IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	Appellee	**BRIEF ON BEHALF OF APPELLANT**
v.		Docket No. ARMY 20250541
Private (E-2) **WILLIE L BISBEE,** United States Army,	Appellant	Tried at Fort Benning, Georgia, on 24 November 2025, before a general court-martial appointed by the Commander, U.S. Army Maneuver Center of Excellence and Fort Benning, Colonel John Ray Langley, military judge, presiding.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

The first undersigned appellate defense counsel attests he has, on behalf of appellant, carefully examined the record of trial in this case. Appellant does not admit the findings and sentence are correct in law and fact, and submits the case to this court on its merits with no specific assignments of error.[1]

[redacted]
Seth J. Bahr
Captain, Judge Advocate
Appellate Defense Counsel
Defense Appellate Division

[redacted]rssen
Major, Judge Advocate
Branch Chief
Defense Appellate Division

[1] Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982), appellant respectfully requests this court consider the information provided in the Appendix.

PANEL 2

Appendix: Matters Submitted Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*

Pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982), the appellant, through appellate defense counsel, personally requests that this court consider the following matters:

I. WHETHER APPELLANT'S SEPARATE CONVICTIONS FOR RESISTING APPREHENSION AND FLEEING APPREHENSION WITH REGARD TO SPECIFICATIONS 1 AND 2 OF CHARGE II ARE MULTIPLICIOUS.

II. WHETHER SPECIFICATIONS 1 AND 2 OF CHARGE II CONSTITUTE AN UNREASONABLE MULTIPLICATION OF CHARGES.

III. WHETHER APPELLANT'S OBJECTION TO MULTIPLICITY WAS WAIVED AND, IF SO, WHETHER DEFENSE COUNSEL WERE INEFFECTIVE FOR FAILING TO RAISE IT.

IV. WHETHER APPELLANT'S OBJECTION TO AN UNREASONBABLE MULTIPLICATION OF CHARGES WAS WAIVED AND, IF SO, WHETHER DEFENSE COUNSEL WERE INEFFECTIVE FOR FAILING TO RAISE IT.

V. WHETHER APPELLANT'S CONVICTIONS ARE LEGALLY AND FACTUALLY SUFFICIENT.

VI. WHETHER THE IMPOSED SENTENCE IS EXCESSIVE AND DISPROPROTIONATE.

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed with the Army Court and Government Appellate Division on July 24, 2026.

[redacted]

MELINDA J. JOHNSON
Paralegal Specialist
Defense Appellate Division