occurred between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. (70, 14%) or remain unknown as to the actual time (91, 19%). These demographics do not vary greatly between Fiscal Year 2012 and Fiscal Year 2013.

With the expansion of the availability of restricted reporting to adult dependents (non-service members) in January, 2012, 34 dependents availed themselves of the option.

Data for the days of the week of the incident were: unknown (261, 53%), Saturdays (79, 16%), Sundays (50, 10%), and Fridays (41, 8%); all other reports were scattered over the remaining days of the week. The number of reports in which the day of the incident is unknown is much greater than last year (261 versus 56). The large number of unknown days of the week likely derives from the assumption that the individuals who were sexually assaulted prior to entry to the Air Force or at some point earlier in their career do not recall or know the actual day of the week the assault occurred.

There were no significant differences noted in combat areas of interest and other reports.

3.2. Reporting Data Discussion. This section should include such information as:

- **Trends in descriptive information about Restricted Reports (e.g., Did more reported incidents occur on/off installation)**
- **Trends in Restricted Reporting conversions**
- **Experiences in Combat Areas of Interest**

- **Other (Please explain)**

Victims made restricted reports within 3 days of the assault 19% percent (94) of the time; 20% (96) of the time within 4 to 30 days after the assault; and 19% (93) within 31 to 365 days after assault. Thirty percent of victims (148) made a restricted report longer than 365 days after the assault, and the length of time between the incident and the report is unknown in 12% (57) of the restricted reports. The largest change came in reports made within 3 days of the assault, as the rate was 32% in Fiscal Year 2012 and decreased to 19% in Fiscal Year 2013. Of the 488 restricted reports, 275 (56%) reported the incident occurred off military installations, 141 (29%) on military installations, and 72 reports had unidentified locations for the incidents.

Most restricted reports made to Air Force SARCs were made by members of the Air Force (439, 90%) with the remaining 10% of the reports from Army (9), Navy (9), Marines (4), Coast Guard (2), and unknown (25) service members. With the expansion of the availability of restricted reporting to adult dependents in January, 2012, 34 dependents availed themselves of the option.

Restricted reports made in the Combat Areas of Interest showed that almost 54% of assaults occurred between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m., on Monday, Tuesday, and Saturday, on the installation (10 of 13), and were reported 4 or more days (12 of 13) after the incident. All 13 victims were Air Force, and most were female (8); under 24 (7); and junior enlisted (10). The small number of reports yields greater variations in the data from year to year.

4. Service Referrals for Victims of Sexual Assault

4.1. Unrestricted Report Referral Data Discussion. This section should include such information as:

- **Summary of referral data and how your service counts a “referral”**
- **Combat Areas of Interest referral data**
- **Discussion of any trends of interest identified in referral data**
- **Other (Please explain)**

In Fiscal Year 2013, service member victims in unrestricted reports were given 1,983 referrals to military resources and 459 referrals to civilian resources. The majority of referrals to military resources were for victim advocacy services (540 referrals), mental health (418 referrals), legal assistance (370), and medical care (220). The majority of civilian-resource referrals were for mental health services (111), rape crisis services (109), and medical services (65).

One hundred thirteen SAFE kits were completed for military victims. Twenty three were completed for non-military victims.

In the Combat Area of Interest, 34 total referrals were made for victims of sexual assault with unrestricted reports, all to military facilities; 9 were made for medical treatment, 6 for mental health, 7 were made for legal services, and 3 for chaplain/spiritual support.

Referral numbers do not correlate to the number of reports or victims, since an

individual victim may have multiple referrals or none based on victim preference.

4.2. Restricted Report Referral Data Discussion. This section should include such information as:

- **Summary of referral data and how your service counts a “referral”**
- **Combat Areas of Interest referral data**
- **Discussion of any trends of interest identified in referral data**
- **Other (Please explain)**

Service member victims in restricted reports were given 760 referrals to military resources and 224 referrals to civilian resources. The majority of referrals to military resources were to victim advocacy services (221), mental health (156), medical care (123), and legal assistance (94). The majority of civilian-resource referrals were for medical care (57), victim advocacy services (48), and mental health (32).

In the Combat Areas of Interest, 18 referrals were issued to military facilities; 5 for medical treatment, 5 for mental health, 1 for legal services, 3 for chaplain/spiritual support, 1 for the DoD Safe Helpline, and 3 for victim advocates.

Thirty-six SAFE kits were completed for military victims, one in the Combat Areas of Interest. Five were completed for non-military victims.

4.3. Service Referrals for Non-Military Victims Data Discussion. This section should include such information as:

- **Summary of referral data**
- **Combat Areas of Interest referral data**
- **Discussion of any trends of interest identified in referral data**
- **Other (Please explain)**

Non-service member victims were given 237 referrals to military resources and 125 referrals to civilian resources in unrestricted cases.

For restricted cases, non-service member victims received 187 referrals to military resources and 104 to civilian resources.

Twenty-three SAFE kits were completed for non-service member victims.

There were no civilian victims in the Combat Areas of Interest.

Summary of Unrestricted and Restricted Reports

| FISCAL YEAR 2013 SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS | | FY13 Totals |
|---|--|--------------------|
| Total Service Member victims in all investigations closed in FY13* | | 300 |
| Service Member victims whose reports of sexual assault could be substantiated* | | 231 |
| Total Service Member subjects in all investigations closed in FY13** | | 398 |
| Service Member subjects against whom sexual assault reports could be substantiated** | | 283 |
| <p>* Does not include victims from Restricted Reports, per mandate in PL 111-383; Also does not include victims from investigations where command action had yet to be reported. ** Does not include subjects from investigations where command action had yet to be reported.</p> | | |
| FISCAL YEAR 2013 SUMMARY OF RESTRICTED SEXUAL ASSAULT REPORTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS | | FY13 Totals |
| # Service Member Victims initially making Restricted Reports | | 453 |
| # Service Member Victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in the current FY* | | 67 |
| # Service Member Victim Reports Remaining Restricted | | 386 |

Unrestricted Reports

| USAF FY13 UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULTS IN THE MILITARY | |
|--|--------------------|
| A. FY13 REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT (rape, aggravated sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, non-consensual sodomy, and attempts to commit these offenses) BY or AGAINST Service Members. | FY13 Totals |
| Note: The data about Unrestricted Reports in Sections A and B below is raw, uninvestigated information about allegations received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | |
| # VICTIMS in FY13 Unrestricted Reports | 737 |
| # Service Member victims | 568 |
| # Non-Service Member victims | 169 |
| # Unrestricted Reports in the following categories | 635 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 416 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 144 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 36 |
| # Unidentified Subject on Service Member | 39 |
| # Unrestricted Reports of sexual assault occurring | 635 |
| # On military installation | 299 |
| # Off military installation | 286 |
| # Unidentified location | 50 |
| # Investigations Initiated (FY13 Unrestricted Reports) | 509 |
| # Investigations pending completion as of 30-SEP-13 | 509 |
| # Completed FY13 Investigations as of 30-SEP-13 | 0 |
| # All Restricted Reports received in FY13 | 488 |
| # Converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report* | 76 |
| # FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS REMAINING RESTRICTED | 412 |
| B. DETAILS OF UNRESTRICTED REPORTS RECEIVED IN FY13 | FY13 Totals |
| Length of time between sexual assault and Unrestricted Report | 635 |
| # Reports made within 3 days of sexual assault | 183 |
| # Reports made within 4 to 30 days after sexual assault | 117 |
| # Reports made within 31 to 365 days after sexual assault | 172 |
| # Reports made longer than 365 days after sexual assault | 75 |
| # Unknown | 88 |
| Time of sexual assault | 635 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 178 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 52 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 153 |
| # Unknown | 252 |
| Day of sexual assault | 635 |
| # Sunday | 70 |
| # Monday | 42 |
| # Tuesday | 32 |
| # Wednesday | 35 |
| # Thursday | 44 |
| # Friday | 104 |
| # Saturday | 119 |
| # Unknown | 189 |
| C. SUMMARY OF ALL INVESTIGATIONS OF UNRESTRICTED REPORTS COMPLETED IN FY13 | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Investigations completed during FY13 | 521 |
| # Of these investigations with more than one victim, more than one subject, or both | 27 |
| # SUBJECTS in all investigations completed during FY13 | 508 |
| # Service Member subjects in completed investigations | 437 |
| # Your Service Member subjects investigated by your Service | 431 |
| # Other Service Member subjects investigated by your Service | 6 |
| # Non-Service Member subjects in your Service's investigations | 36 |
| # Unidentified subjects in your Service's investigations | 35 |
| # VICTIMS in all investigations completed during FY13 | 543 |
| # Service Member victims | 430 |
| # Service Member victims own Service's investigations | 417 |
| # Other Service Member victims in your Service's investigations | 13 |
| # Non-Service Member victims in your Service's investigations | 113 |
| # Unidentified victims in your Service's investigations | 0 |

Unrestricted Reports (continued)

| D. FINAL DISPOSITIONS FOR SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED FY13 | FY13 Totals | D1. ASSOCIATED VICTIM DATA FOR COMPLETED FY13 INVESTIGATIONS | FY13 Totals |
|--|-------------|--|-------------|
| # All Investigations completed in FY13 | 521 | # VICTIMS in investigations completed in FY13 | 543 |
| # SUBJECTS in investigations completed in FY13 | 508 | # Service Member Victims in investigations completed in FY13 | 430 |
| # Service Member Subjects in investigations completed in FY13 | 437 | # Total Victims associated with MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Total Subjects with allegations unfounded by a Military Criminal Investigative Organization | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved in MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects with allegations unfounded by MCIO | 0 | # Non-Service Member Victims involved in MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member Subjects with allegations unfounded by MCIO | 0 | | |
| # Total Subjects Outside DoD Prosecutive Authority | 97 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated Unknown Offender Reports | 5 |
| # Unknown Offenders | 26 | # Service Member Victims in remaining Unknown Offender Reports | 0 |
| | | # Service Member Victims in substantiated Civilian/Foreign National Subject Reports | 6 |
| # US Civilians or Foreign National Subjects not Subject to the UCMJ | 60 | # Service Member Victims in remaining Civilian/Foreign National Subject Reports | 1 |
| | | # Service Member Victims in substantiated reports against a Service member who is being Prosecuted by a Civilian/Foreign Authority | 7 |
| # Service Members Prosecuted by a Civilian or Foreign Authority | 11 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated reports with a deceased or deserted subject | 0 |
| | | # Service Member Victims in remaining reports with a deceased or deserted subject | 0 |
| # Subjects who died or deserted | 0 | | |
| # Total Command Action Precluded or Declined for Sexual Assault | 89 | # Service member victims who declined to participate in the military justice action | 17 |
| # Service Member Subjects where victim declined to participate in the military justice action | 23 | # Service member victims in investigations having insufficient evidence to prosecute | 44 |
| # Service Member Subjects whose investigations had insufficient evidence to prosecute | 52 | # Service members victims whose cases involved expired statute of limitations | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects whose cases involved expired statute of limitations | 0 | # Service member victims whose allegations were unfounded by Command | 7 |
| # Service Member Subjects with allegations that were unfounded by Command | 14 | | |
| # Service Member Subjects with victims who died before completion of military justice action | 0 | # Service member victims who died before completion of the military justice action | 0 |
| # Subjects still awaiting command action as of 30-SEP-13 | 39 | # Service Member Victims still awaiting command action on a subject as of 30-SEP-13 | 130 |
| # Subjects for whom command action was completed as of 30-SEP-13 | 283 | | |
| # FY13 Service Member Subjects where evidence supported Command Action | 283 | # FY13 Service Member Victims in cases where evidence supported Command Action | 213 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Courts-Martial charge preferred (Initiated) | 169 | # Service Member Victims involved with Court-martial preferrals (Initiations) against subject | 125 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Nonjudicial punishments (Article 15 UCMJ) | 29 | # Service Member Victims involved with Nonjudicial punishments (Article 15) against subject | 20 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Administrative discharges | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Administrative discharges against subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Other adverse administrative actions | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Other administrative actions against subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Courts-Martial charge preferred for non-sexual assault offense | 2 | # Service Member Victims involved with Court-martial preferrals for non-sexual assault offenses | 2 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Non-judicial punishment for non-sexual assault offense | 36 | # Service Member Victims involved with Nonjudicial punishment for non-sexual assault offenses | 25 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Administrative discharges for non-sexual assault offense | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with administrative discharges for non-SA offense | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Other adverse administrative actions for non-sexual assault offense | 47 | # Service Member Victims involved with Other administrative actions for non-SA offense | 41 |

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| F. COURTS-MARTIAL ADJUDICATIONS AND OUTCOMES (Sexual Assault Charge). This section reports the outcomes of courts-martial for sexual assault crimes completed during the Fiscal Year. It combines outcomes for court actions reported in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Subjects with Courts-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) for a Sexual Assault Charge in FY13 | 169 |
| # Subjects whose courts-martial action was NOT completed by the end of FY13 | 0 |
| # Subjects for whom no court-outcome data was available | 0 |
| # Subjects whose courts-martial action was completed by the end of FY13 | 169 |
| # Subjects whose court-martial was dismissed | 35 |
| # Subjects with dismissed court charges who subsequently received NJP | 5 |
| # Subjects who resigned or were discharged in lieu of court-martial | 13 |
| # Officer subjects who were allowed to resign in lieu of court-martial | 1 |
| # Enlisted subjects who were discharged in lieu of court-martial | 12 |
| # Subjects with court-martial charges proceeding to trial on a sexual assault charge | 121 |
| # Subjects Acquitted of Charges | 47 |
| # Subjects Convicted of Any Charge at Trial | 74 |
| Punishments Imposed (For each convicted subject, count all forms of punishment imposed) | |
| # Subjects receiving confinement | 62 |
| # Subjects receiving reductions in rank | 63 |
| # Subjects receiving fines or forfeitures | 37 |
| # Subjects receiving a punitive discharge (Dishonorable, Bad Conduct, or Dismissal) | 50 |
| # Subjects receiving restriction or some limitation on freedom | 5 |
| # Subjects receiving extra duty | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving hard labor | 9 |
| # Subjects to be processed for administrative discharge or separation subsequent to sexual assault charge | 10 |
| # Convicted subjects with a conviction under a UCMJ Article that requires Sex Offender Registration | 56 |
| G. Nonjudicial Punishments Imposed (Sexual Assault Charge). This section reports the outcomes of nonjudicial punishments for sexual assault crimes completed during the Fiscal Year. It combines outcomes for nonjudicial punishment actions reported in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Subjects with Nonjudicial Punishment (Article 15) for a Sexual Assault Charge in FY13 | 29 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment action was not completed by the end of FY13 | 0 |
| # Subjects for whom nonjudicial punishment data was not available | 0 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment action was completed by the end of FY13 | 29 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment was dismissed | 2 |
| # Subjects administered nonjudicial punishment | 27 |
| Punishments Imposed (For each punished subject, count all forms of punishment imposed) | |
| # Subjects receiving correctional custody | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving reductions in rank | 23 |
| # Subjects receiving fines or forfeitures | 15 |
| # Subjects receiving restriction or some limitation on freedom | 4 |
| # Subjects receiving extra duty | 7 |
| # Subjects receiving hard labor | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving a reprimand | 26 |
| # Subjects processed for an administrative discharge or separation subsequent to nonjudicial punishment on a sexual assault charge | 8 |
| H. Other Actions Taken. This section reports other disciplinary action taken for subjects who were investigated for sexual assault. It combines outcomes for subjects in these categories listed in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Subjects receiving an administrative discharge or other separation for a sexual assault offense | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving other adverse administrative action for a sexual assault offense | 0 |
| I. COURTS-MARTIAL ADJUDICATIONS AND OUTCOMES (Non-sexual assault offense). This section reports the outcomes of courts-martial for subjects who were investigated for sexual assault, but upon review of the evidence there was only probable cause for a non-sexual assault offense. It combines outcomes for subjects in this category listed in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Subjects with Courts-Martial Charge Preferred for a non-sexual assault offense in FY13 | 2 |
| # Subjects whose courts-martial action was NOT completed by the end of FY13 | 0 |
| # Subjects for whom no court-outcome data was available | 0 |
| # Subjects whose courts-martial action was completed by the end of FY13 | 2 |
| # Subjects whose court-martial was dismissed | 1 |
| # Subjects with dismissed court charges who subsequently received NJP | 0 |
| # Subjects who resigned or were discharged in lieu of court-martial for a non-sexual assault offense | 0 |
| # Officer subjects who were officers that were allowed to resign in lieu of court-martial | 0 |
| # Enlisted subjects that were discharged in lieu of court-martial | 0 |
| # Subjects with court-martial charges proceeding to trial on a non-sexual assault offense | 1 |
| # Subjects Acquitted of Charges | 0 |
| # Subjects Convicted of Any Charge at Trial | 1 |
| Punishments Imposed (For each convicted subject, count all forms of punishment imposed) | |
| # Subjects receiving confinement | 1 |
| # Subjects receiving reductions in rank | 1 |
| # Subjects receiving fines or forfeitures | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving a punitive discharge (Dishonorable, Bad Conduct, or Dismissal) | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving restriction or some limitation on freedom | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving extra duty | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving hard labor | 0 |
| # Subjects processed for an administrative discharge or separation subsequent to conviction | 0 |
| # Convicted subjects with a conviction under a UCMJ Article that requires Sex Offender Registration | 0 |
| J. Nonjudicial Punishments Imposed (Non-sexual assault offense). This section reports the outcomes of nonjudicial punishments for subjects who were investigated for sexual assault, but upon review of the evidence there was only probable cause for a non-sexual assault offense. It combines outcomes for subjects in this category listed in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Subjects with Nonjudicial Punishment (Article 15) for a non-sexual assault offense in FY13 | 36 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment action was not completed by the end of FY13 | 0 |
| # Subjects for whom nonjudicial punishment data was not available | 0 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment action was completed by the end of FY13 | 36 |
| # Subjects whose nonjudicial punishment was dismissed | 0 |
| # Subjects administered nonjudicial punishment for a non-sexual assault offense | 36 |
| Punishments Imposed (For each punished subject, count all forms of punishment imposed) | |
| # Subjects receiving correctional custody | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving reductions in rank | 26 |
| # Subjects receiving fines or forfeitures | 19 |
| # Subjects receiving restriction or some limitation on freedom | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving extra duty | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving hard labor | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving a reprimand | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving an administrative discharge subsequent to nonjudicial punishment | 2 |
| K. Other Actions Taken (Non-sexual assault offense). This section reports other disciplinary action taken for subjects who were investigated for sexual assault, but upon review of the evidence there was only probable cause for a non-sexual assault offense. It combines outcomes for subjects in these categories listed in Sections D and E above. | FY13 Totals |
| # Subjects receiving an administrative discharge or other separation for a non-sexual assault offense | 0 |
| # Subjects receiving other adverse administrative action for a non-sexual assault offense | 47 |

Unrestricted Reports (continued)

| USAF FY13 UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT - SERVICE MEMBER STATUS BY GENDER | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| L. REPORTED SEXUAL ASSAULTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS (BY or AGAINST Service Members) IN THE BELOW CATEGORIES FOR ALL FY13 INVESTIGATIONS (UR) [Investigation opened within the reporting period] Note: The data in this section is drawn from raw, uninvestigated information about Unrestricted Reports received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | Male on Female | Male on Male | Female on Male | Female on Female | Unknown on Male | Unknown on Female | Multiple Mixed Gender Assault | FY13 Totals | |
| | 531 | 50 | 21 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 5 | 635 | |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 355 | 39 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 416 | |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 136 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 144 | |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 23 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 36 | |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 39 | |
| FY13 UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT BY MATTER INVESTIGATED TYPE (May not reflect what crimes can be charged upon completion of investigation) | | | | | | | | | |
| UNRESTRICTED REPORTS MADE IN FY13 | | Incidents Reported in FY13 | | | | | | | |
| M. REPORTED SEXUAL ASSAULTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS (BY or AGAINST Service Members) IN THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES FOR ALL FY13 INVESTIGATIONS [Investigation opened within the reporting period] Note: The data in this section is drawn from raw, uninvestigated information about Unrestricted Reports received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | Rape (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (Oct07-Jun12) and Sexual Assault (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Contact (Art. 120) | Abusive Sexual Contact (Art.120) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (Oct07-Jun12) (Art. 120) | Non-Consensual Sodomy (Art. 125) | Indecent Assault (Art. 134) (Pre-FY08) | Attempts to Commit Offenses (Art. 80) | FY13 Totals |
| | 184 | 170 | 44 | 165 | 54 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 635 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 111 | 119 | 31 | 105 | 40 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 416 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 39 | 40 | 8 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 16 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 36 |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 18 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 39 |
| # TOTAL Service Member Victims in FY13 Reports | 158 | 149 | 42 | 140 | 58 | 12 | 1 | 8 | 568 |
| # Service Member Victims: Female | 149 | 128 | 34 | 111 | 51 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 481 |
| # Service Member Victims: Male | 9 | 21 | 8 | 29 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 87 |
| TIME OF INCIDENT BY OFFENSE TYPE FOR UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT MADE IN FY13 | | | | | | | | | |
| Time of sexual assault | 184 | 170 | 44 | 165 | 54 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 635 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 57 | 59 | 10 | 33 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 178 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 12 | 7 | 3 | 20 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 52 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 43 | 43 | 12 | 46 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 153 |
| # Unknown | 72 | 61 | 19 | 66 | 24 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 252 |
| Day of sexual assault | 184 | 170 | 44 | 165 | 54 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 635 |
| # Sunday | 22 | 19 | 5 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| # Monday | 11 | 9 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 42 |
| # Tuesday | 8 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| # Wednesday | 11 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| # Thursday | 12 | 12 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| # Friday | 21 | 37 | 4 | 28 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 104 |
| # Saturday | 36 | 36 | 6 | 35 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| # Unknown | 63 | 43 | 12 | 41 | 19 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 189 |

