

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS


UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIRST)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	10 June 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>)	

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1) and (2) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his first enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 60 days, which will end on 19 **August 2025**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 50 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 120 days will have elapsed.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested first enlargement of time.

Respectfully submitted,



TREVOR N. WARD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 10 June 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

TREVOR N. WARD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.)	OF TIME
)	
Captain (O-3))	Before Panel No. 2
ROBERT D. DOBY, USAF,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	No. ACM 40794
)	
)	12 June 2025
)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force

Appellate Defense Division on 12 June 2025



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Robert D. DOBY)	
Captain (O-3))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 10 June 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (First), requesting an additional 60 days in which to file Appellant's assignments of error. The Government opposes the motion.

The court has considered Appellant's motion, the Government's opposition, case law, and this court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 12th day of June, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **19 August 2025**.

Appellant's counsel is advised that any subsequent motions for enlargement of time shall include, in addition to matters required under this court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, statements as to: (1) whether Appellant was advised of Appellant's right to a timely appeal, (2) whether Appellant was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, (3) whether Appellant was advised of the request for an enlargement of time, and (4) whether Appellant agrees with the request for an enlargement of time.



FOR THE COURT



ROBERT DRIESSEN, Maj, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee,</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SECOND)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	7 August 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his second enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **18 September 2025**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 108 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, R. at 1, Appellant was tried by a military judge sitting as a general court-martial. R. at 12. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one charge and one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. Convening Authority Decision on Action. Appellant is not confined.

The record of trial (ROT) is electronic, consisting of 393 pages. The ROT includes 3 prosecution exhibits (to include a stipulation of fact that is 20 pages long) and 4 appellate exhibits.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.
- (2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.
- (3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.
- (4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,

[Redacted signature]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[Redacted address lines]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 7 August 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Olga Stanford.

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A black rectangular redaction box covering a line of text.A black rectangular redaction box covering a line of text.A black rectangular redaction box covering a line of text.


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.)	OF TIME
)	
Captain (O-3))	Before Panel No. 2
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellant.</i>)	
)	8 August 2025
)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.




KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force Appellate Defense Division on 8 August 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (THIRD)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY)	
United States Air Force)	28 August 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his third enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **18 October 2025**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 129 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.* Appellant is not confined.


The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.
- (2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.
- (3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.
- (4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 28 August 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Olga Stanford.

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

Four horizontal black rectangular redaction boxes covering contact information, likely a phone number and email address.


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.)	OF TIME
)	
Captain (O-3))	Before Panel No. 2
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellant.</i>)	
)	2 September 2025
)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force Appellate Defense Division on 2 September 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FOURTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY)	
United States Air Force)	8 October 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his fourth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 November 2025**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 170 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.* Appellant is not confined.

The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages. Counsel is currently assigned sixteen cases; sixteen of those cases are pending before this Court (sixteen cases are pending AOE). Eight cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850 – The digital record of trial is 2411 pages consisting of twenty-five appellate exhibits, twelve prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 757 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case, identified multiple errors, and is drafting the AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Fife*, ACM No. 40829 – The digital record of trial is 837 pages consisting of twenty-two appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 319 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

5. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined.

Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

6. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

7. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

8. *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855 – The digital record of trial is 970 pages, consisting of eight appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 259 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

(1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.

(2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.

(3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.

(4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Olga Stanford.

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

Four horizontal black rectangular redaction boxes covering contact information, likely a phone number and address.

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 8 October 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Olga Stanford.

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

Four horizontal black rectangular redaction boxes covering contact information, likely a phone number and email address.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
)	OF TIME – OUT OF TIME
v.)	
)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Captain (O-3))	
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	No. ACM 40794
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	
)	17 October 2025

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its Out of Time general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case. Due to an oversight, the United States thought that an opposition to this enlargement of time had been filed earlier this week. The United States now takes corrective action and files this response.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.


[Redacted signature block]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[Redacted contact information]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 17 October 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Robert D. DOBY)	
Captain (O-3))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 8 October 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fourth), requesting an additional 30 days in which to file Appellant’s assignments of error.

On 17 October 2025, the Government filed its opposition out of time to Appellant’s motion. However, the Government failed to ask for leave of the court to file their motion out of time. See JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 23(d). In the interest of judicial economy, the court will accept the Government’s opposition out of time as is.

