IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**NOTICE OF DIRECT APPEAL PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ**
v.	)	
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM _____
Appellant	)	6 October 2025

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

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. 1, 13. Appellant was found guilty, consistent with his pleas, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890 and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. 6-7, 16, 68; Electronic Record of Trial (eROT) Vol 1, *Entry of Judgment* (May 1, 2025).

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, forfeiture of $7,000.00 pay per month for two months, and confinement for twenty-one days (served concurrently). Trial Tr. 126; eROT Vol 1, *Entry of Judgment* (May 1, 2025). The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. eROT Vol 1, *Convening Authority Decision on Action* (Apr. 22, 2025).

On 17 July 2025, the Government mailed Appellant the required notice of their right to appeal within ninety days. Pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A), **Appellant files their notice of direct appeal with this Court.**

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Appellate Government Division on 6 October 2025.

[redacted]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	**No. ACM _____**
Appellee	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	**NOTICE OF**
Christopher B. MEEKER	)	**DOCKETING**
Colonel (O-6)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
Appellant	)	

On 6 October 2025, this court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant in the above-styled case, pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A).

As of the date of this notice, the court has not received a record of trial in Appellant's case.

Pursuant to Rule 18(d)(2) of the Joint Rules of Appellate Procedure for Courts of Criminal Appeals, "[a]s soon as practicable after the filing of a Notice of Appeal, the [G]overnment shall provide the Court a complete record, including a verbatim transcript, and provide a copy to the defense. An appellant's brief shall be filed no later than 60 days thereafter." JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 18(d)(2) (as amended 17 May 2024). "[T]he record shall be the contents described in [Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.)] 1112(b) as certified under R.C.M. 1112(c), the attachments for appellate review described in R.C.M. 1112(f), and . . . documents germane to timeliness of the appeal under Article 66(c)(1), UCMJ." JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 6(a)(1).

The court defers decision with regard to timeliness of Appellant's appeal pending receipt of the record of trial. *See* Article 66(c), UCMJ.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 7th day of October, 2025,

ORDERED:

The case in the above-styled matter is referred to Panel 2.

It is further ordered:

The Government will forward a copy of the record of trial to Appellant and the court "as soon as practicable." *See* JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 6(a)(1); 8(d)(2).

FOR THE COURT

[redacted]

JACOB B. HOEFERKAMP, Capt, USAF
Chief Commissioner

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	**No. ACM 40903**
Appellee	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	**NOTICE OF PANEL**
Christopher B. MEEKER	)	**CHANGE**
Colonel (O-6)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
Appellant	)	

It is by the court on this 15th day of December, 2025,

ORDERED:

That the Record of Trial in the above-styled matter is withdrawn from Panel 2 and referred to Panel 1 for appellate review.

This panel letter supersedes all previous panel assignments.

FOR THE COURT

[redacted]

JACOB B. HOEFERKAMP, Capt, USAF
Chief Commissioner

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	**No. ACM 40903**
Appellee	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	**ORDER**
Christopher B. MEEKER	)	
Colonel (O-6)		)
U.S. Air Force	)	
Appellant	)	**Panel 1**

On 22 December 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) requesting an additional 60 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. The Government opposed 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 31st day of December, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **4 March 2026**.

Each request for an enlargement of time will be considered on its merits. 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.

[redacted]

JACOB B. HOEFERKAMP, Capt, USAF
Chief Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIRST)**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	22 December 2025

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 an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 60 days, which will end on **4 March 2026**. On 6 October 2025, this Court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A). On 7 October 2025, Appellant's case was docketed with this Court and this Court ordered the Government to forward a copy of the record of trial to Appellant and the Court. On 4 November 2025, this Court received the record of trial. From the date of docketing to the present date, 76 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 148 days will have elapsed from the date of docketing. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 48 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 120 days will have elapsed from the date this Court received the record of trial.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Appellate Government Division on 22 December 2025.

[redacted]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES, *Appellee,* v. Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,** United States Air Force, *Appellant.*	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 29 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.

[redacted]

KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

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 29 December 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SECOND)**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	20 February 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1), (3)-(4) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **3 April 2026**. On 6 October 2025, this Court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A). On 7 October 2025, Appellant's case was docketed with this Court, and this Court ordered the Government to forward a copy of the record of trial to Appellant and the Court. On 4 November 2025, this Court received the record of trial. From the date of docketing to the present date, 136 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 178 days will have elapsed from the date of docketing. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 108 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed from the date this Court received the record of trial.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Tr. 1, 13-14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890; and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934.[1] Tr. 6-7, 68; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025; Appellate. Ex. XIV.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days (served concurrently). Tr. 126; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action, Apr. 22, 2025.