Unrestricted Reports (continued)

| N. DEMOGRAPHICS ON VICTIMS IN INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED IN FY13 [Investigation Completed within the reporting period by the Service Investigation Agencies, regardless of when Investigation was opened] Note: The information below is drawn from all investigations that were closed during FY13, and does not correspond to the data reported in sections F and G, above. | <i>Victim Data From Investigations completed during FY13</i> | | | | | | | | FY13 Totals |
|---|--|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|--------------------|
| Gender of VICTIMS | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 |
| # Male | 9 | 12 | 6 | 22 | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 65 |
| # Female | 146 | 117 | 24 | 104 | 55 | 5 | | 5 | 456 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Age of VICTIMS | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 |
| # 16-19 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| # 20-24 | 48 | 37 | 8 | 22 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 135 |
| # 25-34 | 14 | 12 | 4 | 17 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 62 |
| # 35-49 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 18 |
| # 50-64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # 65 and older | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 73 | 71 | 16 | 67 | 32 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 266 |
| VICTIM Type | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 |
| # Service Member | 122 | 102 | 24 | 89 | 51 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 408 |
| # DoD Civilian | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| # DoD Contractor | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # US Civilian | 31 | 21 | 5 | 27 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| # Foreign national | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| # Foreign military | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade of Service Member VICTIMS | 122 | 102 | 24 | 89 | 51 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 408 |
| # E1-E4 | 89 | 78 | 16 | 61 | 33 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 288 |
| # E5-E9 | 15 | 19 | 6 | 22 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 85 |
| # WO1-WO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # O1-O3 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| # O4-O10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Service of Service Member VICTIMS | 122 | 102 | 24 | 89 | 51 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 408 |
| # Army | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| # Navy | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| # Marines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Air Force | 118 | 99 | 22 | 87 | 50 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 395 |
| # Coast Guard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Status of Service Member VICTIMS | 122 | 102 | 24 | 89 | 51 | 13 | 1 | 6 | 408 |
| # Active Duty | 109 | 96 | 23 | 83 | 49 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 378 |
| # Reserve (Activated) | 7 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Unrestricted Reports (continued)

| O. DEMOGRAPHICS ON SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED IN FY13 [Investigation Completed within the reporting period by the Service Investigation Agencies, regardless of when Investigation was opened] Note: The information below is drawn from all investigations that were closed during FY13, and does not correspond to the data reported in sections F and G, above. | <i>Subject Data From Investigations Closed during FY13</i> | | | | | | | | | FY13 Totals |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|----------------|-------------|
| Gender of SUBJECTS | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 | |
| # Male | 143 | 119 | 27 | 119 | 56 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 482 | |
| # Female | 3 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | |
| # Unknown | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 21 | |
| Age of SUBJECTS | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 | |
| # 16-19 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | |
| # 20-24 | 60 | 54 | 14 | 39 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 190 | |
| # 25-34 | 37 | 43 | 6 | 45 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 155 | |
| # 35-49 | 16 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 56 | |
| # 50-64 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| # 65 and older | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 32 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 81 | |
| Subject Type | 155 | 129 | 30 | 126 | 60 | 14 | 1 | 6 | 521 | |
| # Service Member | 122 | 120 | 25 | 119 | 54 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 452 | |
| # DoD Civilian | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | |
| # DoD Contractor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # US Civilian | 10 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 21 | |
| # Foreign national | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | |
| # Foreign military | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 17 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 35 | |
| Grade of Service Member SUBJECTS | 122 | 120 | 25 | 119 | 54 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 452 | |
| # E1-E4 | 73 | 67 | 16 | 58 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 245 | |
| # E5-E9 | 32 | 44 | 8 | 47 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 159 | |
| # WO1-WO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # O1-O3 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| # O4-O10 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | |
| Service of Service Member SUBJECTS | 122 | 120 | 25 | 119 | 54 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 452 | |
| # Army | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| # Navy | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |
| # Marines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Air Force | 121 | 120 | 24 | 118 | 53 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 446 | |
| # Coast Guard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Status of Service Member SUBJECTS | 122 | 120 | 25 | 119 | 54 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 452 | |
| # Active Duty | 108 | 111 | 24 | 111 | 51 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 415 | |
| # Reserve (Activated) | 8 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Rape (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (Oct07- Jun12) and Sexual Assault (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Contact (Art. 120) | Abusive Sexual Contact (Art.120) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (Oct07- Jun12) (Art. 120) | Non- Consensual Sodomy (Art. 125) | Indecent Assault (Art. 134) (Pre-FY08) | Attempts to Commit Offenses (Art. 80) | FY13 Totals | |

Restricted Reports

| USAF FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT | |
|--|--------------------|
| A. FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT (rape, aggravated sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, non-consensual sodomy, and attempts to commit these offenses). | FY13 TOTALS |
| # TOTAL victims Initially making Restricted Reports | 488 |
| # Service Member victims making Restricted Reports | 453 |
| # Non-Service Member Victims making Restricted Report involving a Service Member Subject | 35 |
| # Total victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in the current FY* | 76 |
| # Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 67 |
| # Non-Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 9 |
| # TOTAL victim reports remaining Restricted | 412 |
| # Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 386 |
| # Non-Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 26 |
| # Reported sexual assaults involving Service Members in the following categories | 488 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 303 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 69 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member (entitled to a RR by DoD Policy) | 35 |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 81 |
| B. INCIDENT DETAILS | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Reported sexual assaults occurring | 488 |
| # On military installation | 141 |
| # Off military installation | 275 |
| # Unidentified location | 72 |
| Length of time between sexual assault and Restricted Report | 488 |
| # Reports made within 3 days of sexual assault | 94 |
| # Reports made within 4 to 30 days after sexual assault | 96 |
| # Reports made within 31 to 365 days after sexual assault | 93 |
| # Reports made longer than 365 days after sexual assault | 148 |
| # Unknown | 57 |
| Time of sexual assault incident | 488 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 162 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 70 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 165 |
| # Unknown | 91 |
| Day of sexual assault incident | 488 |
| # Sunday | 50 |
| # Monday | 18 |
| # Tuesday | 17 |
| # Wednesday | 11 |
| # Thursday | 11 |
| # Friday | 41 |
| # Saturday | 79 |
| # Unknown | 261 |
| C. RESTRICTED REPORTING - VICTIM SERVICE AFFILIATION | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Service Member VICTIMS | 488 |
| # Army victims | 9 |
| # Navy victims | 9 |
| # Marines victims | 4 |
| # Air Force victims | 439 |
| # Coast Guard | 2 |
| # Unknown | 25 |
| D. DEMOGRAPHICS FOR FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT | FY13 TOTALS |
| Gender of VICTIMS | 488 |
| # Male | 60 |
| # Female | 407 |
| # Unknown | 21 |
| Age of VICTIMS | 444 |
| # 16-19 | 105 |
| # 20-24 | 187 |
| # 25-34 | 91 |
| # 35-49 | 20 |
| # 50-64 | 0 |
| # 65 and older | 0 |
| # Unknown | 41 |
| Grade of Service Member VICTIMS | 453 |
| # E1-E4 | 309 |
| # E5-E9 | 56 |
| # WO1-WO5 | 7 |
| # O1-O3 | 29 |
| # O4-O10 | 5 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 24 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 1 |
| # Unknown | 22 |
| Status of Service Member VICTIMS | 453 |
| # Active Duty | 400 |
| # Reserve (Activated) | 22 |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | 4 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 24 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 |
| # Unknown | 3 |
| VICTIM Type | 488 |
| # Service Member | 453 |
| # DoD Civilian | 1 |
| # DoD Contractor | 1 |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 1 |
| # US Civilian (DoD Dependent Over Age 18) | 34 |
| # Foreign national | 1 |
| # Foreign military | 1 |
| # Unknown | 1 |
| E. RESTRICTED REPORTING FOR A SEXUAL ASSAULT THAT OCCURRED PRIOR TO JOINING SERVICE | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Service Member VICTIMS making a Restricted Report for Incidents Occurring Prior to Military Service | 122 |
| # Service Members Making A Restricted Report for an Incident that Occurred Prior to Age 18 | 82 |
| # Service Member Making a Restricted Report for an Incident that Occurred After Age 18 | 36 |
| # Service Members Choosing Not to Specify | 4 |
| F. RESTRICTED REPORTS CONVERSION DATA (DSAID USE ONLY) | FY13 TOTALS |
| Mean # of Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | 6 |
| Standard Deviation of the Mean For Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | 6 |
| Mode # of Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | 6 |
| * The Restricted Reports are reports that converted to Unrestricted Reports are counted in the total number of Unrestricted Reports listed in Worksheet 1a, Section A. | |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| # Support service referrals for Non-Service Members in the following categories | |
| # MILITARY Resources (Referred by DoD) | 237 |
| # Medical | 31 |
| # Mental Health | 37 |
| # Legal | 42 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 24 |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 125 |
| # Medical | 16 |
| # Mental Health | 32 |
| # Legal | 9 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 19 |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 30 |
| # Victim Advocate | 11 |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 |
| E. FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT FROM NON-SERVICE MEMBERS | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Non-Service Member victims making Restricted Report | 27 |
| # Non-Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 8 |
| # Non-Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 19 |
| # Restricted Reports from Non-Service Member victims in the following categories: | 27 |
| # Non-Service Member on Non-Service Member (entitled to a RR by DoD Policy) | 21 |
| # Unidentified Subject or Undisclosed Affiliation on Non-Service Member | 6 |
| Gender of Non-Service Member VICTIMS | 27 |
| # Male | 1 |
| # Female | 26 |
| # Unknown | 0 |
| Age of Non-Service Member VICTIMS | 27 |
| # 18-19 | 6 |
| # 20-24 | 11 |
| # 25-34 | 8 |
| # 35-49 | 1 |
| # 50-64 | 0 |
| # 65 and older | 0 |
| # Unknown | 1 |
| VICTIM Type | 27 |
| # US Military (DoD Dependent Over Age 18) | 2 |
| # US Civilian (DoD Dependent Over Age 18) | 25 |
| # Unknown | 2 |
| # Support service referrals for Non-Service Member VICTIMS in the following categories | |
| # MILITARY Resources | 85 |
| # Medical | 19 |
| # Mental Health | 12 |
| # Legal | 9 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 7 |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 31 |
| # Medical | 7 |
| # Mental Health | 8 |
| # Legal | 1 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 2 |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 5 |
| # Victim Advocate | 4 |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 |

Reports of Sexual Assault in Combat Areas of Interest

| USAF COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST | |
|---|--------------------|
| A. FY13 REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST (CAI) (rape, aggravated sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, non-consensual sodomy, and attempts to commit these offenses) INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS (BY or AGAINST Service Members). | FY13 Totals |
| # VICTIMS in FY13 Unrestricted Reports in Combat Areas of Interest | 23 |
| # Service Member victims | 23 |
| # Non-Service Member victims | 0 |
| # Unrestricted Reports in the following categories | 19 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 16 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 2 |
| # Unidentified Subject on Service Member | 1 |
| # Unrestricted Reports of sexual assault occurring | 19 |
| # On military installation | 19 |
| # Off military installation | 0 |
| # Unidentified location | 0 |
| # Investigations (From FY13 Unrestricted Reports) | 19 |
| # Pending completion as of 30-SEP-12 | 4 |
| # Completed as of 30-SEP-12 | 15 |
| # Restricted Reports in Combat Areas of Interest | 13 |
| # Converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report* | 2 |
| # FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS REMAINING RESTRICTED | 11 |
| B. FY13 DETAILS OF UNRESTRICTED REPORTS IN COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST | FY13 Totals |
| Length of time between sexual assault and Unrestricted Report | 19 |
| # Reports made within 3 days of sexual assault | 4 |
| # Reports made within 4 to 30 days after sexual assault | 6 |
| # Reports made within 31 to 365 days after sexual assault | 5 |
| # Reports made longer than 365 days after sexual assault | 2 |
| # Unknown | 2 |
| Time of sexual assault | 19 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 2 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 2 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 3 |
| # Unknown | 12 |
| Day of sexual assault | 19 |
| # Sunday | 2 |
| # Monday | 3 |
| # Tuesday | 2 |
| # Wednesday | 2 |
| # Thursday | 0 |
| # Friday | 2 |
| # Saturday | 2 |
| # Unknown | 6 |
| C. SUMMARY OF ALL INVESTIGATIONS OF CAI UNRESTRICTED REPORTS COMPLETED IN FY13 | FY13 Totals |
| # Total Investigations completed during FY13 | 20 |
| # Investigations opened in FY13 and completed in FY13 | 15 |
| # Of these investigations with more than one victim, more than one subject, or both | 3 |
| # Investigations opened prior to FY13 and completed in FY13 | 5 |
| # Of these investigations with more than one victim, more than one subject, or both | 0 |
| # SUBJECTS in all investigations completed during FY13 | 20 |
| # Service Member subjects in completed investigations | 17 |
| # Your Service Member subjects investigated by your Service | 17 |
| # Other Service Member subjects investigated by your Service | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member subjects in your Service's investigations | 2 |
| # Unidentified subjects in your Service's investigations | 1 |
| # VICTIMS in all investigations completed during FY13 | 27 |
| # Service Member victims | 27 |
| # Service Member victims own Service's investigations | 27 |
| # Other Service Member victims in your Service's investigations | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member victims in your Service's investigations | 0 |
| # Unidentified victims in your Service's investigations | 0 |

Reports of Sexual Assault in Combat Areas of Interest (continued)

| D. FINAL DISPOSITIONS FOR SUBJECTS IN COMPLETED FY13 CAI INVESTIGATIONS | FY13 Totals | D1. ASSOCIATED VICTIM DATA FOR COMPLETED FY13 CAI INVESTIGATIONS | FY13 Totals |
|--|-------------|--|-------------|
| # Investigations completed in FY13 | 15 | # VICTIMS in investigations completed in FY13 | 25 |
| # SUBJECTS in investigations completed in FY13 | 20 | # Service Member Victims in investigations completed in FY13 | 25 |
| # Service Member Subjects in investigations completed in FY13 | 17 | # Total Victims associated with MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Total Subjects with allegations unfounded by a Military Criminal Investigative Organization | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved in MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects with allegations unfounded by MCIO | 0 | # Non-Service Member Victims involved in MCIO unfounded allegations | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member Subjects with allegations unfounded by MCIO | 0 | | |
| # Total Subjects Outside DoD Prosecutive Authority | 4 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated Unknown Offender Reports | 2 |
| # Unknown Offenders | 2 | # Service Member Victims in remaining Unknown Offender Reports | 0 |
| # US Civilians or Foreign National Subjects not Subject to the UCMJ | 1 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated Civilian/Foreign National Subject Reports | 1 |
| # Service Members Prosecuted by a Civilian or Foreign Authority | 1 | # Service Member Victims in remaining Civilian/Foreign National Subject Reports | 0 |
| # Subjects who died or deserted | 0 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated reports against a Service member who is being Prosecuted by a Civilian/Foreign Authority | 1 |
| # Total Command Action Precluded or Declined for Sexual Assault | 0 | # Service Member Victims in substantiated reports with a deceased or deserted subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects where victim declined to participate in the military justice action | 0 | # Service Member Victims in remaining reports with a deceased or deserted subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects whose investigations had insufficient evidence to prosecute | 0 | # Service member victims who declined to participate in the military justice action | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects whose cases involved expired statute of limitations | 0 | # Service member victims in investigations having insufficient evidence to prosecute | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects with allegations that were unfounded by Command | 0 | # Service members victims whose cases involved expired statute of limitations | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects with victims who died before completion of military justice action | 0 | # Service member victims whose allegations were unfounded by Command | 0 |
| # Subjects still awaiting command action as of 30-SEP-13 | 3 | # Service member victims who died before completion of the military justice action | 0 |
| # Subjects for whom command action was completed as of 30-SEP-13 | 13 | # Service Member Victims still awaiting command action on a subject as of 30-SEP-13 | 8 |
| # FY13 Service Member Subjects where evidence supported Command Action | 13 | # FY13 Service Member Victims in cases where evidence supported Command Action | 13 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Courts-Martial charge preferred (Initiated) | 5 | # Service Member Victims involved with Court-martial preferrals (Initiations) against subject | 5 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Nonjudicial punishments (Article 15 UCMJ) | 4 | # Service Member Victims involved with Nonjudicial punishments (Article 15) against subject | 4 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Administrative discharges | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Administrative discharges against subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Other adverse administrative actions | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Other administrative actions against subject | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Courts-Martial charge preferred for non-sexual assault offense | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Court-martial preferrals for non-sexual assault offenses | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Non-judicial punishment for non-sexual assault offense | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with Nonjudicial punishment for non-sexual assault offenses | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Administrative discharges for non-sexual assault offense | 0 | # Service Member Victims involved with administrative discharges for non-SA offense | 0 |
| # Service Member Subjects: Other adverse administrative actions for non-sexual assault offense | 4 | # Service Member Victims involved with Other administrative actions for non-SA offense | 4 |

| USAF FY13 UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT - SERVICE MEMBER STATUS BY GENDER | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| F. REPORTED SEXUAL ASSAULTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS (BY or AGAINST Service Members) IN THE BELOW CATEGORIES FOR ALL FY13 INVESTIGATIONS (UR) Note: The data in this section is drawn from raw, uninvestigated information about Unrestricted Reports received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | Male on Female | Male on Male | Female on Male | Female on Female | Unknown on Male | Unknown on Female | Multiple Mixed Gender Assault | FY13 Totals | |
| | | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | |
| FY13 UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT BY OFFENSE TYPE | | | | | | | | | |
| UNRESTRICTED REPORTS MADE IN FY13 | | | | | | | | | |
| Incidents Occurring in Prior Fiscal Years, but Reported in FY13 | | | | | | | | | |
| G. REPORTED SEXUAL ASSAULTS INVOLVING SERVICE MEMBERS (BY or AGAINST Service Members) IN THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES FOR ALL FY13 INVESTIGATIONS Note: The data in this section is drawn from raw, uninvestigated information about Unrestricted Reports received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | Rape (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (Oct07- Jun12) and Sexual Assault (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Contact (Art. 120) | Abusive Sexual Contact (Art.120) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (Oct 07- June12) (Art. 120) | Non-Consensual Sodomy (Art. 125) | Indecent Assault (Art. 134) (Pre-FY08) | Attempts to Commit Offenses (Art. 80) | FY13 Totals |
| | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| # TOTAL Service Member Victims in FY13 Reports | 5 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| # Service Member Victims: Female | 4 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| # Service Member Victims: Male | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| TIME OF INCIDENT BY OFFENSE TYPE FOR UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT MADE IN FY13 | | | | | | | | | |
| Time of sexual assault | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| # Unknown | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Day of sexual assault | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| # Sunday | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Monday | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| # Tuesday | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Wednesday | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Thursday | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Friday | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Saturday | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| # Unknown | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

| H. DEMOGRAPHICS ON VICTIMS IN INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED IN FY13 Note: The information below is drawn from all investigations that were closed during FY13, and does not correspond to the data reported in sections F and G, above. | Victim Data From Investigations Opened In Prior Years, but closed during FY13 | | | | | | | | FY13 Totals |
|--|---|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------------|
| Gender of VICTIMS | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Male | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| # Female | 3 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Age of VICTIMS | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # 16-19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # 20-24 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| # 25-34 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| # 35-49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| # 50-64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # 65 and older | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| VICTIM Type | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Service Member | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # DoD Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # DoD Contractor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # US Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Foreign national | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Foreign military | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grade of Service Member VICTIMS | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # E1-E4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # E5-E9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| # WO1-WO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # O1-O3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # O4-O10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Service of Service Member VICTIMS | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Army | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Navy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Marines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Air Force | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Coast Guard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Status of Service Member VICTIMS | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Active Duty | 3 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 27 |
| # Reserve (Activated) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I. DEMOGRAPHICS ON SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATIONS COMPLETED IN FY13 Note: The information below is drawn from all investigations that were closed during FY13, and does not correspond to the data reported in sections F and G, above. | Subject Data From Investigations Opened In Prior Years, but closed during FY13 | | | | | | | | FY13 Totals |
| Gender of SUBJECTS | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| # Male | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 19 |
| # Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Age of SUBJECTS | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| # 16-19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # 20-24 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| # 25-34 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| # 35-49 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| # 50-64 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| # 65 and older | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Subject Type | 3 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| # Service Member | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # DoD Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # DoD Contractor | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # US Civilian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Foreign national | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| # Foreign military | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Grade of Service Member SUBJECTS | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # E1-E4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| # E5-E9 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| # WO1-WO5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # O1-O3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| # O4-O10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Service of Service Member SUBJECTS | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # Army | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Navy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Marines | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Air Force | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # Coast Guard | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Status of Service Member SUBJECTS | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # Active Duty | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| # Reserve (Activated) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST - LOCATION OF UNRESTRICTED REPORTS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| J. FY13 COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST - LOCATIONS OF UNRESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT Note: The data in this section is drawn from raw, uninvestigated information about Unrestricted Reports received during FY13. These Reports may not be fully investigated by the end of the fiscal year. | Incidents Reported In FY13 | | | | | | | | FY13 Totals |
| | Rape (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (Oct07-Jun12) and Sexual Assault (Art. 120) | Aggravated Sexual Contact (Art. 120) | Abusive Sexual Contact (Art.120) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (Oct 07-June12) (Art. 120) | Non-Consensual Sodomy (Art. 125) | Indecent Assault (Art. 134) (Pre-FY08) | Attempts to Commit Offenses (Art. 80) | |
| TOTAL UNRESTRICTED REPORTS | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Arabian Peninsula, Iraq, Red Sea, and Africa | | | | | | | | | |
| Bahrain | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Iraq | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Jordan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lebanon | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Syria | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yemen | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Egypt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kuwait | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oman | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Qatar | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Uganda | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Saudi Arabia | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| United Arab Emirates | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Central and South Asia | | | | | | | | | |
| Kyrgyzstan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Pakistan | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Afghanistan | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| TOTAL UNRESTRICTED REPORTS | 5 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |

Restricted Reports in Combat Areas of Interest

| USAF COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST (CAI) FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY | |
|---|------------------------|
| A. FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT (rape, aggravated sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, non-consensual sodomy, and attempts to commit these offenses) | FY13 TOTALS |
| # TOTAL victims initially making Restricted Reports | 13 |
| # Service Member victims making Restricted Reports | 13 |
| # Non-Service Member Victims making Restricted Report involving a Service Member Subject | 0 |
| # Total victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in the current FY* | 2 |
| # Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 2 |
| # Non-Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 0 |
| # TOTAL victim reports remaining Restricted | 11 |
| # Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 11 |
| # Non-Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 0 |
| # Reported sexual assaults AGAINST Service Member victims in the following categories | 13 |
| # Service Member on Service Member | 10 |
| # Non-Service Member on Service Member | 2 |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member (entitled to a RR by DoD Policy) | 0 |
| # Unidentified subject on Service Member | 1 |
| B. INCIDENT DETAILS | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Reported sexual assaults occurring | 13 |
| # On military installation | 10 |
| # Off military installation | 3 |
| # Unidentified location | 0 |
| Length of time between sexual assault and Restricted Report | 13 |
| # Reports made within 3 days of sexual assault | 1 |
| # Reports made within 4 to 30 days after sexual assault | 5 |
| # Reports made within 31 to 365 days after sexual assault | 3 |
| # Reports made longer than 365 days after sexual assault | 4 |
| # Unknown | 0 |
| Time of sexual assault incident | 13 |
| # Midnight to 6 am | 4 |
| # 6 am to 6 pm | 2 |
| # 6 pm to midnight | 5 |
| # Unknown | 2 |
| Day of sexual assault incident | 13 |
| # Sunday | 0 |
| # Monday | 1 |
| # Tuesday | 2 |
| # Wednesday | 0 |
| # Thursday | 0 |
| # Friday | 0 |
| # Saturday | 1 |
| # Unknown | 9 |

Restricted Reports in Combat Areas of Interest (continued)

| C. RESTRICTED REPORTING - VICTIM SERVICE AFFILIATION | | FY13 TOTALS |
|--|--|--------------------|
| # Service Member VICTIMS | | 13 |
| # Army victims | | 0 |
| # Navy victims | | 0 |
| # Marines victims | | 0 |
| # Air Force victims | | 13 |
| # Coast Guard | | 0 |
| # Unknown | | 0 |
| D. DEMOGRAPHICS FOR FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT | | FY13 TOTALS |
| Gender of VICTIMS | | 13 |
| # Male | | 5 |
| # Female | | 8 |
| # Unknown | | 0 |
| Age of VICTIMS | | 13 |
| # 16-19 | | 0 |
| # 20-24 | | 7 |
| # 25-34 | | 4 |
| # 35-49 | | 1 |
| # 50-64 | | 0 |
| # 65 and older | | 0 |
| # Unknown | | 1 |
| Grade of Service Member VICTIMS | | 13 |
| # E1-E4 | | 10 |
| # E5-E9 | | 2 |
| # WO1-WO5 | | 0 |
| # O1-O3 | | 1 |
| # O4-O10 | | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | | 0 |
| # Unknown | | 0 |
| Status of Service Member VICTIMS | | 13 |
| # Active Duty | | 11 |
| # Reserve (Activated) | | 2 |
| # National Guard (Activated - Title 10) | | 0 |
| # Cadet/Midshipman | | 0 |
| # Academy Prep School Student | | 0 |
| # Unknown | | 0 |
| VICTIM Type | | 12 |
| # Service Member | | 12 |
| # DoD Civilian | | 0 |
| # DoD Contractor | | 0 |
| # Other US Government Civilian | | 0 |
| # US Civilian (DoD Dependent Over Age 18) | | 0 |
| # Foreign national | | 0 |
| # Foreign military | | 0 |
| # Unknown | | 0 |
| E. RESTRICTED REPORTING FOR A SEXUAL ASSAULT THAT OCCURRED PRIOR TO JOINING SERVICE | | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Service Member VICTIMS making a Restricted Report for Incidents Occurring Prior to Military Service | | 3 |
| # Service Members Making A Restricted Report for an Incident that Occurred Prior to Age 18 | | 0 |
| # Service Member Making a Restricted Report for an Incident that Occurred After Age 18 | | 3 |
| # Service Members Choosing Not to Specify | | 0 |
| F. RESTRICTED REPORTS CONVERSION DATA (DSAID USE ONLY) | | FY13 TOTALS |
| Mean # of Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | | |
| Standard Deviation of the Mean For Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | | |
| Mode # of Days Taken to Change to Unrestricted | | |
| * The Restricted Reports are reports that converted to Unrestricted Reports are counted in the total number of Unrestricted Reports listed in Worksheet 1a, Section A. | | |

Restricted Reports in Combat Areas of Interest (continued)

| E. TOTAL # FY13 COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST -RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT | FY13 Totals |
|---|--------------------|
| <i>TOTAL RESTRICTED ASSAULTS IN COMBAT AREAS OF INTEREST</i> | 13 |
| Arabian Peninsula, Iraq, Red Sea and Africa | |
| Bahrain | 0 |
| Iraq | 0 |
| Jordan | 0 |
| Lebanon | 0 |
| Syria | 0 |
| Yemen | 0 |
| Djibouti | 0 |
| Egypt | 0 |
| Kuwait | 1 |
| Oman | 0 |
| Qatar | 6 |
| Uganda | 0 |
| Saudi Arabia | 0 |
| United Arab Emirates | 2 |
| Central and South Asia | |
| Kyrgyzstan | 2 |
| Pakistan | 0 |
| Afghanistan | 2 |

| USAF FY13 SUPPORT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT | | |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>NOTE: Totals of referrals and military protective orders are for all activities during the reporting period, regardless of when the sexual assault report was made.</i> | | |
| A. SUPPORT SERVICE REFERRALS TO SERVICE MEMBER VICTIMS FROM UNRESTRICTED REPORTS: | FY13 | |
| # Support service referrals for VICTIMS in the following categories | TOTALS | |
| # MILITARY Resources (Referred by DoD) | 34 | |
| # Medical | 9 | |
| # Mental Health | 6 | |
| # Legal | 7 | |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 3 | |
| # Victim Advocate/Uniformed Victim Advocate | 8 | |
| # Victim Advocate/Uniformed Victim Advocate | 8 | |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 0 | |
| # Other | 1 | |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 0 | |
| # Medical | 0 | |
| # Mental Health | 0 | |
| # Legal | 0 | |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 0 | |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 0 | |
| # Victim Advocate | 0 | |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 0 | |
| # Other | 0 | |
| # Cases where SAFEs were conducted | 4 | |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 | |
| # Military victims making an Unrestricted Report for an incident that occurred prior to military service | 1 | |
| B. FY13 MILITARY PROTECTIVE ORDERS (MPO)* AND TRANSFERS - UNRESTRICTED REPORTS | FY13 | |
| # Military Protective Orders issued during FY13 | 1 | |
| # Reported MPO Violations in FY13 | 1 | |
| # Reported MPO Violations by Subjects | 0 | |
| # Reported MPO Violations by victims of sexual assault | 1 | |
| # Reported MPO Violations by Both | 0 | |
| *In accordance with DoD Policy, Military Protective Orders are only issued in Unrestricted Reports. A Restricted Report cannot be made when there is a safety risk for the victim. | | |
| # Unit/Duty expedited transfer requests by Service Member victims of sexual assault | 0 | Total Number Denied |
| # Unit/Duty expedited transfer requests by Service Member victims Denied | 0 | Reasons for Disapproval (Total) |
| # Installation expedited transfer requests by Service Member victims of sexual assault | 1 | |
| # Installation expedited transfer requests by Service Member victims Denied | 0 | |
| C. SUPPORT SERVICE REFERRALS FOR MILITARY VICTIMS IN RESTRICTED REPORTS: | FY13 | |
| # Support service referrals for VICTIMS in the following categories | TOTALS | |
| # MILITARY Resources (Referred by DoD) | 18 | |
| # Medical | 5 | |
| # Mental Health | 5 | |
| # Legal | 1 | |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 3 | |
| # Victim Advocate/Uniformed Victim Advocate | 3 | |
| # Victim Advocate/Uniformed Victim Advocate | 3 | |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 1 | |
| # Other | 0 | |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 0 | |
| # Medical | 0 | |
| # Mental Health | 0 | |
| # Legal | 0 | |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 0 | |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 0 | |
| # Victim Advocate | 0 | |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 0 | |
| # Other | 0 | |
| # Cases where SAFEs were conducted | 1 | |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 | |
| CIVILIAN DATA | | |
| D. SEXUAL ASSAULT SERVICES TO NON-SERVICE MEMBERS (DOD CIVILIANS, DEPENDENTS, CONTRACTORS, ETC) | FY13 | |
| # Non-Service Members assisted in the following categories: | TOTALS | |
| # Service Member on Non-Service Member | 5 | |
| # Non-Service Member on Non-Service Member | 7 | |
| # Unidentified Subject or Undisclosed Affiliation on Non-Service Member | 3 | |
| Gender of Non-Service Members Assisted | 15 | |
| # Male | 0 | |
| # Female | 15 | |
| # Unknown | 0 | |
| Age of Non-Service Members Assisted | 15 | |
| # 16-19 | 0 | |
| # 20-24 | 2 | |
| # 25-34 | 7 | |
| # 35-49 | 4 | |
| # 50-64 | 1 | |
| # 65 and older | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 1 | |
| Non-Service Member Type | 15 | |
| # DoD Civilian | 6 | |
| # DoD Contractor | 1 | |
| # Other US Government Civilian | 1 | |
| # US Civilian | 7 | |
| # Foreign National | 0 | |
| # Foreign Military | 0 | |
| # Unknown | 0 | |

Support Services for Victims of Sexual Assault in Combat Areas of Interest (continued)