The court has considered Appellant’s motion, the Government’s opposition, case law, and this court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 17th day of October, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fourth) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **17 November 2025**.

FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIFTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY)	
United States Air Force)	26 October 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his fifth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 December 2025**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 188 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.* Appellant is not confined.

The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages. Counsel is currently assigned sixteen cases; sixteen of those cases are pending before this Court (sixteen cases are pending AOE). Eight cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850 – The digital record of trial is 2411 pages consisting of twenty-five appellate exhibits, twelve prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 757 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case, identified multiple errors, and is drafting the AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Fife*, ACM No. 40829 – The digital record of trial is 837 pages consisting of twenty-two appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 319 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case.

5. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined.

Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

6. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

7. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

8. *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855 – The digital record of trial is 970 pages, consisting of eight appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 259 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of this case, identified multiple errors, and is drafting the AOE brief.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

(1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.

(2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.

(3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.

(4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,

[Redacted signature block]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

[Redacted line]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 26 October 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Olga Stanford.

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

Four horizontal black rectangular redaction boxes covering contact information, likely a phone number and email address.


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.)	OF TIME
)	
Captain (O-3))	Before Panel No. 2
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellant.</i>)	28 October 2025
)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.




KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force Appellate Defense Division on 28 October 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SIXTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel 2
)	
Captain (O-3))	No. ACM 40794
ROBERT D. DOBY)	
United States Air Force)	3 December 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his sixth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 January 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 226 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.* Appellant is not confined.

The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages. Counsel is currently assigned twenty cases; twenty of those cases are pending before this Court (eighteen cases are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in three of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850; *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855; and *United States v. Souza*, ACM No. S32813. Of the cases pending AOE brief, eight cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850 – The digital record of trial is 2411 pages consisting of twenty-five appellate exhibits, twelve prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 757 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case, identified multiple errors, and submitted the AOE brief. On 2 December 2025, this Court denied Appellant’s Motion to Exceed Page Limit and Word Count and ordered Appellant to file a revised brief within fourteen days, by 17 December 2025.
2. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is

- seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Fife*, ACM No. 40829 – The digital record of trial is 837 pages consisting of twenty-two appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 319 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case.
 5. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
 6. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
 7. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
 8. *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855 – The digital record of trial is 970 pages, consisting of eight appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 259 pages. Appellant is currently


confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of this case, identified multiple errors, and is drafting the AOE brief.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.
- (2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.
- (3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.
- (4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,


OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel






CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 3 December 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.)	OF TIME
)	
Captain (O-3))	Before Panel No. 2
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	
United States Air Force,)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellant.</i>)	
)	5 December 2025
)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force Appellate Defense Division on 5 December 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

UNITED STATES <i>Appellee</i>)	No. ACM 40794
)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Robert D. DOBY Captain (O-3) U.S. Air Force <i>Appellant</i>)	
)	
)	Panel 2

On 3 December 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Sixth) requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error. The Government opposes the motion.

The court has considered Appellant’s motion, the Government’s opposition, case law, and this court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 8th day of December, 2025,


ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Sixth) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **16 January 2026**.

Appellant’s counsel is advised that given the number of enlargements granted thus far, any further requests for an enlargement of time may necessitate a status conference to determine the progress being made on Appellant’s case per this court’s Rule 23.3(m)(6). A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 23.3(m)(6).



FOR THE COURT



JACOB B. HOEFERKAMP, Capt, USAF
Chief Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
)	(SEVENTH)
v.)	
)	Before Panel 2
Captain (O-3))	
ROBERT D. DOBY)	No. ACM 40794
United States Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	6 January 2026

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his seventh enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **15 February 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 April 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 260 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed.

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.* Appellant is not confined.

The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages. Counsel is currently assigned twenty cases; twenty of those cases are pending before this Court (eighteen cases are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in two of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850 and *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855. Of the cases pending AOE brief, seven cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850 – The digital record of trial is 2411 pages consisting of twenty-five appellate exhibits, twelve prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 757 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case, identified multiple errors, and submitted the AOE brief. On 2 December 2025 and on 30 December 2025, this Court denied Appellant’s Motions to Exceed Page Limit and Word Count. This Court’s last order directed Appellant to file a revised brief within fourteen sixteen, by 15 January.
2. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

4. *United States v. Fife*, ACM No. 40829 – The digital record of trial is 837 pages consisting of twenty-two appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 319 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case.
5. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
6. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
7. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant has been advised of his right to a timely appeal.