The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not currently confined.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on his case. Appellant was advised of the request for this enlargement of time. Appellant has provided limited consent

[1] Pursuant to a plea agreement, one charge and one specification of extramarital sexual conduct in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 134, was withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice. Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025; Appellate. Ex. XIV.

to disclose a confidential communication with counsel wherein he consented to the request for this enlargement of time.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete his review of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 20 February 2026.

[redacted]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
Appellee,	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6)	)	
CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,	)	No. ACM 40903
United States Air Force.	)	
Appellant	)	23 February 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 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.

[redacted]
VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

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 23 February 2026.

[redacted]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**NOTICE OF APPEARANCE**
v.	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)	No. ACM 40903 17 March 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 12 and 13 of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the undersigned, an attorney admitted to practice before this Court, hereby enters her appearance as an appellate counsel for the appellant in the above-captioned case.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 17 March 2026.

[redacted]
PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF APPELLATE DEFENSE COUNSEL**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	17 March 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 12(b), 12.4, and 23.3(h) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel respectfully requests to withdraw as counsel in the above-captioned case. Undersigned counsel is withdrawing to allow a more available appellate defense counsel to take over Appellant's case. Capt Paige Markley Denton has been detailed substitute appellate military counsel in undersigned counsel's stead and made her notice of appearance on 17 March 2026. Counsel have completed a thorough turnover of the record.

Appellant has been advised of this motion to withdraw as counsel and consents to undersigned counsel's withdrawal. A copy of this motion will be delivered to Appellant following its filing.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 17 March 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)))))))))	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (THIRD)** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 26 March 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Colonel Christopher B. Meeker, Appellant, hereby moves for a third enlargement of time (EOT) to file his Assignments of Error (AOE) in the above captioned case. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **3 May 2026**. This Court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025. Appellant's case was docketed with this Court on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 170 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 208 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 142 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Tr. 1, 13-14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890; and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Tr. 6-7, 68; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025;

Appellate. Ex. XIV. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Tr. 126; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action, Apr. 22, 2025.

The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel was recently detailed to this case, with Capt John Fredericks withdrawing. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned twenty-seven cases; twenty-five cases are pending before this Court (twenty-three cases are pending AOEs), and two cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF). To date, **six** cases are prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Carlisle*, No. ACM 40784 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This case has had ten enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is twenty-eight volumes, with Volume 1 containing most of the record. It is 2,209 pages and contains four prosecution exhibits, nine defense exhibits, and thirty-five appellate exhibits. The transcript is 273 pages long. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel began substantively reviewing the record of trial but has not finished yet.

2. *United States v. Northrup*, No. ACM 40854 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This case has had six enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains five prosecution exhibits, seven

defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits. The transcript is 191 pages long. This appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Champaco*, No. ACM S32828 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This case has had six enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twelve appellate exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Davis*, No. ACM S32831 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This case has had six enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of six prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and seven appellate exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Brown*, No. ACM 25055 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different counsel. This case has had five enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 773 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, forty-two defense exhibits, and three appellate exhibits. The transcript is 195 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

6. *United States vs. Quijano*, No. ACM 25072 – Undersigned counsel was detailed the week of 9 March 2026 to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This case has had three enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 1,769 pages, consisting of six prosecution exhibits, twenty-two defense exhibits, and twenty-five appellate exhibits. The transcript is 876 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Since being detailed to the present case, which occurred after its last EOT, undersigned counsel has made the following progress on other higher priority cases: in *United States vs. Carlisle*, starting substantive review of the record of trial, discussing the case and record of trial with that appellant, legal research, filing a motion to view sealed materials, and viewing sealed materials. Since being detailed to the present case, undersigned counsel has also conducted approximately eight hours of calls with new clients and approximately eleven hours of docket organization and case turnover with clients' previous counsel. Undersigned counsel has spent approximately four-and-a-half hours on EOTs.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors. Appellant was (1) advised of his right to a timely appeal, (2) updated on the status of counsel's progress on his case, and (3) advised of this request for an enlargement of time. He asserts his right to a timely appeal but, understanding that undersigned counsel has not yet thoroughly reviewed his case due to other clients' cases being docketed with this Court prior to his, (4) consents to the request for an enlargement of time.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[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 26 March 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
Appellee,	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6)	)	
CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,	)	No. ACM 40903
United States Air Force.	)	
Appellant	)	27 March 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 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.

