HEADQUARTERS

LST MARINE AIRCRAFT WING, AIRCRAFT, FMF, PACIFIC c/o FLEET POST OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

> 289/jfm A17-3 161-SU 9 July 1958

Reproduced from the Unclassified / Declassified Holdings of the National Archives

RELEASED PER P.L.-102-526 (JFK ACT)

MEMORANDUM

From: Wing Law Specialist To: Chief of Staff

Subj: Summary Court-Martial, case of Lee H. Oswald, private, USMC

1. Subject court-martial has been reviewed pursuant to the provisions of Article 65c, Uniform Code of Military Justice.

2. In reviewing said case no errors or irregularities were noted, other than the failure of the record to reflect legally admissible evidence of the one prior conviction considered by the court. The accused pleaded not guilty to all charges and specifications. Since he was found guilty of only one charge and specification the summary of the evidence will be limited to the approved findings only.

Technical Sergeant Rodriguez and two companions were seated in a 3. The accused approached their table. He spilled part of a drink Cafe. on the Technical Sergeant. Whether this was accidentaly or not was an issue in the case. Apparantly the court decided that it was accidental. When the drink was spilled the Technical Sergeant arose and shoved the This resulted in the accused inviting the sergeant outaccused away. The Sergeant testified that the actual words alledged were used. side. This was corroborated by another witness. The accused testified in his The substance of his testimony was that he felt that the own behalf. Sergeant had it in for him. He had asked to be transferred from under his cognizance. This had been refused. He testified that he went over to see the sergeant for the purpose of discussing the situation with him; that the drink was spilled accidentally; and that he was somewhat intoxicated. He remembered inviting the accused outside but did not remember calling him yellow or anything like that.

4. The findings are correct in law and fact and the evidence is sufficient to establish guilt beyond reasonable doubt. The victims' testimony was corroborated by disinterested witnesses; the accuseds' testimony admitted certain material aspects of it; and did not deny uttering the words charged. As a matter of fact his competency as a witness is seriously impared by his own admission that he was drunk.