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| # Support service referrals for Non-Service Members in the following categories | |
| # MILITARY Resources (Referred by DoD) | 35 |
| # Medical | 3 |
| # Mental Health | 6 |
| # Legal | 3 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 6 |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 23 |
| # Medical | 4 |
| # Mental Health | 6 |
| # Legal | 2 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 3 |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 6 |
| # Victim Advocate | 2 |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 0 |
| # Other | 0 |
| # Cases where SAFEs were conducted | 1 |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 |
| E. FY13 RESTRICTED REPORTS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT FROM NON-SERVICE MEMBERS | FY13 TOTALS |
| # Non-Service Member victims making Restricted Report | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member victims who converted from Restricted Report to Unrestricted Report in current FY | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member victim reports remaining Restricted | 0 |
| # Restricted Reports from Non-Service Member victims in the following categories: | 0 |
| # Non-Service Member on Non-Service Member (entitled to a RR by DoD Policy) | 0 |
| # Unidentified Subject or Undisclosed Affiliation on Non-Service Member | 0 |
| Gender of Non-Service Member VICTIMS | 0 |
| # Male | 0 |
| # Female | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 |
| Age of Non-Service Member VICTIMS | 0 |
| # 18-19 | 0 |
| # 20-24 | 0 |
| # 25-34 | 0 |
| # 35-49 | 0 |
| # 50-64 | 0 |
| # 65 and older | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 |
| VICTIM Type | 0 |
| # DoD Military | 0 |
| # DoD Civilian | 0 |
| # US Civilian (DoD Dependent Over Age 18) | 0 |
| # Unknown | 0 |
| # Support service referrals for Non-Service Member VICTIMS in the following categories | |
| # MILITARY Resources | 0 |
| # Medical | 0 |
| # Mental Health | 0 |
| # Legal | 0 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 0 |
| # CIVILIAN Resources (Referred by DoD) | 0 |
| # Medical | 0 |
| # Mental Health | 0 |
| # Legal | 0 |
| # Chaplain/Spiritual Support | 0 |
| # Rape Crisis Center | 0 |
| # Victim Advocate | 0 |
| # DoD Safe Helpline | 0 |
| # Other | 0 |
| # Cases where SAFEs were conducted | 0 |
| # Cases where SAFE kits or other needed supplies were not available at time of victim's exam | 0 |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|------------|-----------------|----------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 1A | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | | | | | | | | | | | | All Subjects and Victims | Victim #1 attended a wedding where she met Subject #1 and Subject #2 (in case immediately below). After the reception, Victim returned to the hotel room of the two men. Victim #1 sat on the bed and engaged in conversation with both Subjects. Victim #1 reported that Subject #1 unhooked her bra and, as she attempted to stand, he forced her back down while Subject #2 blocked the door. Victim reported that Subject #2 removed her pants and that both Subjects took turns having sexual intercourse with the victim #2 was discovered through the subsequent investigation as having allegedly been sexually assaulted by both Subjects the previous night at the same wedding. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, assault consummated by a battery, and conduct unbecoming an officer. Following the Article 32 investigation, the general court-martial convening authority referred charges against Subject #1 to a general court-martial. Prior to the trial, Victim #2 wrote a letter to the convening authority stating that she did not believe she had been raped or sexually assaulted. Charges related to Victim #2 were withdrawn prior to trial. Subject #1 was convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer. Subject #1 was acquitted of rape and assault consummated by a battery. The panel of members imposed no punishment during sentencing. |
| 1B | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | YES | | | Dismissal | | | | | | | | All Subjects and Victims | Victim #1 attended a wedding where she met Subject #1 (from companion case immediately above) and Subject #2. After the reception, Victim returned to the hotel room of the two men. Victim #1 sat on the bed and engaged in conversation with both Subjects. Victim #1 reported that Subject #1 unhooked her bra and as she attempted to stand forced her back down while Subject #2 blocked the door. Victim reported that Subject #2 removed her pants and that both Subjects took turns having sexual intercourse with her. Victim #2 was discovered through the subsequent investigation as having allegedly been sexually assaulted by both Subjects. Victim #1 reported that Subject #1 unhooked her bra and as she attempted to stand forced her back down while Subject #2 blocked the door. Victim reported that Subject #2 removed her pants and that both Subjects took turns having sexual intercourse with her. Victim #2 was discovered through the subsequent investigation as having allegedly been sexually assaulted by both Subjects the previous night at the same wedding. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, assault, conspiracy to commit rape, conspiracy to commit an indecent act, and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Subject #2 was convicted of 2 specifications of conspiracy to commit an indecent act and 2 specifications of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Subject #2 was sentenced to confinement for 2 months, a dishonorable discharge, and a reprimand. |
| 2A | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | All Subjects and Victims | Victim #1 reported that after consuming alcohol at a hotel party Subject #1 digitally penetrated Victim and then Subject #1 and Subject #2 (in companion case immediately following) began grabbing her breasts and touching her. Victim #1 indicated she told both Subjects to "stop". Victim #1 stated that Subject #2 then started performing oral sex on her while Subject #1 forced her legs apart and Subject #1 then got on top of Victim and penetrated her vagina with his penis. Victim #2 reported that on a different night than the allegations involving Victim #1 she and Subject #1 had been drinking alcohol at an off-base residence when Subject #1 grabbed her, began to kiss her, and removed her pants and performed oral sex on her while she said "no" and then attempted to penetrate her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges against Subject #1 for sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Prior to the court-martial, Victim #2 declined to participate and requested that the charges relating to her be dismissed. The general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges relating to Victim #2. Subject #1 was acquitted of the remaining charges. | |
| 2B | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | E-1 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that after consuming alcohol at a hotel party off-base, Subject #1 in companion case (case immediately preceding) digitally penetrated Victim and then Subject #2 and Subject #1 began grabbing her breasts and touching her. Victim indicated she told both Subjects to "stop". Victim #1 stated that Subject #2 then started performing oral sex on her while Subject #1 forced her legs apart and Subject #2 then got on top of Victim and penetrated her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges against Subject #2 for rape, assault consummated by a battery, and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject #1 was acquitted of rape, forcible sodomy, and distribution of cocaine. Subject #1 was sentenced to confinement for 18 months, a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 3A | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Male & Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | Wrongful use, possession, etc. of controlled substances Art. 112a | | YES | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1, Subject #1, Subject #2 (in companion case immediately following), and other Airmen took a weekend trip. At some point in the evening Victim #1 and Subject #1 began kissing. Victim reported that both Subjects took turns inserting their penises into her vagina and mouth while holding her down. Victim reported that she resisted and told both Subjects to stop. Victim #2 reported that on a different occasion she remembered waking up and that Subject #1 was forcing her to perform oral sex. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges against Subject #1 of use and distribution of cocaine, use and distribution of ecstasy, rape, forcible sodomy, and disseminating a lawless command. Subject #1 was convicted of use and distribution of cocaine, use and distribution of ecstasy, rape, forcible sodomy, and disseminating a lawless command. Subject #1 was sentenced to confinement for 1 year, hard labor without confinement for 90 days, and reduction in grade to E-1. Administrative discharge proceedings were pending at the end of FY13. |
| 3B | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | Wrongful use, possession, etc. of controlled substances Art. 112a | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject #1 (in companion case immediately preceding), Subject #2 and other Airmen took a weekend trip. At some point in the evening Victim #1 and Subject #1 began kissing. Victim reported that both Subjects then took turns inserting their penises into her vagina and mouth while holding her down. Victim reported that she resisted and told both Subjects to stop. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander referred charges against Subject #2 for rape, forcible sodomy, wrongful use of cocaine, wrongful use of ecstasy, and willfully disobeying a lawful command. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject #2 was convicted of wrongful use of cocaine and ecstasy and willfully disobeying a lawful command. Subject #2 was acquitted of rape and forcible sodomy. Subject #2 was sentenced to confinement for 1 year, hard labor without confinement for 90 days, and reduction in grade to E-1. Administrative discharge proceedings were pending at the end of FY13. |
| 4 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she and Subject were friends. Victim was at Subject's house watching a movie. When the movie ended Subject started kissing Victim. Victim consented at first but changed her mind and told Subject to stop. Subject pulled Victim's pants down and penis of and had sexual intercourse with Victim. Case initially investigated by Great Falls PD. Jurisdiction referred to the Air Force. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape, wrongful sexual contact, and conduct unbecoming an officer. Following the Article 32 investigation the charges were referred to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 5 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | | | General | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she and Subject were watching a movie and Subject attempted to have sexual intercourse with her on multiple occasions and she said "no" each time. Victim reported that Subject forcibly digitally penetrated her and after struggling to push him away she eventually gave up struggling and they had sexual intercourse. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 4 months, 30 days restriction, forfeiture of \$1,000/month for 4 months, and reduction in grade to E-1. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General service characterization. |
| 6 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that after going to the movies with Subject, Subject invited her back to his residence. Victim reported that she and Subject began cuddling and Subject started kissing victim's neck. Victim reported that she said told Subject to stop multiple times and that Subject pinned her arms down and put his hand down her pants and digitally penetrated her vagina and pulled her pants down and inserted his penis in her vagina. Victim #2 reported that Subject entered her room through the connecting doorway of another female Airmen that Subject was dating and pulled her breast out of her shirt and put his mouth on it. Victim #3 reported that Subject touched her breasts, pulled her bra over her head, and exposed her breasts to her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, wrongful sexual contact, and unlawful entry. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. |
| 7 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she blacked out due to intoxication and that she had been sexually assaulted by Subject during the blackout. She later stated it could have been a dream. Victim subsequently declined to participate. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was insufficient evidence to support preferred charges without the victim's participation. The commander sent Subject with a LOR for misconduct and initiated administrative discharge proceedings. The special court-martial convening authority terminated discharge proceedings. | |
| 8 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she, her husband, and their spouses were drinking alcohol at their house on-base. Victim reported that she fell asleep on the couch and Subject touched her buttocks, breasts, and vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 9 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | YES | All Victims | During two separate incidents, Subject sexually assaulted Victim #1 and Victim #2, who were asleep after consuming alcohol at parties. Subject photographed the assaults. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of abusive sexual contact, indecent acts, and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact, indecent acts, and assault consummated by a battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 18 months, a bad conduct discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 10 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and other persons went out drinking off base. After returning to base everyone went to sleep. Victim reported that during the night Subject penetrated her vagina with his penis and orally sodomized her vagina while she was unable to consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 11 | Nonconsensu at Sodomy Art. 125 | Kyrgyzstan | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensu at Sodomy Art. 125 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that during a deployment he and Subject were in Victim's room drinking alcohol. Victim stated that she passed out and woke up to Subject on top of him with Subject's penis inserted into his anus. The investigation into Victim's allegation was joined with ongoing investigation stemming from misconduct Subject allegedly committed while he was an instructor at basic military training from 2008-2010. In 2009, several members of his 55-member male training flight reported that Subject committed acts of maltreatment against them. Among the instances of maltreatment, Subject struck members in the genitals, ordered them to perform PT while naked in close proximity to the commander, and ordered members to get up hot on their genitals as punishment. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges for forcible sodomy, abusive sexual contact, simple assault, cruelty or maltreatment, failure to obey a general order, and denial of flight. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of 2 specifications of abusive sexual contact, 4 specifications of simple assault, 12 specifications of cruelty or maltreatment, 4 specifications of failure to obey a general order, and 7 specifications of denial of duty. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, forfeiture of \$1,000/month for 3 months, and reduction in grade to E-6. At the conclusion of FY13, administrative discharge action against Subject was pending. |
| 12 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY12 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY12 to FY12) Art. 120 | Discharge or Restraint in Lieu of Court-Martial | | | | | | | | | | | LOTH | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was drinking alcohol at a bar off-base. Subject took her home to his off-base residence and Victim indicated that she woke up the next day and Subject indicated they had sexual intercourse, but she did not remember having sex. On a second separate occasion Victim was at Subject's off-base residence watching a movie and Subject attempted to initiate sexual contact. Victim told Subject "no". Victim went to sleep and woke up to Subject touching her breasts for sensory. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, maltreatment, denial of duty. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 request with a LOTHIC service characterization. | |
| 13 | Aggravated Sexual Assault and (FY12 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Subject was invited to a party at an off-base residence where she met Victim. That night they both drank excessive amounts of alcohol and Victim got sick and passed out. Despite the efforts of other Airmen at the party to separate Subject from Victim, Subject had sexual intercourse with Victim while she was too drunk to consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, and denial of duty. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject pled guilty to sexual assault and forcible sodomy pursuant to a Plea Agreement. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 years and 9 months, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime | | |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| 14 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she attended a party off-base with Subject and other Airman where they all drank alcohol. After leaving the party they went to another apartment. Victim sat on a couch and reported that Subject attempted to pull her down. She said she resisted and told him to "stop." Victim reported that Subject got on top of Victim, removed her shorts, and penetrated her vagina with his penis and then her anus with his penis, while Victim continued to tell Subject to "stop." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | | |
| 15 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Male | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | YES | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject pressed his groin against Victim's shoulder. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact for abusive sexual contact imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-3, suspended reduction in grade to E-2, 14 days extra duty, and a reprimand. | |
| 16 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | OCOUNS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she and Subject spent the evening socializing and drinking alcohol at a bar off-base. Upon returning to base Victim stated that Subject offered to walk Victim home and then took her into the bushes and sexually assaulted her by forcibly sodomizing her against sexual intercourse while when she was unable to consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, forcible sodomy, indecent exposure, drunk driving, adultery, and making a false official statement. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred charges for sexual assault and forcible sodomy to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | | |
| 17 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q3 | Unknown Subject | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject raped her off-base. The subsequent OSI investigation was unable to identify a Subject. This case resulted in no action. | |
| 18 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she and Subject hung out and drank alcohol at a bar. They returned to Subject's off-base residence and engaged in consensual sex. Victim reported that after falling asleep she woke up to Subject on top of her digitally penetrating her and that she tried to move away and told Subject to "stop" but then he started having sexual intercourse with her as she continued to tell him to "stop." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 19 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Dereliction of Duty Art. 92 | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went to bed after consuming large amounts of alcohol. Victim heard noises coming from Victim's room and went into the room where she found Subject laying on top of Victim in her bed, yelled at him, and began to hit him to get him off of Victim. Victim woke up to the witness's yelling. Victim's pajama pants and underwear had been removed, but the shirt she was wearing remained. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual assault, housebreaking, unlawful entry, and dereliction of duty for underage drinking. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of dereliction of duty for underage drinking and acquitted of the remaining offenses. Subject was sentenced to hard labor for 60 days, forfeiture of \$300/month for 6 months, and reduction to E-2. | |
| 20 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went out drinking with friends off base. Subject gave Victim a ride home and walked her to her dorm room. Victim laid down on her bed and Victim and Subject engaged in consensual kissing. Victim stated "I can't have sex." Victim began having memory gaps, but remembers Subject taking off her pants and underwear. Next three days she remembers Subject having sex with Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge of aggravated sexual assault. The Article 32 hearing Investigating Officer recommended not going forward with the case. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charge. | |
| 21 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Assault Art. 128 | | | YES | | | | | | General | | | Victim | Victim and Subject attended the same party off-base. Victim fell asleep on the couch. Victim reported that Subject touched her legs, waist, and breasts. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Pursuant to a pretrial agreement, charges were referred for assault. Victim pled guilty to the simple assault charges and the abusive sexual contact charges were dropped and dismissed by the special court-martial convening authority. Subject was sentenced to hard labor without confinement for 2 months, reduction in grade to E-1, and a reprimand. The accused was then recommended for discharge administratively separated from the Air Force with a General Service characterization. Subject has been previously investigated for a sexual assault offense. | | |
| 22 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Male | Multiple Victims - Male | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that he was at an off base house for a flight party, where he became sick after consuming multiple alcoholic beverages. Victim #1 reported that he went to the couch in the basement and Subject who he had dated in the past, came down to talk to him. Victim #1 reported that he passed out and the next thing he remembered was Subject on top of him kissing him. A witness who entered the room reported seeing Subject on top of Victim, kissing Victim with Victim's penis on Subject's hand and that Victim appeared unconscious and was not moving. Victim #2 reported that he and Subject were hanging out in his dorm room, that he had recently taken prescribed antidepressants and became drowsy. Victim #2 reported that Subject attempted to kiss him and that he said "no" and pushed Subject away. Victim #2 reported that he fell asleep and woke up to Subject's penis inserted into his buttocks grinding on him. Victim #2 reported that Subject forcibly penetrated his anus with his penis. Subsequently, Victim #2 communicated to the legal office and AFOSI that he no longer wished to participate in the investigation. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and child endangerment (related to a separate allegation not involving either Victim #1 or Victim #2). Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges of sexual assault and abusive sexual contact to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 1 year, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 23 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Discharge or of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | UOTHC | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she had been drinking with her sister and Subject (her sister's husband). Victim stated she and Subject had sex and Subject came over and started touching her breasts and pulling off her pants. Victim stated she stayed motionless and felt like she couldn't move or say anything. Victim also relayed that she could have stopped the assault if she wanted to, but something prevented her from doing so. Subject proceeded to have sex with her. Case initially investigated by Great Falls PD and Subject assigned in Great Falls, MT. Great Falls relinquished jurisdiction to the Air Force. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, and adultery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the discharge in lieu of court-martial with an UOTHC service characterization. | | |
| 24 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q1 | Civilian or Foreign Person Subject to UCMJ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject hosted a barbecue that Victim and others attended. Victim became intoxicated and decided to stay the night at Subject's home. Subject gave Victim some water Victim later believed had been drugged and Victim fell asleep. Victim awoke in Subject's bed with Subject stroking Victim's penis and over thigh. Victim pushed Subject's hand away and Subject went downstairs. Victim followed Subject who acted as if he was confused at what had happened. Subject later confessed to OSI that he had assaulted Victim. Local prosecutors retained jurisdiction and Subject later pled guilty to lewd and lascivious conduct in civilian court and was sentenced with fines with an option of 50 hours community service in lieu of the fines, counseling and an alcohol abuse course. Victim #1 reported that while she was TDY she and Subject, her supervisor, were drinking at the enlisted club with other people. | | |
| 25 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 returned to her room. Subject brought more drinks and Victim let him in. After drinking and talking Victim #1 reported that she passed out and woke up to Subject feeling between her legs. Victim #2 was discovered during the investigation and reported that while TDY she and Subject were drinking off base with other people. Victim #2 wanted to go back to her room and Subject told her she could stay in her room. Victim #2 reported that she woke up to Subject's penis inserted into her vagina. Victim #2 subsequently sent initial counsel and AFOSI a message to stop contacting her, indicating that she no longer was willing to cooperate with the investigation. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for abusive sexual contact and the special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was convicted of wrongful sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to reduction in grade to E-4, and a reprimand. Discharge decision pending at end of FY15. | |
| 26 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim was cleaning offices and being supervised after normal duty hours by the Subject. While she was cleaning an office, Subject came in and pushed her into the office chair and ran his hand over her inner thigh to her pubic area. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred and referred charges of abusive sexual contact and cruelty or brutality in the court-martial. Victim decided she no longer wanted to participate in the court-martial. As a result, the commander withdrew and dismissed the charges without prejudice. |
| 27 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | All Victims | Victim #1 reported alleged sexual assaults committed by Subject over the previous 3 years. Victim #1 stated that Subject stayed with her in a car when she was intoxicated and kissed and fondled her breasts until she told him to stop. Victim #2 reported that Subject attempted to fondle her while she was intoxicated, but that Subjects with caught him in the act. Victim #1 reported that Subject raped Victim #3 in a car outside a bar when Victim #3 was intoxicated. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority took no action in the case due to the victims declining to participate. The commander to Report to the Subject. | | |
| 28 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | Rape Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that after agreeing to spend the night with Subject in his dorm room, after falling asleep she woke up to Subject's hand down her pants and her pants untied. She got out of bed and told him that his touching her while she was asleep was not ok. A couple days later the two were hanging out and Subject inserted his fingers into Victim #1's vagina without her consent and forcibly straddled her, taking her wrists in one of his hands and penetrating her vagina with his penis. During the course of the investigation Victim #2 and Victim #3 were discovered, but were also sexually assaulted by Subject in his dorm room. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and battery. Subject was convicted of 2 specifications of rape, 2 specifications of aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, 2 specifications of forcible sodomy, and battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 10 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 29 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject took her to a warehouse facility on base and made sexual advances, despite Victim's verbal objection. Subject penetrated Victim's vagina with his penis. After the investigation started Victim moved out of state and did not respond to attempts from investigators to contact her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority returned the case to the commander for action. The commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, indecent exposure, and indecent exposure. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 15 days of extra duty, reduction in grade to E-1, and a reprimand. |
| 30 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Subject | Victim was the driver for Sober Ride. Victim reported that upon picking Subject was urinating on her pants and stumbling. Victim stated that upon entering the vehicle Subject slid his hand along the left side of Victim's buttock and then grabbed Victim's right side buttock. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was not probable cause to support the sexual assault allegation and issued Subject a LOR. | | |
| 31 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | YES | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that Subject, a co-worker grabbed her breast. Subject indicated that he had been teasing Victim and Victim grabbed her pectoral muscle and in response he grabbed her breast. Victim #2 reported that she asked for Subject's ID card as she drove on base and when she reached to retrieve his ID card and placed it for his penis he pushed her away. Victim #2 reported that Subject grabbed her and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for sexual assault and disciplinary conduct. The Staff Judge Advocate, the commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-2, suspended reduction in grade to E-1, and a reprimand. |
| 32 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | | | | | | | | General | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that Subject touched her breast and thigh. Victim #2 reported that Subject slipped her on the buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-2, suspended reduction in grade to E-1, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. | |
| 33 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | OCOUNS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Aggravated Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Aggravated Sexual Assault Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that Subject touched her breasts and slipped her buttocks. Victim #2 reported that Subject touched her breasts and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, indecent exposure, and indecent exposure. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 10 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-5, and a reprimand. |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 34 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | | Victim reported that she met Subject online and moved in with him. Victim reported that Subject forced her to have sex with him twice. Victim also reported that Subject indicated he could not support Victim financially and placed a letter online arranging for Victim to have sex with other men for money. Victim told Subject she did not want to do that and Subject in another room to make sure she did what she was told. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, forcible pandering, unlawful communication of a threat, and destruction of non-military property. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of forcible pandering and unlawful communication of a threat. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 7 months, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. |
| 35 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Two female Armen met up with three male coworkers to celebrate Victim's birthday. After a night of heavy drinking, the female Armen went back to their hotel room and allowed Subject and another male Airman to sleep in their room since they had been locked out of their hotel room. During the night, Victim awoke to Subject attempting to have sexual intercourse with her. She jumped out of bed and eventually called the police. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the commander preferred an additional charge of abusive sexual contact and the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted of aggravated sexual assault and convicted of abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 12 months, a dishonorable discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. |
| 36 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Assault Art. 128 | YES | YES | YES | | | | | | | General | | | Victim #1 reported that Subject touched her buttocks or hip through her clothing. Victim #2 reported that Subject touched her back through her clothing and underneath her bra strap. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred two specifications of abusive sexual contact involving Victim #1 and Victim #2 and two specifications of harassment involving two other female Airmen who did not make sexual assault allegations. Prior to referral the special court-martial convening authority withdrew and dismissed the abusive sexual contact specifications and the commander preferred additional specifications of assault consummated by battery. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject pled guilty to all specifications. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 20 days, reduction in grade to E-1, restriction to base for 10 days, forfeiture of \$1010, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. |
| 37 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | Both Victim and Subject | | Subject was at Victim's house. Subject offered Victim a massage, which she accepted. Victim took off her shirt while Subject was giving her a massage and Subject digitally penetrated her vagina without her consent. Victim indicated that she did not say "no" but described a feeling of horror while the event occurred. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. |
| 38 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | General | | Victim reported that she and Subject were watching television in Subject's dorm room when Subject grabbed her breasts and touched her crotch. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was only probable cause for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR for attempted adultery. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged for underage drinking and carrying on inappropriate sexual relationships with two married women. | |
| 39 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Victim #1 and Victim #2 reported that Subject touched their breasts and buttocks numerous occasions throughout the night at an off base party. Both Victims subsequently declined to participate and the investigation did not yield any additional evidence to support the sexual assault allegations. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for inappropriate and unprofessional conduct. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 40 | Rape Art.120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her in his dorm room after a party. Victim later declined to participate in the case. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with a vacation action for underage drinking. |
| 41 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | | Foreign Prosecution of Person Subject to | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported to civilian law enforcement that Subject, a prior acquaintance, invited her over to his home to catch up and he attempted to initiate sex. Victim stated that Subject began rubbing her crotch despite her telling him "No" multiple times. Subject was charged in civilian court with third degree sexual assault and second degree false imprisonment. Subject was acquitted of both offenses. | |
| 42 | Rape Art.120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject | | Victim let Subject into her dorm room and they started kissing, but she told Subject that they were not going to have sex because he had been drinking. Victim alleged that Subject raped her while she tried to push him off by pushing on his arm and chest. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge of rape. After receiving the Article 32 investigation and the advice of the staff judge advocate, the convening authority dismissed the charge due to the Victim's decision not to participate. |
| 43 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Victim reported that Subject came up from behind her at work and kissed her on the back of the neck. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 44 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Dismissed followed by Art 15 Punishment | Victim Non-Participation | False official statements Art. 107 | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim met Subject through Facebook and went over to Subject's house. Victim and Subject shared a beer and Subject started kissing Victim. Victim reported that she told Subject that she did not like him like that. Victim reported that Subject carried her to his room, where she again told him "No." Victim reported that Subject took her clothes off and penetrated her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and providing alcohol to a minor. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges due to Victim declining to participate. Commander offered the Subject nonjudicial punishment for providing alcohol to a minor and making a false statement. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to E-4, forfeiture of \$1,521.00/month for 2 months, 45 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 45 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | | Victim reported that after a night of drinking with friends she went home and received an invitation from Subject to go to his house. Subject picked Victim up. Victim reported going to sleep in Subject's bed and recalling at one point feeling Subject on top of her. Victim indicated there were significant gaps in her memory but the next morning Subject acknowledged that they had sex. Victim and Subject had been in a prior consensual sexual relationship, but were no longer together. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 46 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court-Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | UOTH | | Victim #1 reported that Subject touched her breast under her shirt and attempted to touch her buttocks and kiss her. Victim #2 reported that she was walking to her dorm and Subject put his arm around her waist and attempted to kiss her. She stated that Subject did this repeatedly as she kept telling him to stop. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact and the special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject submitted a Chapter 4 request for discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 with an UOTH service characterization. | |
| 47 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Adultery Art. 134-2 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Adultery Art. 134-2 | | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | Victim reported she and Subject were having an affair, and during the course of the affair there were a small number of occasions where Subject pressured Victim to have sex when she did not initially want to. Victim alleges that some of the pressuring involved Subject kissing her and touching her breasts or vagina. Subject denied there was ever an affair. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for adultery. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4, suspended forfeiture of \$1,201.00/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 48 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Assault Art. 128 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Assault Art. 128 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | After a night of drinking, Victim passed out on a hotel room bed. When she awoke, Subject was taking off her shoes, shirt, and bra, while the Subject in a companion case took off her pants and underwear (NOTE: companion case is a Navy Subject). Subject laid next to Victim naked and watched as the other Subject poked Victim in her groin, breast, cleavage, and nipples. Both Subjects then left the Victim in her bed and went to the other bed to have intercourse. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for assault consummated by battery. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-1, forfeiture of \$7,650.00/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 49 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | After drinking alcohol with friends, Victim and Subject returned to a hotel room to sleep. Victim reported that when she awoke in the morning, her shirt was pulled up and Subject had his mouth on her exposed breast. On a separate occasion Victim reported that she and Subject slept on the couch at his home after a night out with friends and Subject sexually assaulted her and ejaculated on her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and indecent acts. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and indecent acts with another. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 4 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 50 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject rubbed an object against her buttocks and genitalia through her clothing. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to the grade of E-4, and a reprimand. |