(2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.

(3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case.

(4) Appellant has specifically consented to this enlargement of time.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant the requested enlargement of time for good cause shown.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 6 January 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

[Redacted signature]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[Redacted contact information]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES’
)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Captain (O-3))	
ROBERT D. DOBY,)	No. ACM 40794
United States Air Force.)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	7 January 2026

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF
THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its opposition to Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

The United States respectfully maintains that short of a death penalty case or other extraordinary circumstances, it should not take any appellant nearly a year to submit an assignment of error to this Court. If Appellant’s new delay request is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 300 days in length. Appellant’s nearly year-long delay practically ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court’s appellate processing standards. Appellant has already consumed almost two-thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 8 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant’s counsel has not completed review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests that this Court deny Appellant's enlargement motion.




VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 7 January 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Robert D. DOBY)	
Captain (O-3))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 6 January 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh) requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error. The Government opposed the motion and noted that “[i]f Appellant’s new delay request is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 300 days in length.”

On 12 January 2026, the court held a status conference to discuss the progress of this case. Appellant was represented by Captain Olga Stanford; Lieutenant Colonel Allen S. Abrams from the Appellate Defense Division was also present. Major Vanessa Bairos represented the Government. This court indicated the main reason for the conference was the lack of information in Appellant’s motion regarding the progress made on Appellant’s case. In response to questions from the court, Captain Stanford provided additional information, indicating that she had completed her review of the record with the exception of the sealed materials. Captain Stanford added she anticipates filing a motion to examine the sealed materials next week. The court also asked Appellant’s counsel to be more specific on her case progress as required per this court’s Rule 23.3(m)(6) in future correspondence with the court. A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 23.3(m)(6). Major Bairos did not dispute any representation made by the Defense.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 12th day of January, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **15 February 2026**.

It is further ordered:

Appellant's counsel is advised that given the number of enlargements granted thus far, the court will continue to closely examine any further requests for an enlargement of time.



FOR THE COURT

[Redacted signature]

JACOB B. HOEFERKAMP, Capt, USAF
Chief Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	CONSENT MOTION TO
<i>Appellee</i>)	EXAMINE SEALED MATERIALS
)	
v.)	
)	Before Panel 2
Captain (O-3))	
ROBERT D. DOBY)	No. ACM 40794
United States Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	21 January 2026

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rules 3.1, 23.1(b), and 23.3(f) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel hereby moves this Court to permit appellate counsel for the Appellant and the Government to examine the following sealed materials in Appellant’s record of trial (ROT): Attach. 2 to Pros. Ex. 1 (disc containing contraband media).

Facts

On 25 November 2024, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia. Record (R.) at 1. Consistent with his pleas, R. at 14–15, the military judge found Appellant guilty of one specification of wrongfully possessing obscene visual depictions, incorporated through 18 U.S.C. Section 1466A(b)(1), in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 934. R. at 79. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a dismissal and a reprimand. R. at 99. The convening authority took no action on the findings in this case. Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Captain Robert D. Doby. The convening authority took the following action on the sentence: disapproval of the adjudged reprimand. *Id.*

During the proceedings, the military judge ordered Attach. 2 to Pros. Ex. 1 sealed

because it contained contraband materials. R. at 18–19.

Law

Pursuant to Rule for Court Martial (R.C.M.) 1113(b)(3)(B)(i), “materials presented or reviewed at trial and sealed . . . may be examined by appellate counsel upon a colorable showing to the reviewing or appellate authority that examination is reasonably necessary to a proper fulfillment of the appellate counsel’s responsibilities[.]”

Although Courts of Criminal Appeals have a broad mandate to review the record unconstrained by an appellant’s assignments of error, that broad mandate does not reduce the importance of adequate representation. As we said in *United States v. Ortiz*, 24 M.J. 323, 325 (C.M.A. 1987), independent review is not the same as competent appellate representation.

United States v. May, 47 M.J. 478, 481 (C.A.A.F. 1998).

