

UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

Before
COOPER, WILLIAMS, and SCHLACK
Appellate Military Judges

UNITED STATES, Appellee
v.
Private E1 TRENT M. MORLOCK
United States Army, Appellant

ARMY 20230265

Headquarters, Fort Stewart
Albert G. Courie III and Stephan E. Nolten, Military Judges
Lieutenant Colonel Tanasha N. Stinson, Staff Judge Advocate

For Appellant: Captain Robert W. Duffie, JA; Robert Feldmeier, Esquire (on brief and reply brief); Captain Eli M. Creighton, JA; Robert Feldmeier, Esquire (on supplemental brief).

For Appellee: Colonel Richard E. Gorini, JA; Captain Anthony J. Scarpati, JA; Captain Vy T. Nguyen, JA (on brief).

13 April 2026

DECISION ON RECONSIDERATION

Per Curiam:

On 29 January 2025, appellant submitted this case with four assignments of error, including ineffective assistance of counsel, and seven *Grostefon* matters. *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982). On 11 June 2025, this court ordered affidavits from trial defense counsel and on 25 July 2025, granted the government's motion to attach said affidavits to the record (Government Appellate Exhibit 1 and 2). On 15 September 2025, this court granted appellant's motion to attach Defense Appellate Exhibits A–F (exhibits relevant to the ineffective assistance claim) and granted appellant's subsequent motion to attach Defense Appellate Exhibit G (an affidavit in support of the ineffective assistance claim). However, notice of these granted motions was not provided to counsel. Two days later, on 17 September 2025, the court summarily affirmed the findings and the sentence.

On 15 October 2025, because counsel was unaware that their motions to attach had been granted before the issuance of the summary affirmance, appellant requested reconsideration of the claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. This court granted the motion for reconsideration.

Now, upon reconsideration, and after reviewing the initial brief, reply brief, supplemental brief and reconsideration request submitted by appellant, all matters submitted by appellant pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, Defense Appellate Exhibits A–G, the response brief submitted by appellee, Government Appellate Exhibits 1 and 2, and the trial record, we again find defense counsel’s performance was not ineffective. Accordingly, the findings of guilty and the sentence are AFFIRMED.

FOR THE COURT:

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of James W. Heining.

JAMES W. HEINING,
Clerk of Court