| 51 | Wrongful Sexual Contact and Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Wrongful Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject and Victim went drinking at a bar and returned to the home of a friend to sleep. They decided to sleep in the same bed, fully clothed, as it was the only bed left to sleep in. In the morning, Victim awoke. Her pants were down to her knees and the accused was rubbing his erect penis between her buttocks. She got up and left the room. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for wrongful sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 52 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject teased Victim and asked to see her. Victim agreed and Subject arrived at her dorm room. Victim told Subject she had a boyfriend. Subject rolled Victim onto her back, climbed on top of her, and held her arms over her. Victim said "Stop" and fought by kicking and biting Subject. Subject digitally penetrated Victim's vagina and pulled her shirt up and kissed and sucked on her breast. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 53 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | | YES | | | | YES | | | General | | | Victim, spouse of another military member, reported that Subject placed his hands on her hips and buttocks while at a Halloween event. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact and simple assault. The commander imposed punishment of 30 days extra duty, reduction in grade to E-2, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. | |
| 54 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Dismissed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she was running down the street and Subject ran up behind her and thrust his penis into her buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander served Subject with nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. After receiving the Subject's response, the commander determined that Subject did not commit the offense and withdrew the nonjudicial punishment. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged/Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 55 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject were attending the same house party. Victim went to sleep in the basement and was woken by Subject. Subject and Victim engaged in consensual kissing. Subject lifted Victim's shirt and Victim pushed Subject away. Subject pushed Victim back onto the couch and removed her pants and performed oral sex on Victim without her consent. Victim tried to get away by falling off the couch. Subject moved on top of her. Victim stated "I want you to stop." Subject tried to penetrate Victim's vagina with his penis. Subject continued to pursue Victim despite her pleading for him to stop and digitally penetrated Victim. After receiving the report and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape, sexual assault, and aggravated sexual contact. Following the Article 32 investigation, three specifications of sexual assault were referred to a general court-martial. The Subject was convicted as charged and sentenced to a dishonorable discharge, confinement for 3 years, total forfeiture of pay and allowances, and reduction to E-1. |
| 56 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G3 | | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Victim | Victim was out drinking alcohol with another civilian, her then-boyfriend, and Subject. Subject drove them all home to the civilian's home. Victim reported that she woke up with Subject on top of her and felt him penetrate her vagina with his penis. Victim subsequently declined to participate in the case. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate the initial disposition authority determined there was insufficient evidence to prefer charges without the Victim's participation. The commander served Subject with an LOR for poor decision making on the night of the alleged sexual assault. | |
| 57 | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim returned to her dorm after night of drinking alcohol. Subject, her next-door neighbor, brought clothes for Victim to change. Victim passed out and awoke choking on Subject's penis. Victim turned away and Subject left. During a separate incident, Victim went to Subject's house. They fell asleep watching a movie together. Victim awoke to Subject touching her breast. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for forcible sodomy and wrongful sexual contact. Victim declined to participate in the Article 32 hearing. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges due to Victim's desire not to participate in the case. |
| 58 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Services | Multiple Victims - Female | G1 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | YES | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victims reported that Subject made inappropriate comments of a sexual nature to multiple female Navy and Air Force members that he worked with. Victim #1 reported that Subject grabbed her breasts and buttocks and asked her to lie about it to investigators. Victim #2 reported that Subject grabbed her buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for wrongful sexual contact, assault consummated by a battery, dereliction of duty, obstructing justice, and indecent language. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject was convicted of one specification of wrongful sexual contact, one specification of indecent language, and one specification of dereliction of duty. Subject was acquitted of one specification of wrongful sexual contact, one specification of dereliction of duty, and three specifications of assault consummated by a battery. Subject was sentenced to 60 days hard labor without confinement, reduction in grade to E-4, forfeiture of \$200/month for 6 months, and a reprimand. |
| 59 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and other Airmen, including Subject, were hanging out from a Subject back to base. Victim volunteered to ride Subject back to base. Subject invited Victim to his dorm room to watch a movie. While they were sitting on the bed, Subject positioned himself on top of Victim and touched her legs, then her breasts. Victim asked him not to touch her but Subject continued. Subject then flipped Victim on her stomach and pulled her pants down, digitally penetrating her vagina and also inserting his penis into her vagina. Victim reported she was in a state of shock and was frozen, unable to communicate or physically resist. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. |
| 60 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | | UOTHC | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject went out to a club where they both drank and then went to a house party. At the end of the night they returned to Subject's off-base residence. Victim reported that she fell asleep and woke up to Subject penetrating her vagina with his penis and that she told him "no" and "stop" and he continued to penetrate her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. Victim supported the Chapter 4 discharge. The general court-martial convening authority approved Subject's Chapter 4 discharge with a UOTHC service characterization. |
| 61 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Cruelty and maltreatment Art. 33 | | | YES | | YES | YES | | | | | General | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject, her coworker, made several sexually offensive comments to her and on one occasion touched her breast through the clothing, touched her buttocks through the clothing with his groin, and kissed her neck. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, indecent conduct, maltreatment, and dereliction of duty. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject was convicted of indecent conduct, maltreatment, and dereliction of duty. Subject was sentenced to restriction for 2 months, hard labor without confinement for 3 months, reduction in grade to E-2, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. |
| 62 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | | YES | | | | | | | | General | YES | Victim's former supervisor, Subject, sent her a text message indicating he was coming to her room to comfort her about a recent incident in which Victim had been caught shoplifting. Once in her room Subject offered Victim a back massage, which she consented to. As Subject gave Victim a massage, he digitally penetrated her vagina. Victim told Subject that she shouldn't be doing this and to stop. Subject did not immediately stop. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred a charge of sexual assault. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge of sexual assault to a special court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 30 days, reduction to E-3, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. |
| 63 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | UOTHC | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that at a party off base Subject touched her buttock and vaginal area. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for wrongful sexual contact and maltreatment. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4, forfeiture of \$1,181/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently discharged for commission of a serious offense with an UOTHC service characterization. |
| 64 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | YES | | YES | | | YES | | | | | YES | Victim | Victim reported that she returned to her boyfriend's off-base residence after they had been out drinking. Victim reported that she and her boyfriend were engaging in sexual intercourse when Subject, her boyfriend's roommate, entered the room naked while he was masturbating and touched her face with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, indecent viewing, and indecent exposure. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of indecent viewing and indecent exposure. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 30 days, hard labor without confinement for 30 days, and reduction in grade to E-2. |
| 65 | Attempt Art. 80 | Afghanistan | | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Male | G3 | Unknown Subject | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim alleged attempted sodomy by 2 Afghan nationals while deployed. OSI was unable to identify or find the Subjects. Case closed with no action. |
| 66 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her by penetrating her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. |
| 67 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | G2 | | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | | YES | | YES | YES | | | | | | All Victims | Victim #1 and Victim #2 reported that while they were asleep Subject took possession of Victim #1's cell phone and forwarded nude pictures of Victim #1 and Victim #2 to his phone. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for indecent viewing and providing alcohol to a minor. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to the grade of E-2, restriction to base for 30 days, 30 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 68 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed followed by Art 15 Punishment | Further Evidence Discovered | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | General | Both Victim and Subject | Victim attended a dorm room party with Subject and other Airmen. Victim, Subject, and other Airmen were drinking alcohol. Victim reported that Subject pressed Victim against a wall and began to kiss her. Victim kissed Subject back and Subject stated he wanted to have sexual intercourse. Victim told Subject she was not interested. Victim reported that Subject pushed Victim onto the bed, removed her clothing, and inserted his penis into her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. A video of the incident discovered on the eve of trial showed evidence of consent. The general court-martial convening authority dismissed charges and returned the case to the commander for appropriate disposition. The commander offered the Subject nonjudicial punishment for indecent conduct for having sexual intercourse with Victim in the presence of other Airmen and other offenses not related to the incident. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to E-1, suspended forfeiture of \$745/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently discharged for drug use with a General Service characterization. |
| 69 | Sexual Assault (Victim Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Underage Drinking Art. 134 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Underage Drinking Art. 134 | YES | | YES | | | | YES | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was socializing with Subject and other friends in his dorm room. Victim stated that she left Subject's dorm room to go back to her own and fell asleep. Subject called her to ask if he could come over. Victim told him no. Victim said she woke up to Subject in her bed and told him to leave. She indicated she did not remember what happened after that but says that she awoke again to find his legs on her face, neck, and feet on her hands on her arms, back, inner thighs, breasts, and groin. Victim was groping her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for underage drinking. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-2, suspended forfeiture of \$835/month for 2 months, 45 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 70 | Sexual Assault (Victim Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | G4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went out to a club with Subject and other Airmen. Afterwards they returned to Subject's off-base residence. Victim reported waking up and asking Subject if he had sex. Subject replied they had. Victim had no recollection. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority recommended that court-martial was not appropriate due to the Article 32 Investigative Officer's recommendation not to go forward to court-martial. |
| 71 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G4 | | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went out drinking alcohol with Subject and Subject's wife. All three returned to Subject's residence on-base. Victim reported that Subject's wife forcibly removed her pants and digitally penetrated her and Subject then engaged in sexual intercourse with her after she said "no." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for non-sexual assault offenses. The commander served Subject with an LOR and nonjudicial punishment for indecent exposure and adultery. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-3 and a reprimand. |
| 72 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was drinking alcohol on two separate occasions with Subject and another person. On the first occasion, Victim and Subject consensually kissed. Subject also started to grab and rub Victim's breast and vagina. When Victim said "no," Subject departed. On the second occasion, Victim reported that she fell asleep and woke up to find Subject on top of her attempting to penetrate her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and obstruction of justice. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 73 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-2 | Female | G3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that during a squadron camping trip where everyone was drinking alcohol Subject kissed her and put his hand down the back of her pants, digitally penetrating her anus. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority decided to return the case to the commander for action. The commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued Subject an LOR for indecent acts. |
| 74 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | G1 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | Rape Art.120 | YES | | DD | | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 went to Subject's dorm room to watch a movie. During the movie, Subject grabbed her head and forced her to perform oral sex on him. When she tried to resist, he smacked her in the head until she complied. Almost a year later, after a night of drinking, Subject was invited to the dorm room of Victim #2 with whom he had had previous consensual sexual intercourse. Victim #2 invited Subject to stay the night, but never consented to sex. That night, in bed, Subject forced her to have sex with him. Upon learning of the sexual assault, Victim #1 was charged with her previous reported rape. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape, abusive sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and assault consummated by a battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 11 years, a dishonorable discharge, and a reprimand. |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art. 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 75 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Dismissed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that while at the club on-base Subject grabbed her buttocks and touched her genital area in an attempt to penetrate her vagina with his fingers. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Victim subsequently declined to participate in the court-martial. As a result the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 76 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Female | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim attended a house party hosted by Subject where both drank alcohol to the point of intoxication. Victim stated that she laid down on the couch and woke up with Subject having sex with her. Victim stated that she could not remember what happened and declined to participate in the investigation. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was insufficient evidence to support the sexual assault allegation without the Victim's participation. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for indecent exposure, assault consummated by a battery, and drunk and disorderly conduct. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4, forfeiture of \$500/month for 6 months, 30 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 77 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Dismissed followed by art 15 Punishment | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | Dereliction of Duty Art. 92 | | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that she and Subject consensually kissed and Subject began rubbing her vagina underneath her clothes and digitally penetrated her. Victim asked if they could just watch TV, to which Subject agreed. Victim reported that she and Subject began to kiss again and Subject again started to rub her vagina underneath her clothes. She removed both of her clothes, and pulled Victim on top of her and placed his penis inside her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and deviation of duty for having a minor in his dorm room. The Article 32 hearing officer recommended that the rape charge be dismissed. The convening authority dismissed the charges. Commander offered the Subject nonjudicial punishment for dereliction of duty for having a minor in his dorm room. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to E-4 with suspended reduction to E-1, forfeiture of \$1,149 for 1 month with \$89 suspended, 30 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 78 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that she had dinner at Subject's house off-base and she also drank alcohol. Victim went to sleep and Subject began touching her breasts and genitals. Victim reported that she attempted to push Subject away, but passed out and when she woke up again she was naked and said her vagina was sore. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined that because the Victim indicated she would decline to participate in a prosecution, there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense without her testimony. The commander served Subject with nonjudicial punishment for dereliction of duty for providing alcohol to a minor. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-4. |
| 79 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | Rape Art. 120 | YES | | YES | | | | | | General | YES | Victim | Victim became heavily intoxicated at a bar of base. Subject and Subject's friend took her back to Subject's on-base residence where they helped her to Subject's bedroom. After Subject's friend left the room, Subject laid in bed with the Victim, started kissing her, massaged her breasts, and digitally penetrated her. During a second incident in the morning Victim woke to Subject penetrating her with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and aggravated sexual assault. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after the Article 32 investigation. The Subject was convicted of rape and sentenced to confinement for 7 months and reduction to E-1. Subsequently, Subject was administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. | |
| 80 | Nonconsensus at Sodomy Art. 120 | Djibouti | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that while deployed the Subject, and a group of friends were out at a local restaurant eating and drinking. Victim reported that when she returned to her room Subject followed her and asked permission to enter her room, which she allowed. Victim stated that Subject kissed and touched her on the neck and shoulders and that she pulled her shorts and she and Subject began to kiss and lick her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape, abusive sexual contact, and wrongful sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. |
| 81 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | UOTIC | | | Victim | Victim reported that during her intake as a patient at the clinic Subject placed her hand on his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, dereliction of duty, and making a false official report. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 discharge with an UOTIC service characterization. |
| 82 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Female | | Amy | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was at a bar with other soldiers in her unit where she met Subject. Victim and Subject drank throughout the night and returned to Victim's dorm room. Victim reported waking up to Subject on top of her in bed. She told Subject "no" and indicated she went to a court-martial hearing. Subject indicated she woke up a second time and her shorts and underwear had been removed and Subject was on top of her and felt his penis between her legs and pain in her anus. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, forcible sodomy, and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. |
| 83 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim and Subject went to Subject's dorm room after going out to dinner with other Airmen. Subject placed his hand on Victim's groin. Victim pushed his hand away and told him no or stop. Subject then put his hand down Victim's pants and digitally penetrated her. Victim stated that she just wanted to get it over with at that point and Subject and Victim started having sexual intercourse. Victim indicated she gave no consent saying no or stop didn't seem to matter. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 84 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Male | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject were drinking with other Airmen. Subject told Victim that he knew Victim was aware that Subject was gay and Victim stated that he did not care. Victim and Subject went back to Subject's room and Victim reported that Subject sodomized him and that he did not care because he said "no" to any of the sexual acts because he had been drinking. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. |
| 85 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Subject | Victim was at the bowling alley on-base with her friends and met Subject with his friend. Victim had never met them before, but as she passed their table, they began talking to her. Victim decided to leave the bowling alley and Subject's friend offered to walk her home. Subject and his friend walked Victim to her dorm. As Victim went inside, Subject said he wanted to get to know her better. Victim agreed that because she does not have a phone and she does not have a Facebook account, he could stop by her room over the weekend to hang out. Victim entered her room at about 2100 and changed into pajamas. She heard a banging noise outside and realized someone was at the door. She opened the door and saw Subject. Subject put his hands on both sides of Victim's head and tried to pull her in, as if to kiss her. Victim immediately put her hands on his chest area and said "no". She repeated "no" two or three times before Subject acknowledged what she was saying. Victim told Subject to go home. Subject apologized. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. |
| 86 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim met Subject at an off-base party. During the party Victim stated that she consensually performed oral sex on Subject. Victim reported that later in the night she had passed out and woke up to Subject digitally penetrating her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for aggravated sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of \$400/month for 6 months, and reduction in grade to E-3. |
| 87 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Subject and a group of friends at tech school went to a night club. Everyone consumed alcohol. Subject then went with a smaller group of friends that included Victim to a party at a hotel room in town. At the party, they all continued to consume alcohol. Subject and Victim were in the same bed, where a friend of Subject's had Victim down while Subject forced himself upon her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of resisting apprehension, misdemeanor of sentinel, breach of the peace, aggravated sexual assault, indecent exposure, assault consummated by a battery, drunk and disorderly conduct, and unlawful communication of a threat. Following the Article 32 hearing, commander preferred an additional charge of wrongful sexual contact. The general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual assault, 2 specifications of assault consummated by a battery, indecent exposure, drunk and disorderly conduct, and misdemeanor of a sentinel. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 years, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 88 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | | | YES | | | | | General | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject grabbed her buttocks and physically assaulted her on numerous occasions. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for aggravated sexual contact, aggravated assault, and dereliction of duty. The commander imposed punishment of forfeiture of \$980, restriction to base for 30 days, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. |
| 89 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and another Airman were watching a movie in the other Airman's dorm room. Victim stated she felt asleep and woke up to Subject touching her waist and stomach area, which she was with. Subject tried to pull Victim's pants down and Victim told him to stop. Subject started kissing Victim and digitally penetrated her vagina. Victim told Subject to stop but he continued until she was able to break free. Subject started kissing Victim again and put all of his weight on her as she tried to get away. Victim was able to get away and called her friends, who called security forces. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and aggravated sexual contact. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after the Article 32 investigation. The Subject was acquitted. |
| 90 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim and Subject had previously been in a consensual sexual relationship. Subject climbed into Victim's bed. Victim indicated that he was dragging someone else. Subject performed fellatio on Victim, who indicated he was in shock and did not respond to Victim's actions. Subject attempted to kiss Victim and Victim pushed him away and asked him to leave. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 91 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | | | General | | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject licked the face of the Victim while she was sleeping on the couch at the home of a third party. When Subject licked Victim's face, it woke her up. Subject then made sexually suggestive comments to Victim and Victim's friend, tried to follow her into the bathroom and tried to touch her again when she returned to the couch. Victim and Victim's friend then left the home and Subject felt asleep alone on the couch. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4, suspended forfeiture of \$120/month for 2 months, 30 days restriction, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. |
| 92 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | | Rape and Sexual Assault of a Child Art. 120d | YES | | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | | Victim | Victim #1 reported that Subject raped her on one occasion in her dorm room and a second time in her living quarters at a missile alert facility. Victim #2 reported that Subject brushed up against her and touched her buttocks several times intentionally. The investigation also involved a child Victim. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape, aggravated charges of rape, aggravated sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, forcible sodomy, aggravated assault of a child, sodomy of a child, and dereliction of duty. Following the Article 32 investigation, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. The Subject pled guilty to aggravated sexual assault of a child, sodomy of a child, wrongful sexual contact, and dereliction of duty pursuant to a pre-trial agreement. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 5 years, a dishonorable discharge, and reduction to E-1. |
| 93 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Subject | Victim stated that Subject came to her room after sending her a message on Facebook and she realized he was intoxicated when he arrived. Subject grabbed Victim by her arm and dragged her to the bed, attempted to kiss her, and then removed her pants followed by his. Victim stated that she felt numb and gave in to sexual intercourse with Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and aggravated sexual contact. The initial disposition authority decided there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR for adultery. |
| 94 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim and Subject made arrangements to meet at Subject's dorm room for pizza and a movie. Subject made sexual advances and Victim told Subject to stop. Subject grabbed Victim by the arm, pushed her on the bed, removed her clothes and had sexual intercourse with her. The next morning Victim and Subject dated. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate the initial disposition authority decided there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served an LOR on the Subject for engaging in an unprofessional relationship with the Victim. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime | |
|-----|--|----------|-----------------|----------------|--|-------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 95 | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Dismissed followed by Art 15 Punishment | Staff Judge Advocate recommended insufficient evidence to refer charges to court-martial | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim attended a party in Subject's dorm room with Subject and other Airmen. Victim, Subject, and other Airmen were drinking alcohol. As the Subject of the previous report began to have sexual intercourse with Victim, Subject approached Victim, sat near her head and put his penis in Victim's face, attempting to place it in her mouth. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. After the report of investigation was received on the eve of trial showed evidence of consent. The general court-martial convening authority dismissed charges and returned the case to the commander for appropriate disposition. The commander offered the Subject nonjudicial punishment for indecent conduct for touching Victim's face with his penis in the presence of other Airmen. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction to E-3 and a reprimand. Comparison case to previous case. | |
| 96 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim was helping another Airman at work when Subject began talking to Victim and asked her assistance with an issue. Victim reported that she told Subject she could not help him at the moment and that she stood up, turned her back to Subject, and he came up behind her and touched her buttocks. Victim stated she yelled "Hey!" and Subject returned to his room. After reviewing the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and issued Subject a LOR and vacated suspended delinquency from previous nonjudicial punishment for curfew violation. | |
| 97 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Dismissed | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject squeezed her buttocks at a club off-base. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. After receiving the Subject's response, the commander withdrew the nonjudicial punishment action and issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 98 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Victim's husband were playing pool at the club on-base where they were socializing with Subject and another Airman. Victim's husband reported that as Subject was hugging Victim goodbye Subject grabbed and squeezed Victim's buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact and disorderly conduct. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-8, forfeiture of \$500/month for two months, and a reprimand. | |
| 99 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was at a club off-base with other Airmen and that Subject came up to her while she was dancing, placed his hands on her hips and grinded against her buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and issued an LOR. | |
| 100 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | | YES | | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that Subject repeatedly hit her on the buttocks with his hand while socializing at the club on-base. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for conduct unbecoming an officer. The initial disposition authority imposed punishment of forfeiture of \$750/month for 2 months and a reprimand. |
| 101 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that she was walking back to her dorm room from a party where she consumed alcohol and the entered Subject's room to talk and fell asleep in his bed. Victim reported that she woke up to Subject fondling her breasts. Victim stated that she pushed Subject's hand away and tried to leave and Subject still hit her hand back under her hair. Victim stated that she and Subject had been previously involved in a relationship. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge of abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a summary court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 102 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (F108 to F112) | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Assault Art. 128 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Assault Art. 128 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was at a club off-base drinking alcohol and dancing with friends. Victim stated that Subject approached her, pulled her shirt down with one hand to expose her breast and touched her breasts. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with nonjudicial punishment for simple assault. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-4. | |
| 103 | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject and Victim had dated previously. Victim reported that Subject attempted to put his penis in Victim's mouth against her will. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for forcible sodomy. Victim declined to participate in the Article 32 hearing. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charge due to Victim's decision not to participate. | |
| 104 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that Subject tested her and asked to come over to his room to hang out. When he arrived Victim indicated the Subject had been drinking alcohol. Victim reported that Subject pushed her onto the bed and attempted to digitally penetrate her vagina. Victim said "no" and "stop" and Subject started to perform oral sex on her. Victim stated she was able to get out of bed and asked Subject to leave the room, which he did. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and defilement of duty. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred charges for sexual assault and abusive sexual contact to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 105 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Amy | O-2 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she, Subject, and other military members went to dinner and bars off base. Victim and Subject returned to Victim's dorm room. Victim reported that Subject digitally penetrated Victim and she told him to "stop" and he then digitally penetrated her with his penis, she told him to "stop" again and he digitally penetrated her while ejaculating. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 106 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-3 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim was at a bar off base. She reported that she was talking to someone when she felt something touching her buttocks through her shorts. She turned around and glared at Subject and resumed her conversation. Shortly after she was touched in the same place and turned around and threw water on Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 107 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | YES | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Over the course of several years, 4 female Airmen reported that Subject sexually assaulted them in their bed while they slept. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, and indecent acts. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual assault and wrongful sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 1 year, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. |
| 108 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Disorderly conduct Art. 134-13 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Disorderly conduct Art. 134-13 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she, Subject, and other Airmen stayed the weekend at a hotel off base. While drinking alcohol, the four Airmen socialized in Victim's room. Victim reported that while she and one of the Airmen were engaging in consensual sexual acts, Subject rubbed her clothes, inserted his finger into her vagina, performed oral sex on her, and digitally penetrated her anus, all without her consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority returned the case to the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for disorderly conduct. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4. | |
| 109 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (F108 to F112) | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported Subject walked up behind her, turned her around and started kissing her and fondled and kissed her breasts, and rubbed her vagina through her clothing at his off-base residence. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR for an inappropriate relationship. | |
| 110 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim was at a bar with friends when she saw Subject, an acquaintance. Victim and Subject danced and when Victim began to stumble her friends took her outside to leave. Subject followed and when Victim fell in the parking lot to vomit, Subject approached her and grabbed her breasts and buttocks and kissed her neck. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a summary court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 111 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (F108 to F112) | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (F108 to F112) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (F108 to F112) Art. 120 | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | | Involvement specified. | Victim #1 and her friends went to a nightclub. Subject started dancing behind her and reached around and put his hand in her pants and digitally penetrated her vagina. Victim #2 reported that during a work shift together, Subject came up behind her and reached around and grabbed her breast through her ABU top. Victim #3 reported that Subject entered her dorm room and pinned her down on the bed. She was able to pull her hands between Subject and her body, but Subject tried to grab her buttocks and she was pulled out from between them. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual assault, indecent acts, wrongful sexual contact, unlawful entry, adultery, defilement of duty, cruelty or mistreatment, abusive sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after the Article 32 investigation. The Subject was convicted of defilement of duty, unlawful entry, assault consummated by a battery, aggravated sexual assault, and wrongful sexual contact. The Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction to E-1. | |
| 112 | Sexual Assault (After 28 June Art. 120) | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 June Art. 120) | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject drank at a local bar before returning to Subject's residence on-base. Victim reported that she blacked out and believed she was sexually assaulted. Victim stated they did not have sexual intercourse but that it was consensual. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the Investigating Officer recommended not going forward due to a lack of evidence. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charge. | |
| 113 | Rape Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 June Art. 120) | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | | | | General | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject were TDY to Red Flag Alaska. They both went to a bar off base. Victim decided to walk back to base. Subject followed her and tried to kiss her. He then took her purse, which caused her to fall to the ground, when he tried to pull her pants off. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after the Article 32 investigation. The Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after 60 days, restriction for 60 days, reduction to E-3, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General service characterization. | |