Air Force regulations governing professional duties and conduct of appellate defense counsel impose upon counsel, *inter alia*, a duty to provide “competent representation,”¹ perform “reasonable diligence,”² and to “give a client his or her best professional evaluation of the questions that might be presented on appeal...[to] consider all issues that might affect the validity of the judgment of conviction and sentence...[to] advise on the probable outcome of a challenge to the conviction or sentence...[and to] endeavor to persuade the client to abandon a wholly frivolous appeal or to eliminate contentions lacking in substance.”³ These requirements are consistent with those imposed by the state bar to which counsel belong.⁴

This Court may grant relief “on the basis of the entire record” of trial. Article 66, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 866. Appellate defense counsel detailed by the Judge Advocate General shall

¹ Air Force Instruction (AFI) 51-110, *Professional Responsibility Program*, Attachment 2: Air Force Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 1.1 (11 Dec. 2018).

² *Id.* at Rule 1.3.

³ AFI 51-110, Attachment 7: Air Force Standards for Criminal Justice, Standard 4-8.3(b).

⁴ Undersigned counsel is licensed to practice law in Connecticut.

represent accused servicemembers before this Court. Article 70, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 870.

Analysis

The parties “presented” and “reviewed” the sealed material at trial. It is reasonably necessary for Appellant’s counsel to review this sealed exhibit for counsel to competently conduct a professional evaluation of Appellant’s case and to uncover all issues which might afford him relief. Because examination of the material in question is reasonably necessary to the fulfillment of counsel’s Article 70, UCMJ, duties, and because the contents of the Motions were made available to the parties at trial, Appellant has provided the “colorable showing” required by R.C.M. 1113(b)(3)(B)(i) to permit his counsel’s examination of the sealed material and has shown good cause to grant this motion.

The Government consents to both parties viewing the sealed material detailed above.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant this consent motion and permit appellate counsel for the Appellant and the Government to examine the aforementioned sealed material and receive copies of the material removed but not sealed contained within the original record of trial.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 21 January 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



**UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS**

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40794
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Robert D. DOBY)	
Captain (O-3))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 21 January 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Consent Motion to Examine Sealed Materials, requesting both parties be allowed to examine Attachment 2 of Prosecution Exhibit 1, which was ordered sealed by the military judge and reviewed by trial and defense counsel at Appellant’s court-martial.*

Appellate counsel may examine sealed materials released to counsel at trial “upon a colorable showing . . . that examination is reasonably necessary to a proper fulfillment of the appellate counsel’s responsibilities.” Rule for Courts-Martial 1113(b)(3)(B)(i), *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.).

The court finds Appellant has made a colorable showing that review of sealed material is reasonably necessary for a proper fulfillment of appellate defense counsel’s responsibilities. This court’s order permits counsel for both parties to examine the materials.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 30th day of January, 2026,

ORDERED:


* While the language on the envelope to Attachment 2 states, in part, “REVIEWED IN CAMERA BY MILITARY JUDGE,” the record reflects otherwise. The military judge did not view the attachment in camera, and the record supports that the parties examined the material in Attachment 2 at Appellant’s court-martial.

Appellant's Consent Motion to Examine Sealed Materials is **GRANTED**. Appellate defense counsel and appellate government counsel may view **Attachment 2 of Prosecution Exhibit 1**, subject to the following conditions:

To view the sealed materials, counsel will coordinate with the court.

No counsel granted access to the materials may photocopy, photograph, reproduce, disclose, or make available the content to any other individual without the court's prior written authorization.

FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION TO WITHDRAW
)	FROM APPELLATE REVIEW
<i>Appellee</i>)	AND ATTACH
)	
v.)	
)	Before Panel 2
Captain (O-3))	
ROBERT D. DOBY)	No. ACM 40794
United States Air Force)	
)	12 February 2026
<i>Appellant</i>)	

**TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS:**

Pursuant to Rule 16 of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1115, Appellant, Captain Robert D. Doby, moves to withdraw his case from appellate review.

Appellant has fully consulted with Captain Olga Stanford, his appellate defense counsel, regarding this motion to withdraw. No person has compelled, coerced, or induced Appellant to withdraw his case from appellate review by force, promises of clemency, or otherwise.

Further, pursuant to Rules 23(b) and 23.3(b) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel asks this Court to attach the two-page document appended to this pleading to the record of this proceeding. The appended document, Appellant’s completed DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial Subject to Review by a Court of Criminal Appeals*, is necessary to comply with R.C.M. 1115(d) and Rule 16.1 of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant this motion to withdraw from appellate review and attach matters to the record.

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 12 February 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