| 114 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Services | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | Rape Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that she and Subject were watching movies in her dorm room when Subject climbed on top of her and engaged in sexual intercourse with her while he held her arms above her head and when she said no Subject ignored her protests. Victim #2 was discovered during the investigation. Victim #2 reported that during a consensual relationship, Subject touched her vagina and breasts without her consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape and acquitted of abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 115 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (F108 to F112) | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (F108 to F112) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Assault Art. 128 | YES | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | An investigation was initiated after an Airman reported that Subject had made inappropriate sexual comments to several junior female Airmen. During the course of the investigation, Victim reported that Subject attempted to touch her breasts and inner thigh. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for cruelty or mistreatment, attempted wrongful sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, attempted assault consummated by a battery and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of 4 specifications of cruelty or mistreatment and 2 specifications of assault consummated by a battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 months and reduction in grade to E-4. | |
| 116 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (F108 to F112) | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Disorderly conduct Art. 134-13 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Disorderly conduct Art. 134-13 | | | YES | | | | YES | | | | | Subject | Subject punched the fence in the smoke pit near the club on-base, causing damage to the fence, and a blood alcohol test revealed his BAC as 189. A witness reported that Subject touched Victim's breast and stomach in the dance floor. Victim later informed Subject that she did not want to be touched. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined that there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for drunk and disorderly conduct and disrespect towards an NCO. The commander imposed punishment of 10 days extra duty, reduction in grade to E-2, and a reprimand. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| 159 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim reported that Subject called her into his office during duty hours approximately 10-12 times over a six-month period and digitally penetrated her vagina. Two years prior to this time frame Victim and Subject had a consensual sexual encounter where Subject digitally penetrated her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined that Subject was not Subject to the UCMJ at the time of the offense. Subject received an LOR for engaging in an unprofessional relationship. | |
| 160 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | Victim | | Victim and Subject went to a dance hall with a group of people. Victim drank alcohol beforehand. Victim and Subject danced together. Victim stated that Subject drove her back to her house and the next thing she remembered was Subject over her in her bed penetrating her vagina with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for sexual assault. The victim testified on behalf of the Article 32 hearing and indicated she did not want to participate in a court-martial. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 161 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Dismissed followed by Art 15 Punishment | Staff Judge Advocate recommended insufficient evidence to refer charges to court-martial | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | | | | YES | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she went to a club with friends. While at the club she danced and talked with Subject. Subject invited Victim to come home and have sex with him and Victim agreed. Subject asked Victim if she would be his dominatrix and Victim said she would. Victim reported that once she was alone with Subject in the car she was too scared to say "no" to his demands for sexual acts and had sexual intercourse with Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, assault consummated by a battery, and indecent acts. Following the Article 32 hearing, the Staff Judge Advocate advised the special court-martial convening authority there was insufficient evidence to go forward. Additionally, the victim indicated that she did not wish to pursue a court-martial. The initial disposition authority agreed with the recommendation. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for committing indecent acts. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4 and a reprimand. |
| 162 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim, Subject, Subject's wife, and other Airmen were drinking off base. Victim's wife confronted Victim approximately 5 months later stating she was the cause of the divorce between her and Subject because Subject had fondled Victim's inner thigh and breast when they were in the car driving back onto base 5 months earlier. Victim responded that she was unconscious at the time and did not consent to the touching. The investigation also uncovered allegations that Subject sexually assaulted his step-daughter. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual contact with a child, abusive sexual contact with a child, and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 163 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Dismissed | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim attended a party at Subject's off-base residence. Victim and Subject both drank alcohol. Victim reported that she began blacking out and lost memory of the events of the night but woke up to Subject on top of her having sex. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander preferred charges for unprofessional relationship and adultery. The victim expressed that she did not want to testify. The initial disposition authority reviewed the case and determined there was insufficient evidence to proceed without the victim's participation. The commander served Subject with an LOR for engaging in an unprofessional relationship and adultery. | |
| 164 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject touched her breast through her clothing. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to the grade of E-2, suspended forfeiture of \$250/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 165 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | All Victims | | Victim #1 and Subject rented a hotel room where they engaged in consensual kissing. Victim #1 and Subject had been at the beach and Victim was wearing her swimsuit. She stated Subject got on top of her and penetrated her vagina. Victim #1 stated she said "No, I don't want to," but Subject continued and she said "I said I don't want it. Stop" while attempting to push Subject away. On a separate occasion Victim #2 was at the beach for a bonfire where she was drinking alcohol. Victim #2 and Subject were again back to base. Victim #2 reported that the next thing she remembered was being in a room with Subject and Subject's penis inside her vagina. Victim #2 stated that she blacked out and/or fell asleep during the sexual assault. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 166 | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Male | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim reported that he and Subject went to several night clubs where they consumed large amounts of alcohol. Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted him while he was not able to consent due to intoxication. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for forcible sodomy, wrongful sexual contact, and simple assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 167 | Attempt Art. 80 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Male | Unknown Subject | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim and Subject | | Victim reported that three unknown men attempted to sexually assault him. The case was closed following an OSI investigation when a Subject could not be identified. | |
| 168 | Attempt Art. 80 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Unknown Subject | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim and Subject | | Victim stated she was sexually assaulted by an unknown offender. The case was closed following an OSI investigation when a Subject could not be identified. | |
| 169 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Male | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court-Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | IOTH | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim and Subject were TDY to Red Flag Alaska, where they shared a dorm room. They were drinking together and after returning to their room, Victim went to sleep. Victim woke up to Subject standing over her bed with his hand down Victim's boxers. Victim punched Subject in the face. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred and referred a charge of abusive sexual contact to a special court-martial. Subject submitted a Chapter 4 request for discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 with an UOTHC characterization. | |
| 170 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | YES | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim and Subject were drinking alcohol in the dorm. Victim became sick and returned to her room with Subject. Victim reported not remembering coming back to her room or the lead-up to intercourse. She reports remembering Subject having anal sex with her and stated that the Subject stopped to stop several times before he stopped. Victim and Subject stated they had previously engaged in consensual sex. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority decided not to take allegations due to victim's sexual allegation due to victim stating she did not want to testify. The commander preferred charges for rape and aggravated sexual assault. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to the grade of E-2 and a reprimand. | |
| 171 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject sexually harassed her and rubbed her thigh. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for dereliction of duty (sexual harassment and unprofessional relationship) and abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-6. | |
| 172 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | Victim reported several instances of Subject making unprofessional comments and stated that on one occasion Subject touched her knee and lower thigh. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for non-sexual assault offenses. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 173 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims - Female | Multiple Victims - Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court-Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | | IOTH | | Victim #1 was Subject's ex-girlfriend. Victim #1 reported that while watching movies Subject kept trying to grope her and she said "No." Victim #1 stated that they went upstairs and were in a "topping" position and that Subject groped her again, she said "No," and then Subject removed her pants and penetrated her vagina with his penis. Victim #1 told Subject to stop and he did not immediately stop. Victim #1 reported the alleged sexual assault to the local police department. The prosecutor declined to prosecute the case. Victim #2 reported that while Subject was living with her and her husband as a tenant he was drinking alcohol one night and Victim #2 awoke to Subject digitally penetrating her vagina and spooning her from behind. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred 2 specifications of sexual assault involving Victim #1 and Victim #2 and a specification of assault consummated by battery involving Victim #3 (who did not make a sexual assault allegation). Following the Article 32 hearing, Subject requested a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 discharge with an UOTHC service characterization. Subject grabbed the breasts of Victim, a subordinate officer. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority reviewed the case and returned to the commander for disposition. The commander offered the Subject nonjudicial punishment for wrongful sexual contact and conduct unbecoming an officer. The commander imposed punishment of a reprimand. | |
| 174 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-4 | Female | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject raped her after she fell asleep at his off-base residence. After making an initial report to OSI, Victim was referred to local law enforcement because Subject was Subject to the UCMJ at the time of the offense. Victim declined to meet with civilian law enforcement, who in turn declined to open an investigation. The commander served Subject with an LOR. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with an UOTHC service characterization. | |
| 175 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | IOTH | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim reported that she took a trip with her mother and her mother's fiancé to visit Subject and his fiancé. Victim stated that she went to sleep in a room in the house and when she woke up Subject was performing oral sex on her. Victim reported the sexual assault to local law enforcement. Subject pled guilty to sexual battery in the local jurisdiction and received 18 months probation. | |
| 176 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Civilian or Foreign Prosecution of Person Not Subject to UCMJ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim's husband reported that Subject sexually assaulted his wife in base housing. Victim attended a party with her husband involving a race, the objective of which was significant consumption of alcohol. Victim reported that later in the night she followed Subject upstairs and her first recollection was her husband entering the room and storming out after seeing her in bed with Subject. Victim stated that she tested Subject, who confirmed sexual intercourse did not occur, but that he digitally penetrated her. Victim stated that she did not believe she was the victim of a crime, did not wish to press charges, and that she likely would have consented to sexual contact with Subject had she not been under the effects of alcohol. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 177 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim reported that after a unit going away function Subject walked her to her car and then got in the car, kissed her, and grabbed her hand and placed it on his penis through his pants. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with a false official statement punishment for making a false official statement. The commander imposed punishment of a suspended reduction to E-6 and a reprimand. |
| 178 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | False official statements Art. 107 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | False official statements Art. 107 | | | YES | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | | Victim and Subject met online. They decided to meet in person at a McDonald's and then went to the Subject's on-base dormitory room. They kissed and Subject digitally penetrated Victim's vagina and penetrated her with his penis, both without her consent and over her objection. Subject admitted to continued intercourse over Victim's objection. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of the lesser included offense of aggravated sexual assault and sentenced to confinement for 60 days, a bad conduct discharge, and forfeiture of all pay and allowances. | |
| 179 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | BCD | | | | YES | | Victim and Subject met online. They decided to meet in person at a McDonald's and then went to the Subject's on-base dormitory room. They kissed and Subject digitally penetrated Victim's vagina and penetrated her with his penis, both without her consent and over her objection. Subject admitted to continued intercourse over Victim's objection. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of the lesser included offense of aggravated sexual assault and sentenced to confinement for 60 days, a bad conduct discharge, and forfeiture of all pay and allowances. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged/Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disrupted/Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 180 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 2) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G3 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsent at Sodomy Art. 125 | Convicted | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | YES | | YES | | | | | | | | | | Victim alleged that the Subject digitally penetrated her vagina and performed oral sex on her at her off base apartment while her husband was staying in the dorms on base. Two other Victims in the case were Victims of non-sexual assault offenses. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of disobeying a lawful command, unprofessional relationship, cruelty or maltreatment, wrongful sexual contact, forcible sodomy, and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Pursuant to a pretrial agreement, the general court-martial convening authority and the subject agreed to a plea of guilty to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted in accordance with a plea and sentenced to confinement for 6 months, reduction to E-5, and a reprimand. |
| 181 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | G2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she invited Subject and another Airman and friends over to her off-base residence where they all consumed alcohol. Victim stated that after everyone else left Subject entered her bedroom and digitally penetrated her without her consent and attempted to perform oral sex on her at which point she told him to stop. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 182 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Male & Female | Multiple Victims | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | Subject pressed his erect penis against the buttocks of Victim #1 and groped the breast of Victim #2. Both sexual assaults took place in their dorm building. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for wrongful sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 30 days, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 183 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim met Subject in a bar with a group of friends. Subject invited her and her friend to a house party. Victim was intoxicated. Victim wanted to go to sleep and Subject offered her bed. Victim woke up and discovered Subject was digitally penetrating her vagina. Victim indicated thinking "I didn't want this" but decided that if Subject thought he could do this she would at least get an orgasm out of it and leaned over to grab Subject to pull him on top of her. Subject said she needed a condom and Victim left the room. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for aggravated sexual assault. The commander dismissed the charge. | |
| 184 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-3 | Female | G1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Conduct unbecoming Art. 133 | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject, her superior, sat on her lap, touched her lower back, and attempted to kiss her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. The commander imposed punishment of a reprimand. |
| 185 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | G2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Subject asked Victim if he could sleep off his intoxication at her off-base residence. At Victim's home, Victim allowed Subject to lie in her bed with her. They talked for a while before Subject got on top of her and held her arms while he digitally penetrated her and then had intercourse with her, both while she was snuggling and telling him "no." Subject then went to the bathroom and returned to try to repeat his actions. Victim reported that she thought him off until he passed out again in her bed. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 186 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | G4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went to Subject's off-base residence to watch a movie while Subject was out of town. Victim reported that she was falling in and out of sleep during the movie and remembered Subject rubbing her legs. Victim stated that Subject picked her up off the couch and carried her to his bedroom. Victim reported that Subject laid her on the bed and rubbed her back, neck, chest, breasts, genitals, legs, and thighs with his hands over her clothing. Victim stated that she "froze" and did not know what to do or say. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 187 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | G4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was dancing with Subject at a local bar and dance club and Subject started touching her breast and buttocks with his hands as they were dancing. Victim reported that she told Subject to stop and move his hands, and that she continued to dance with Subject and he continued to put his hands on her buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 188 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims Male | G4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | YES | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that on several occasions Subject hugged and patted him on the buttocks. Victim stated that he asked Subject to stop on several occasions and that he was uncomfortable during these exchanges. Several other male recruits suffered similar misconduct. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued a non-judicial punishment for dereliction of duty for embracing and patting the buttocks of male recruits. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-5 and a reprimand. |
| 189 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject slapped her buttocks on multiple occasions and made inappropriate comments to her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered nonjudicial punishment for wrongful sexual contact and dereliction of duty. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-3, suspended reduction in grade to E-2, and a reprimand. Subject was administratively separated via a DODC ballot. |
| 190 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | G4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | | YES | | YES | | | General | | | Subject touched Victim on three occasions on the breast and crotch area, over her clothing, during training. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority referred the case to the commander for disposition. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of 14 days of extra duty, restriction to base for 14 days, forfeiture of \$758 for one month, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General service characterization. | |
| 191 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Foreign National | Female | G4 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that he and Subject were watching a movie at Subject's off-base residence. They both went to sleep in the same bed and Victim reported that he woke up to Subject touching his penis and buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 192 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 2) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | G4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art. 120 | Convicted | | Rape Art. 120 | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and several friends were drinking alcohol in the dorms. Victim fell asleep in Subject's dorm room and woke up to him having sex with her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 4 years, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. At demerency, the general court-martial convening authority waived mandatory forfeitures for 6 months for the benefit of Subject's dependents. | |
| 193 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | G4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim met Subject at a hotel with friends off-base. Victim stated that Subject made inappropriate sexual comments to her and at one point grabbed her and held her tightly against his body and pulled her into a hot tub. Victim stated that she was very upset and yelled "No, No, No!" Once Subject backed away Victim stated that he was gazing at her with his hands in his shorts adjusting himself. Victim stated that Subject grabbed her from behind a second time and pushed her towards the deeper end of the pool and that she struggled and said "No" and "Stop" the entire time. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 194 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 2) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G2 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court-Martial | | | | | | | | | | | LOTHC | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject were both at the same party off-base where both drank alcohol. Victim reported that Subject digitally penetrated her vagina while she slept. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 discharge with an LOTHC service characterization. | |
| 195 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims Female | G1 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | | Dismissal | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject was at her house for a party and that she walked into the kitchen and Subject, who she described as heavily intoxicated, came from behind and placed his hand under her pants and grabbed her buttocks and then grabbed her breast. Victim stated that later in the night Subject repeatedly approached her in her bedroom and attempted to have sex with her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, forcible sodomy, assault consummated by a battery, and conduct unbecoming an officer pertaining to the allegations brought by Victims #2 and #3. Charges were not preferred regarding the allegations brought by Victim #1 because attempts by the legal office and law enforcement to contact Victim #1 were unsuccessful. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of all charges and sentenced to confinement for 4 years, dismissal, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and a reprimand. | |
| 196 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | G4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that Subject was at her house for a party and that she walked into the kitchen and Subject, who she described as heavily intoxicated, came from behind and placed his hand under her pants and grabbed her buttocks and then grabbed her breast. Victim stated that later in the night Subject repeatedly approached her in her bedroom and attempted to have sex with her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, stalking, and adultery. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 197 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 2) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-3 | Female | G4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was drinking with Subject and other Airmen. They returned to one of the Airmen's off-base residences and fell asleep in different parts of the house. Victim reported that she woke up with her pants and underwear down and Subject on top of her with his penis inside her vagina. She reported that she screamed and told him to get off and he complied. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 198 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | Female | G1 | | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | | Dismissal | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and her friends met a group of people including Subject at a concert and went to Subject's house after. Victim's friends eventually left while Victim stayed behind with Subject and his wife. Subject's wife offered for Victim to sleep at the house since it was getting late. Victim reported not wanting to go to Subject's wife's room on the night and roasting Subject under the covers next to Victim with his hand down her pants digitally penetrating her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and conduct unbecoming an officer. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of one specification of aggravated sexual assault, one specification of abusive sexual contact, and three specifications of conduct unbecoming an officer. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 1 year and a dismissal. During demerency, the general court-martial convening authority disapproved the findings of guilty and the sentence. As a result Subject is no longer required to register as a sex offender. | |
| 199 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims Female | G3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | While attending technical school, Subject persistently sexually harassed several female classmates. On multiple occasions, he groped the breasts, buttocks, and groin of Victim #1, Victim #2, Victim #3, and Victim #4. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, and indecent language. After the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of two specifications of aggravated sexual contact, abusive contact, and indecent language. Subject was sentenced to a bad conduct discharge, forfeiture of \$701/month for 6 months, and reduction in grade to E-1. |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 200 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim and Subject met at an off-base house party. Victim consumed several mixed alcoholic drinks and was not used to drinking alcohol. Subject had a couple of alcoholic drinks, but was not intoxicated. Victim danced with Subject and Subject left the party with her and accompanied her back to her dorm room. Once inside, Victim and Subject had oral and vaginal intercourse. The next day, Victim felt like she would not have had sex if she were sober and reported the incident as a sexual assault. Victim agreed to an interview and said the sexual acts were consensual. Victim also stated she was aware of her actions during the incident. After receiving the report, the commander preferred charges for rape, forcible sodomy, and failure to obey a lawful order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the Investigating Officer recommended not going forward with the case. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 201 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | General | | | | While Subject was on leave, Victim and Subject attended a party together at a friend's house. Subject and Victim were drinking alcohol, although Victim was underage. Subject escorted Victim back to Subject's hotel room where they engaged in sexual intercourse and other sexual activity approximately five times. Victim recalls some of the sexual activity, but states she backed out at some point. The next morning, she woke up sore and she was partially undressed. Later the next day, Victim sent Subject a message and asked him what happened. He replied that the sex was a "good workout." Before the night in question, Victim and Subject had a previous relationship. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, Victim stated she did not want to participate in any further proceedings. As a result the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. Subsequently, Subject was administratively discharged with a General service characterization. | |
| 202 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Female | | Air Force | E-4 | Male | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | YES | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject often hugged him at work, exchanged over one hundred text messages that were intimate and personal, and expressed that she loved him, though he was cute, and missed him. While out to dinner with other co-workers and Victim, Subject flirted with Victim. After reviewing the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for dereliction of duty for engaging in an unprofessional relationship. The commander imposed punishment of a suspended reduction in grade to E-5 and a reprimand. | |
| 203 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Amy | E-1 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim reported that Subject grabbed her buttocks in class. After reviewing the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined that probably cause only existed for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject. | |
| 204 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Unknown Subject | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that an unknown male Subject placed his hand on Victim's thigh multiple times at the on-base community center. Victim stated that the Subject's hand was placed on Victim's knee, then the middle of her thigh, then on her upper thigh, approximately five inches from her groin. Victim was unable to identify a Subject in a photo lineup and declined to participate further in the investigation. The case was closed with no action since a Subject could not be identified. | |
| 205 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she and Subject were watching a movie on Subject's bed when Subject reached into Victim's pants and digitally penetrated her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Victim subsequently indicated she no longer wanted to participate in a court-martial. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 206 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | Victim felt | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | Victim attended an off-base party with other Airmen. Subject left the party with his wife and then came back to the party. At that time Victim was asleep on a sofa. Victim stated she woke up and Subject was half laying on top of her legs on the sofa. She motioned to other Airmen to get Subject off of her and they woke up and told Subject to sleep on the floor, which he did. Victim fell back asleep and woke up and felt Subject's mouth on her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. The incident acts charge was dismissed. Subject was convicted of wrongful sexual contact and acquitted of aggravated sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 45 days, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 207 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she invited Subject to listen to music in her dorm room. Victim stated that Subject touched her buttocks, back, thighs, and breast and that she started to give in because of peer pressure and the Subject's coaxing. Victim reported that Subject grabbed her vagina and she pushed his hand away. Victim reported that she got up to go to the bathroom and when she came back told Subject "I can't do this" but that Subject kept pressuring her. Victim reported that Subject penetrated her vagina with his penis and she froze and went into shock. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing the Investigating Officer recommended not going forward with the charges. The general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 208 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | United Arab Emirates | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | While deployed Subject entered the room of Victim #1 while she slept, removed his pants, got into bed with her, and kissed her while rubbing his penis on her leg. On separate occasions, he would expose his penis to Victim #2 and touch her while at work without her consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, indecent acts, indecent exposure, assault consummated by a battery, burglary-unlawful entry, making a false official statement, and violating a general order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject pled guilty to all charges. Following the Article 32 hearing, exception of indecent exposure and burglary, which the general court-martial convening authority withdrew and dismissed pursuant to a pretrial agreement. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 10 months, a bad conduct discharge, reduction in grade to E-1, and forfeiture of all pay and allowances. | |
| 209 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | YES | BCD | | YES | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject touched her breasts and buttocks while he taped her waist and bust line. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, assault consummated by a battery, and engaging in an unprofessional relationship. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of engaging in an unprofessional relationship. Subject was sentenced to hard labor without confinement for 3 months, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in grade to E-3. | |
| 210 | Aggravated Sexual Assault Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Obstructing justice Art. 134-36 | YES | | YES | DD | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject, a military training instructor, called her to a supply room and when she arrived began to fondle her and took her pants off. Victim stated that she froze and Subject had sexual intercourse with her. The investigation also involved other female trainees who indicated that Subject had sexual relations with them. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual contact, adultery, destruction of justice, making a false official statement, being absent without leave, violation of a general order, failure to obey a lawful order, and dereliction of duty. Subject was convicted of adultery, obstruction of justice, making a false official statement, being absent without leave, violation of a general order, failure to obey a lawful order, and willful dereliction of duty. Subject was acquitted of aggravated sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 30 months, a dishonorable discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 211 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | Victim reported that she had multiple sexual encounters with Subject, a military training instructor. Victim reported that Subject touched her in her vaginal areas over her clothing and placed her hand on his penis over his clothing. Subject had Victim perform oral sex on him while in the flight office and had sexual intercourse with Subject multiple times during training. The investigation also involved other female trainees who indicated that Subject had sexual relations with them. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, adultery, aggravated sexual contact, forcible sodomy, obstructing justice, adultery, and engaging in an unprofessional relationship. Subject was convicted of wrongful sexual contact, sodomy, 3 specifications of adultery, and 3 specifications of engaging in an unprofessional relationship. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 years, a dishonorable discharge, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 212 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | Victim was in direct contact with Subject by her recruiter and contacted Subject requesting to be a Recruiter's Assistant following the completion of technical school. Victim reported that Subject locked the door to his office, closed the blinds, and began kissing her, groped her breasts, and digitally penetrated her vagina. Victim reported that Subject then asked if he could perform oral sex on her, that she said "no," but that he guided her hand to his penis and would not let her remove it. After being Subject "no" several times, Victim reported that she relented and Subject performed oral sex on her. The investigation also involved other female trainees who indicated that Subject had sexual relations or inappropriate relationships with them. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, forcible sodomy, sodomy, obstructing justice, indecent exposure, assault consummated by a battery, engaging in an unprofessional relationship, false official statement, failure to obey a lawful order, and disobeying a general order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual assault, 2 specifications of sodomy, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, wrongful sexual contact, 3 specifications of indecent exposure, obstruction of justice, assault consummated by a battery, engaging in an unprofessional relationship, false official statement, 15 specifications of failure to obey a lawful order, and disobeying a general order. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 27 years, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. At clemency, the general court-martial convening authority waived mandatory forfeiture for 6 months for the benefit of Subject's dependents. | |
| 213 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Rape Art.120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | | YES | Victim #1 reported that after technical school, Subject brought her back to his apartment and after embracing her and kissing her on the neck moved her toward the bedroom and undressed her and penetrated her with his penis. Victim reported that she said "no" and tried to push Subject away. On another occasion Victim #1 reported that Subject gave her alcohol and she recalled waking up the next morning "naked" and smelling of sex. Victim #2 reported that after technical school she was at Subject's apartment and Subject had sexual intercourse with her. Victim #2 reported that she backed out during the intercourse because of the amount of alcohol she drank. The investigation also involved other female trainees who indicated that Subject had sexual relations or inappropriate relationships with them. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, false official statement, adultery, engaging in an unprofessional relationship, and failure to obey a lawful order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape, aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, false official statement, adultery, engaging in an unprofessional relationship, and failure to obey a lawful order. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 4 years, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 214 | Nonconsensus at Sodomy Art. 125 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensus at Sodomy Art. 125 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim, Subject, and Subject in a companion case (pending at conclusion of FY13) rented a hotel room where they drank alcohol throughout the evening. Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her by inserting his penis in her vagina and performed oral sex and engaged in sexual intercourse in the presence of Subject in companion case. Victim also reported that Subject obliged in Subject in companion case sexually assault her by inserting his penis in her vagina and force her to perform oral sex on Subject in companion case. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, indecent acts, forcible sodomy, assault consummated by a battery, and adultery. Following the Article 32 hearing the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 215 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that he was showering, bent over to pick up shampoo, and left Subject behind him pelvic thrusting with his genitals striking Victim's buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 216 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject, her military training instructor, slapped her on the buttocks on one occasion. On another occasion she reported that Subject called her into his office, put his hand down her pants and digitally penetrated her vagina, and removed his penis from his shorts and inserted his penis in Victim's mouth. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, forcible sodomy, and failure to obey a lawful order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime | | |
|-----|---|----------|-----------------|----------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| 217 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and other Armen drank alcohol off base and returned to a hotel room. Victim reported laying down to fall asleep and waking up to Subject touching her legs and then putting her hand in his underwear. The next time she woke Subject was on top of her having sex with her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault. The Victim indicated that she did not want to participate in the Article 32 hearing. As a result, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed charges. | | |
| 218 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Male | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Assault Art. 128 | Convicted | | | Assault Art. 128 | YES | | YES | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was in formation with Subject and Subject grabbed her groin area. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander preferred a charge for assault consummated by a battery. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a summary court-martial. Subject was convicted of assault consummated by battery. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 10 days and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 219 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Assault Art. 128 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Assault Art. 128 | | YES | | YES | | | YES | | General | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that Subject pushed her on her breasts and threatened her with bodily harm. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander preferred charges for sexual assault, simple assault, and delinquent duty by providing alcohol to a minor. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault, simple assault, and delinquent duty by providing alcohol to a minor. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 months, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. | |
| 220 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Female | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Consensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Consensual Sodomy Art. 125 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | All Subjects and Victims | Victim and Subject (the wife of Victim's supervisor) were at another Airman's birthday party off-base when Victim's supervisor (who is the Subject in the case below) pressured Victim to have sexual intercourse with Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for sodomy and adultery. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction to E-3, forfeiture of 30 days, and a reprimand. | |
| 221 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Cruelty and maltreatment Art. 93 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Cruelty and maltreatment Art. 93 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject (Victim's supervisor) were at another Airman's birthday party off-base when the Subject pressured Victim to have sexual intercourse with his wife (Subject in the case above). After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense and offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for cruelty or maltreatment and adultery. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction to E-4, forfeiture of \$1181 for 2 months, and a reprimand. | |
| 222 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOC | | | | Victim | Victim invited Subject to her dorm room. When Subject arrived, Victim relayed that she had been drinking alcohol. Victim and Subject watched movies while Victim continued to drink alcohol. After several hours, Victim initiated kissing with Subject and brought Subject into her bedroom and put her hand down his pants. Subject undressed and removed Victim's clothes and they continued to kiss and Subject digitally penetrated Victim. Subject then engaged in vaginal intercourse. Victim stated that she was comfortable with everything except the intercourse and did not want it to go that far. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOC to Subject. | | |
| 223 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and another Airman were drinking in Subject's dorm room. Victim woke up with no memory of the previous night but stated that she physically felt that her vagina had been penetrated. Subject told witness that he and Victim kissed and that he digitally penetrated Victim's vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, simple assault, and delinquent duty by providing alcohol to a minor. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault, simple assault, and delinquent duty by providing alcohol to a minor. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 224 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim and Subject were both a party at another Airman's house on-base. Both Victim and Subject were drinking alcohol. Victim fell asleep on a couch and reported waking up to Subject placing his penis inside her mouth. Victim reported that she froze. Victim reported that Subject lifted her dress and digitally penetrated her and then inserted his penis into her vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | | |
| 225 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | | Rape Art.120 | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject sexually assaulted and exposed himself to several young women between the ages of 14 and 26, including Victim #1 and Victim #2, both adult female civilians. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, sexual assault, sexual abuse of a child, indecent contact with a child, abusive sexual contact with a child, indecent language, adultery, child pornography, and failure to obey a lawful order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape, sexual abuse of a child, indecent contact with a child, 3 specifications of indecent acts, 3 specifications of abusive sexual contact with a child, and indecent language. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 years, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 226 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that during a hip she shared a bed with Subject. She reported waking up in the morning with her clothes off feeling as though she had sex. The next night Subject rolled her over and Victim pretended to sleep while Subject had intercourse with her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and aggravated sexual assault. Prior to the Article 32 hearing, the Victim declined to participate. Subsequently the special court-martial convening authority determined there was insufficient evidence to proceed without the Victim's participation. No action was taken in this case. | |
| 227 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Subject hosted a party at his house off-base for the Airman in the office. When Victim arrived Subject stated "whatever happens in his house, stays at his house." Later in the evening when Victim was outside on the phone, Subject began to rub Victim's leg up near his pocket and then moved his hand to touch the lining of Victim's underwear. When Victim got the phone, they talked about what happened and the Subject made an offer to commit a sex act with him. Victim indicated he did not want to participate and Subject stated she would still stand by her offer. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-3, forfeiture of \$200/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General Service characterization. | |
| 228 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim went to a club and drank alcohol with Subject and another Airman. They all returned to a hotel room that they shared. Victim reported that she woke up in the hotel room alone with Subject wearing only a shirt and could not remember what happened the night before. Victim stated that she asked Subject what happened and he said that they had sex and she was the one who had given her cab fare and she had left. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, and unlawful possession of drugs. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was subsequently declined to participate or respond to the subpoena. As a result, the general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 229 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | | | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Subject had alcohol drinks at his off-base house with Victim, whom he met online. Local law enforcement responded to a call that Victim was walking down the street wearing only a shirt. Subject stated that he and Victim had consensual sex and he had given her cab fare and she had left. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, and unlawful possession of drugs. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was subsequently declined to participate or respond to the subpoena. As a result, the general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 230 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Assault Art. 128 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Assault Art. 128 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that while at a unit party, Subject touched her buttocks and later in the day hugged her and "cupped" her buttocks two to three times. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for simple assault. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-6, forfeiture of \$1,000 pay, and a reprimand. Administrative discharge proceedings were pending at the end of FY13. | |
| 231 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1, Victim #2, Subject, and Subject in companion case were hanging out at a hotel off base. Victim #1 engaged in consensual kissing with Subject and consented to Subject removing her underwear and digitally penetrating her. Later in the evening Victim #1 and Subject were in the same bed and Subject rolled Victim #1 onto her back, removed her underwear and began digitally penetrating her without her consent. Victim #1 told Subject to stop, but Subject penetrated her with his penis. At an another point in the evening Victim #2 was in the bathroom because she felt sick. Subject came up behind her and began to touch her. Victim #2 said "No," but Subject turned Victim #2 around and forced his penis inside her vagina from behind. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape. Following the Article 32 investigation, the convening authority dismissed the charges due to the Investigating Officer's recommendation not to go forward with the case. | |
| 232 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | | Rape Art.120 | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and other Armen were drinking alcohol on-base. Victim began to feel sick and informed the group she was going back to her dorm. Subject offered to walk her back. As they started walking, Subject led Victim in a direction away from her dorm. Subject pushed Victim against a wall and attempted to kiss her. Victim said "No." Subject then pushed Victim to the ground, exposed his penis, and attempted to get her to perform oral sex on him. Victim fought back. Subject ripped off Victim's leggings and underwear, held her down by her wrists and forearms and penetrated her vagina with his penis and then flipped her over and orally sodomized her with his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of one specification of rape and one specification of forcible sodomy. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, reduction to E-1, and a reprimand. | |
| 233 | Aggravated Sexual Abuse (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | YES | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | | DO | | | | | | | | YES | | Victim | Subject struck into Victim #1's dorm room without her permission in an attempt to have sex with her. A year later, Subject had a party in his dorm room. When Victim #2, who was at the party, became tired after consuming a large amount of alcohol, Subject allowed her to sleep in his bed while he slept on the floor. Victim #2 awoke in the middle of the night to Subject digitally penetrating her anus and vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for burglary and sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of burglary and one specification of sexual assault and was acquitted of a second specification of sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 years and a dishonorable discharge. At the time of the court-martial Subject was serving 15 years confinement for a previous sexual assault conviction in FY12. | |
| 234 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | YES | | | | | YES | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that she was outside her building at the smoke pit and Subject sat down next to her. Victim reported that Subject was intoxicated. Victim reported that Subject grabbed her breast and buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-2, 30 days extra duty, and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently medically discharged. | |
| 235 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | | YES | | YES | | | YES | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that on numerous occasions Subject would hug her and pat her on the buttocks while hugging her. On one occasion Subject hugged her and touched her breast. When Victim asked Subject to move his hand, he got up and started kissing her on the neck. Victim pushed Subject away. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for wrongful sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-1, restriction to base for 45 days, 45 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 236 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Female | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | LOC | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim, Subject, and other Armen were at a hotel party. Victim reported that while she was having consensual sex with Subject, Subject ejaculated in her mouth and then inserted his penis in her vagina. At another point in the evening Victim stated that Subject slapped and choked her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges upon the Investigating Officer's recommendation not to proceed to court-martial. The commander issued Subject with a LOC. | |
| 237 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-1 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOC | | | Victim reported that Subject stopped her on the buttocks and sent her unwanted text messages. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOC to Subject. | | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| 238 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that she was at a club off base when she ran into Subject, who she knew from training. Victim stated that she left the club with Subject and they walked a short distance and consensually kissed. Victim reported that Subject became forceful and she felt uncomfortable when he grabbed her chest. She stated that she started to pull away and told Subject that she was not comfortable. Subject undid both Victim's pants and he grabbed her head and put his penis in her mouth. He then inserted his penis into her vagina. Victim stated that she began to cry in confusion and pain and that she told Subject "No" but he didn't stop. He then tried to run Victim over and penetrate her anus with his penis but Victim said "No" and then he stopped. She then tried to orally sodomize Victim, but she said "No" and he stopped. Subject then inserted his penis into Victim's mouth again and ejaculated. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, Victim declined to participate in the court-martial. Additionally, the investigating officer recommended not going forward with the charge. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charge. | |
| 239 | Aggravated Sexual Offense Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Convicted | | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | | | Dismissal | | | | | | | YES | | Victim #1 reported that Subject touched her breast and vagina without her consent and forced her to perform oral sex on him. Victim #2 reported that Subject attempted to force her to perform oral sex on him. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for forcible sodomy, attempted forcible sodomy and aggravated sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of attempted forcible sodomy and wrongful sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 8 months and a demerit. |
| 240 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | | Dismissal | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 reported that at a hotel party she was sleeping on the floor next to Subject and Subject kissed her and started to put his hands under her beltline and pulled on her hip. Victim #2 reported that at the same hotel party involving Victim #1, she woke up in the middle of the night to Subject taking off her pants and attempting to have sex with her. Victim #3 reported that after she toilet Subject to tell him she wanted to end their casual romantic relationship. Subject entered her dorm room without her permission and groped her under her clothes and made Victim touch his genitalia with her hand. Victim #4 reported that after she went to sleep at an off-base party, she woke up to Subject and another cadet having sex with her. Two other cadets reported Subject unlawfully entering their room. Victim #1, Victim #2, and Victim #4 subsequently declined to participate in the investigation. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for attempted forcible sodomy, aggravated sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and unlawful entry. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact and unlawful entry. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 months, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and a demerit. |
| 241 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Subject | Victim reported that she was at an off-base party at the home of her boyfriend and she left to go home after a fight with her boyfriend. Subject, who was also at the party attempted to call Victim on the phone several times and then drove to her home. Victim let Subject into her home and after some conversation, Subject pulled her pants down and sexually assaulted her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual contact and abusive sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 15 months, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-4. | |
| 242 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | Cadet/Midshipman Disciplinary System | | | | | Victim #1 reported that Subject had been watching movies in her room and returned believing he had been looked out of his room. Victim offered to let him sleep in her bed. Victim reported that Subject asked if he could put his arm around her and she said "Yes" and that she pretended to sleep while Subject rubbed her stomach and breasts outside of her bra. Victim #2 reported that Subject sexually assaulted her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was insufficient evidence to support the sexual assault allegations. Case disposed of through cadet disciplinary system. |
| 243 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOTHC | Victim #1 reported that Subject had sexual intercourse with her and digitally penetrated her vagina on multiple occasions despite her telling him "No." Victim #2 reported that she was in Subject's room and they were consensually kissing when he grabbed her hand and put it down his pants on his penis and then he put his hand down her pants despite her telling him "No." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, attempted sexual contact, and unlawful entry. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 15 months, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-4. |
| 244 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Cadet/Midshipman | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that during the course of engaging in sexual acts with Subject she got up and told Subject to "Stop." Subject then pushed her back on the bed and penetrated her vagina again with his penis. Victim stated that she attempted to tell Subject "No." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charge due to the Investigating Officer's recommendation that the case should not proceed to a court-martial. |
| 245 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | LOR | Subject and Victim drank alcohol at a club-off-base with other Airmen. At the end of the night they returned to a hotel where the group of male Airmen and female Airmen has reserved separate rooms. When Victim returned to her room, undressed down to her underwear and got in her bed, she noticed Subject in the room. Subject proceeded to remove Victim's underwear, perform oral sex on Victim, lay down beside Victim and then had Victim sit on his face where he then licked Victim's anus. Victim states she then went to sleep and Subject was gone the next morning. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. |
| 246 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-1 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | LOR | Victim's friend reported that Victim was sexually assaulted by Subject and three other Airmen. Victim had told her friend that she had sex with four people, didn't remember a name and felt gross. Victim reported to OSI that she did not consider herself to be a victim. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. |
| 247 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject squeezed her left buttock twice. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR. |
| 248 | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | | Victim #1 reported that Subject made sexual advances to her while they were working together. Subject invited Victim to his office, asked her if she wanted to have sex with him and when she said "No" and tried to leave grabbed her hips and rubbed his pelvis on her buttocks. Victim #2 reported that Subject invited her to babysit his children and when she arrived his children were not there. Victim #3 stated that Subject reached into her bra and rubbed her nipples. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, and maltreatment. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact and maltreatment and acquitted of aggravated sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction to the grade of E-1. |
| 249 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | After a night of drinking with Victim, Subject took her to his friend's house where he had sex with her while she was unconscious. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 3 years, a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 250 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Oman | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | Subject attempted to unlock the back of Victim by reaching under her shirt after she returned the daily limit of alcoholic drinks at his deployed location. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges of abusive sexual contact, false official statement, and failure to obey a lawful general order. The general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a summary court-martial. Subject pled guilty to all charges and was sentenced to 14 days confinement, forfeiture of \$500, and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 251 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | COCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | YES | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that while drinking at a bar, he went into an alley to urinate and when he finished Subject approached him in the alley and grabbed his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge of abusive sexual contact and the special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was convicted of abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 30 days, forfeiture of \$1,600/month for 3 months, and reduction in grade to E-4. | |
| 252 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | YES | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | Convicted | | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 125 | YES | YES | YES | DD | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that he, Subject, and a group of friends went out drinking at a hotel. Victim reported that he passed out and woke up to Subject forcibly sodomizing him. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge of forcible sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of one specification of forcible sodomy. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 years, a dishonorable discharge, total forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and reduction in grade to E-1. Subject has been previously investigated for a sexual assault offense. | |
| 253 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOTHC | Victim and Subject were sitting in a truck on the flight line. Subject told Victim he was "testing" on his phone and what was being tested in the conversation. Victim stated she looked over and could see Subject had her hand on her hip and she stated that she had explicit conversation and put his hand on Victim's knee, touched her arm, bit her neck, and asked for a "sneak peek" of her breasts. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of abusive sexual contact, assault consummated by a battery, and disorderly conduct. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The convening authority approved the Chapter 4 discharge with a LOTHC characterization. |
| 254 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Qatar | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | | | | | YES | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject touched her breast. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact and assault consummated by a battery. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction to E-6, forfeiture of \$600/month for 2 months, 45 days extra duty, and a reprimand. |
| 255 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-2 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | | Victim was lying on a bed watching Subject and other play video games. Subject said he was going to grab her buttocks and proceeded to do so without Victim's consent. Others in the room witnessed the sexual contact. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction to E-6, forfeiture of \$100/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 256 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | COCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Unknown | Female | | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that Subject touched her buttock through the clothing. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of dishonorable discharge. The commander imposed punishment of reduction to the grade of E-2, suspended forfeiture of \$849/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 257 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | COCONUS | Air Force | Female | | Air Force | Multiple Victims - Male | | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim #1 reported that Subject grabbed his chest. Victim #2 reported that Subject grabbed his buttocks. Victim #3 reported that Subject grabbed her hips and groin on his hips and groin. Victim #4 reported that Subject touched her genitalia and buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact and destruction of duty. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-2, and a reprimand. |
| 258 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Afghanistan | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-6 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that on one occasion Subject gave her a pat on the buttocks and another occasion during which Subject hugged her from behind and grabbed her breasts over her clothing. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact, assault consummated by a battery, and conduct unbecoming an officer. The commander imposed punishment of forfeiture of \$2,000/month for 2 months, and a reprimand. |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NLP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|--|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|---|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| 259 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Qatar | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Male | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | Subject | Victim reported that he awoke to Subject, his roommate, touching him on his inner thigh. Victim reported that when he reached Subject seemed dazed and confused. Subject indicated that he took Amien and consumed alcohol and could not remember anything from the night. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4, suspended forfeiture of \$600/monthly for 2 months, and a reprimand. |
| 260 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | YES | YES | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she, Subject, and other Airman had been playing drinking games. Other people had her room and Subject approached her from behind, placed his hands on her lower waist, and whispered words to the effect of "you've never had a guy like me." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact, simple assault, drunk and disorderly conduct, and failure to obey a lawful order. The commander imposed punishment of suspended reduction in grade to E-4, forfeiture of \$1,200/month for 2 months (1 month of which was suspended), and a reprimand. |
| 261 | Federal/State Local Civilian Sex Offense Not Specified | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | | Female | Q1 | Unlawful Force/Person Subject to Sexual Assault | | | | | | | | | | | | General | | | Subject | Victim reported to civilian law enforcement that she was dancing with her husband at a bar when Subject approached her from behind and grabbed her buttocks. Civilian law enforcement arrested Subject for sexual battery. Subject pleaded no contest to disorderly conduct and was sentenced to confinement for 60 days. This sentence was suspended and Subject was placed on probation for 3 years. Subject was administratively separated for minor disciplinary infractions and failed in alcohol abuse treatment with a General service characterization. | |
| 262 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | COCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Male | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | | YES | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1, Victim #2, Subject, and several other Airmen were at the consolidated club on base. Victim #1 was heavily intoxicated and Victim #2 escorted him back to the dorms and let Victim #1 stay in his room and returned to the club. Victim #2 returned to his room to find Subject knocking on the door and Victim #1 opening the door. During conversation with Victim #2, Subject put a hand up to Victim #2's shirt and rubbed his chest and later rubbed Victim #2's breast. Victim #1 stated that he backed out, but remembers waking up to find himself in Subject's room with Subject performing oral sex on him. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander decided there was insufficient evidence to take evidence regarding Victim #1's allegation. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for abusive sexual contact against Victim #2 and imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-2 and a reprimand. | |
| 263 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Adultery Art. 134-2 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Adultery Art. 134-2 | | | YES | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim subsequently declined to participate in the investigation. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for adultery. The commander imposed punishment of reduction in grade to E-4 and a reprimand. | |
| 264 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Kyrgyzstan | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Victim | Victim reported that she was sitting at a table and Subject came over to talk to her. Victim reported that Subject hugged her goodnight and his hands went down to her lower back and upper buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. Subject was given an LOR for assault consummated by a battery. | |
| 265 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q4 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | Victim reported that Subject sexually harassed her. The SARC reported that Victim had been sexually assaulted. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued an LOR to Subject for sexual harassment. | |
| 266 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Qatar | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | Victim told witness that Subject would make inappropriate sexual comments to her. Victim told witness on one occasion that Subject hugged her goodnight and placed his hand on her buttocks and told her that if her marriage didn't work out she should call him. Witness told Victim that they were going to talk to Subject's supervisor. Victim stated that she did not want to report the situation to Subject's supervisor. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined that without Victim's participation there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued Subject an LOR. | |
| 267 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | United Arab Emirates | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | Victim reported five incidents during which Subject, a member of the same unit, touched her sexually and kissed her while both were on duty. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander determined there was only probable cause for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued subject a LOR for unprofessional conduct. | |
| 268 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Staff Judge Advocate recommended insufficient evidence to refer charges to court-martial. | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her while she was passed out due to intoxication. Victim stated that she did not remember having sex until Subject told her through a text message. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges in accordance with the Staff Judge Advocate's advice that there was insufficient evidence to proceed to a court-martial. | |
| 269 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she, Subject, and other Airmen were drinking at Subject's off-base residence. Victim reported that Subject grabbed her vagina from outside her clothing. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for abusive sexual contact. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 270 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | US Civilian | | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her at a party while she was heavily intoxicated and unable to consent. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate the commander preferred charges for sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges in accordance with the recommendation of the Article 32 investigating officer not to proceed to court-martial. | |
| 271 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Male | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Convicted | | Rape Art.120 | YES | YES | YES | DO | | | | | | | YES | Victim | Subjects roommate, Victim #1, was brought back home after a night of heavy drinking. Within Victim #1's sleep, Subject raped him. Further investigation revealed that, during a previous outing with several male co-workers, Subject sexually assaulted Victim #2 while he slept in his truck. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, and assault consummated by a battery following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of rape and abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a disbarment discharge, forfeiture of \$1,156/month for 6 months, and reduction in grade to E-1. |
| 272 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim | Victim reported that she was asleep in her dorm room, had forgotten to lock her door before falling asleep, and woke up to Subject fondling her naked breasts. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, and abusive sexual contact, housebreaking and unlawful entry. Following the Article 32 hearing the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. |
| 273 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | Q2 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1, Victim #2, Subject, and other Airmen were at a party at Victim #1's off-base residence. Victim #2 reported that Subject touched and kissed her breasts while she was passed out. Victim #1 reported that Subject came into her bedroom and began having sexually intercourse with her. She reported that she initially thought Subject was her boyfriend and when she realized he was not, she pushed him off of her and ran out of the room. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape, aggravated sexual assault, wrongful sexual contact, and sodomy. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 274 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Multiple Victims | Multiple Victims - Female | | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Discharge or Resignation in Lieu of Court Martial | | | | | | | | | | | | | UOTHC | Victim #1 picked up Subject at a nightclub off-base to drive him back to base. They went to another Airman's house on-base. Victim stated that she and Subject were on a couch when Subject started trying to touch her and perform oral sex on her. Victim #1 told Subject "no" but he continued, orally sodomizing her and digitally penetrating her vagina. Victim #1 and Subject returned to the dorms. Victim #1 told Victim #2 what happened. Victim #2 confronted Subject stating that Subject had also sexually assaulted her in the same manner previously. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject submitted a request for a Chapter 4 discharge in lieu of court-martial. The general court-martial convening authority approved the Chapter 4 with a UOTHC Service Characterization. | |
| 275 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Absence without leave (AWOL) Art. 86 | | | YES | | | | | | General | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she was drinking with Subject and other Airmen in the dorms. Victim and Subject sat on Subject's bed to watch a movie. Victim and Subject engaged in consensual kissing. Subject then laid Victim on her back, removed her shirt and kissed her neck, breasts, and stomach. Subject then digitally penetrated Victim and when he asked Victim if it hurt she replied "yes." During this time Victim was telling witness for "help." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, AWOL, failure to go, drunk on duty, and failure to obey a lawful order. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred all charges (with the exception of drunk on duty) to a general court-martial. Subject pled guilty to, and was convicted of, all non-sexual charges. Subject was sentenced to reduction in grade to E-1 and a reprimand. Subject was subsequently administratively discharged with a General service characterization. | |
| 276 | Rape Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | Victim reported that Subject invited her to his off-base residence and provided her with alcohol. Victim stated that Subject removed her clothes, digitally penetrated her vagina, and rubbed his penis on her vagina and asked if she wanted to have sex to which she said "no." After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges in accordance with the Article 32 Investigating Officer's recommendation not to proceed to court-martial. The commander served Subject with an LOR. | |
| 277 | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | | YES | BCD | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that she attended a house party off base after drinking at bars with some friends. Victim reported that she met Subject at the party and was backing out drunk on one point. Victim asked Subject for water and then Subject carried her to a bedroom. Victim reported that Subject removed her pants and underwear and sexually assaulted her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for attempted sexual assault, abusive sexual contact, and failure to obey a lawful regulation. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of attempted sexual assault and abusive sexual contact. Subject was sentenced to a bad conduct discharge and reduction in grade to E-1. | |
| 278 | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Abusive Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Other Sexual Misconduct Art. 120c | YES | | YES | BCD | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject | Victim #1 was working with Subject and reported that Subject grabbed her breasts on three separate occasions. There are 3 other victims of non-sexual assault allegations. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for abusive sexual contact, indecent acts, assault consummated by a battery, unlawful communication of a threat, and surreptitiously videotaping another person. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of indecent conduct, assault, and surreptitiously videotaping another person. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 years, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction in rank to E-1. |
| 279 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Assault (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | Both Victim and Subject | Victim reported that following a night of drinking alcohol extensively with Subject they returned to her dorm room and engaged in sexual intercourse. Victim stated that she was heavily intoxicated and beyond the capacity to consent to sexual activity. Subject and Victim had a previous consensual sexual relationship. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for aggravated sexual assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charge to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |

UR Case Synopses

| No. | Offense Alleged Investigated | Location | Subject Service | Subject Gender | Subject: Prior Investigation for Sex Assault? | Victim Service | Victim Grade | Victim Gender | Quarter Disposition Completed | Sexual Assault Offense: Court-Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Most Serious Offense Charged | Court Case or Article 15 Outcome | Reason Charges Dismissed at Art 32 Hearing, if applicable. | Most Serious Offense Convicted | Confinement (Court Only) | Fines and Forfeitures | Reduction in Rank | Court-Martial Discharge | Restriction | Hard Labor | Extra Duty | Correctional Custody (NJP Only) | Adverse Administrative Action Type | Administrative Discharge Type | Must Register as Sex Offender | Alcohol Use | Narrative of the Crime |
|-----|---|-------------|-----------------|----------------|---|----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|
| 280 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | O-1 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject raped her off-base in Subject's car. The victim alleged the offenses occurred off base in the accused's car. The incident was reported to law enforcement the day after it occurred. Alcohol use by the victim was reported. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the commander preferred charges of rape and indecent acts. The charges were referred to a general court-martial after the Article 32 investigation. The accused was acquitted at trial. | |
| 281 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-5 | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim and Subject were at a bar with other Airmen. Victim reported that Subject touched her buttocks. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for wrongful sexual contact, assault consummated by a battery, drunk and disorderly conduct, and making a false official statement. The special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a special court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 282 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | Acquitted | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that on two separate occasions Victim sexually assaulted her at work by pulling her into rooms and touching his penis against her buttocks, touching her breasts and vagina, and forcing her to touch his penis. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for wrongful sexual contact and assault consummated by a battery. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was acquitted. | |
| 283 | Rape Art.120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | Unknown | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Dismissed | Victim Non-Participation | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her when they were previously stationed together. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for Sexual Assault. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. The special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges. | |
| 284 | Rape Art.120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q4 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Rape Art.120 | Dismissed | Hearing officer did not find sufficient evidence to recommend action on the charges preferred. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Victim reported that Subject, who she knew, muscled his way into her apartment and pushed her into the bedroom and raped her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred a charge for rape. Following the Article 32 hearing, the special court-martial convening authority dismissed the charges in accordance with the Article 32 Investigating Officer's recommendation not to proceed to court-martial. | |
| 285 | Rape Art.120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q2 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Adultery Art. 134-2 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Adultery Art. 134-2 | | YES | YES | | | | YES | | | | | Both Victim and Subject Victim attended a party at Subject's home. All were drinking alcohol during the evening. Victim and Subject's wife engaged in sexual activities in Subject's room once most of the guests had left. Subject entered the bedroom and all three parties engaged in various sexual activities to include intercourse with Subject. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate the commander determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for adultery. The commander imposed punishment of 30 days extra duty, suspended reduction in grade to E-4, forfeiture of \$1,000, and a reprimand. | |
| 286 | Nonconsensual Sodomy Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Male | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Nonjudicial Punishment | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | Art 15 Punishment Imposed | | Dereliction of duty Art. 92 | | | | | | | | | | | | Subject and Victim, his subordinate, were eating dinner together at Subject's home. Victim allowed Subject to fondle his penis after dinner. Victim agreed to go with Subject to the bedroom where they had anal and oral sex. Victim reported that the sexual acts were not consensual. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander offered Subject nonjudicial punishment for dereliction of duty for engaging in an unprofessional relationship. The commander imposed punishment of a reprimand. | |
| 287 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-4 | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject Victim, Subject, their spouses, and other persons were at Subject's house for a party. Victim, her husband, Subject, and Subject's wife were the last people at the party. Victim went to the kitchen to get a drink. Subject approached Victim in the kitchen and began groping Victim and touching her. Subject pulled Victim to the ground, pulled down her pants, and digitally penetrated her. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the staff judge advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander issued a LOR to Subject. | | |
| 288 | Rape Art.120 | Afghanistan | Air Force | Male | | Air Force | E-3 | Female | Q3 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | | Victim reported that she was hanging out with Subject and he showed her on a couch, covered her mouth, pinned her down, and removed her clothes and penetrated her vagina with his penis. Victim stated she attempted to push Subject off and struck him multiple times. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the initial disposition authority determined there was probable cause only for a non-sexual assault offense. The commander served Subject with an LOR for adultery and violation of General Order 1-B. | |
| 289 | Rape Art.120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q3 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | Convicted | | Sexual Assault (After 28 Jun 12) Art. 120 | YES | | | | | | | | | YES | Both Victim and Subject Victim reported that she attended Oktoberfest with Subject and several friends. Victim reported that Subject sexually assaulted her by penetrating her vagina with his penis while they walked back to a hotel. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for rape and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Following the Article 32 hearing, the general court-martial convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of sexual assault and conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 2 years and 3 months, and a dismissal. | | |
| 290 | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | CONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Sexual Assault Offense: Court Martial Charge Preferred (Initiated) | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | Convicted | | Aggravated Sexual Contact Art. 120 | YES | | YES | BCD | | | | | | YES | | Victim and Subject were friends and Victim had medical problems and took medication that would knock her out and Subject took care of her after her medical appointments. One morning Victim woke up feeling like she had sex. Subject admitted in a Facebook email that he digitally penetrated Victim's vagina. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander preferred charges for aggravated sexual contact and wrongful sexual contact. Following the Article 32 hearing, the convening authority referred the charges to a general court-martial. Subject was convicted of aggravated sexual contact and the wrongful sexual contact charge was dismissed. Subject was sentenced to confinement for 6 months, a bad conduct discharge, and reduction to E-1. | |
| 291 | Wrongful Sexual Contact (FY08 to FY12) Art. 120 | OCONUS | Air Force | Male | | | US Civilian | Female | Q1 | Non-Sexual Assault Offense: Adverse Administrative Actions | | | | | | | | | | | | LOR | | | Both Victim and Subject Victim reported that she, Subject, and two other junior officers were out at a bar. She stated that subject grabbed the waist of her pants and told her to take them off and then slapped her buttocks and attempted to grab her breasts. After receiving the report of investigation and consulting with the Staff Judge Advocate, the commander served an LOR on subject. | | |