[redacted]
VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

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 27 March 2026.

[redacted]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)))))))))	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FOURTH)** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 23 April 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Colonel Christopher B. Meeker, Appellant, hereby moves for a fourth enlargement of time (EOT) to file his Assignments of Error (AOE) in the above captioned case. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **2 June 2026**. This Court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 198 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 238 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 170 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Tr. 1, 13-14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890; and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Tr. 6-7, 68; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025;

Appellate. Ex. XIV. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Tr. 126; Entry of Judgment, May 1, 2025. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action, Apr. 22, 2025. The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned twenty-nine cases. Twenty-eight of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-seven are pending AOEs). To date, **seven** cases are prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Carlisle*, No. ACM 40784 – This case has had eleven enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is twenty-eight volumes, with Volume 1 containing most of the record. It is 2,209 pages and contains four Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, and thirty-five Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 273 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel began substantively reviewing the record but is not finished.

2. *United States v. Binkley*, No. ACM 40924 – This case has had one enlargement of time. This case would not ordinarily be prioritized over Appellant's case. However, the appellant in it retained civilian counsel and his civilian counsel is reviewing the record of trial and considering potential errors currently. Therefore, the undersigned counsel must review the record of trial imminently in order to advise that appellant regarding potential errors and work with that civilian counsel on the brief. The electronic record of trial contains 2,722 pages, thirteen prosecution exhibits, four defense exhibits, one court exhibit, and fifty appellate exhibits. The transcript is 757

pages long. This appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial but will do so soon.

3. *United States v. Northrup*, No. ACM 40854 – This case has had seven enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains five prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits. The transcript is 191 pages long. This appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Champaco*, No. ACM S32828 – This case has had six enlargements of time; a seventh was requested yesterday. The electronic record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twelve appellate exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Davis*, No. ACM S32831 – This case has had six enlargements of time; a seventh was requested yesterday. The electronic record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of six prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and seven appellate exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

6. *United States v. Brown*, No. ACM 25055 – This case has had six enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 773 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, forty-two defense exhibits, and three appellate exhibits. The transcript is 195 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

7. *United States vs. Quijano*, No. ACM 25072 – This case has had four enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 1,769 pages, consisting of six prosecution exhibits, twenty-

two defense exhibits, and twenty-five appellate exhibits. The transcript is 876 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Since the last EOT in this case, undersigned counsel has completed the following work in higher priority cases: (1) in *United States v. Carlisle*, substantively reviewing the record of trial, discussing the case and record of trial with that appellant, and conducting legal research, and (2) in *United States v. Binkley*, discussing the case with that appellant and civilian counsel. Since the last EOT in this case, undersigned counsel has also spent approximately ten hours on client calls and approximately seven hours on EOTs.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors. Appellant was (1) advised of his right to a timely appeal, (2) updated on the status of counsel's progress on his case, and (3) advised of this request for an enlargement of time. He asserts his right to a timely appeal but, understanding that undersigned counsel has not yet substantively reviewed his case due to other clients' cases being docketed with this Court prior to his, (4) consents to the request for an enlargement of time.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 23 April 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
Appellee,	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6)	)	
CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,	)	No. ACM 40903
United States Air Force.	)	
Appellant	)	27 April 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 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.

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

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 27 April 2026.

[redacted]
REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)))))))))	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIFTH)** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 22 May 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant, moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file his Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **2 July 2026**. This Court received Appellant's notice of direct appeal pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 227 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 268 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 199 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. at 1, 13–14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890, and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. at 6–7, 68; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. XIV. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000

pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Trial Tr. at 126; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action. The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned thirty-three cases, which are all pending before this Court. Thirty-two are pending AOEs. **Seven** have priority over the present case:

1. *United States v. Carlisle*, No. ACM 40784 – This case has had twelve enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is twenty-eight volumes, with Volume 1 containing most of the record. It is 2,209 pages and contains four Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, and thirty-five Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 273 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her substantive review of the record but has not yet completed this appellant's AOE brief.

2. *United States v. Binkley*, No. ACM 40924 – This case has had two enlargements of time. This case would not ordinarily be prioritized over Appellant's case, but this appellant retained civilian counsel who is reviewing the record of trial and considering potential errors currently. Therefore, undersigned counsel must review the record of trial imminently to advise this appellant regarding potential errors and work with that civilian counsel on the brief. The electronic record of trial contains 2,722 pages, thirteen Prosecution Exhibits, four Defense Exhibits, one Court Exhibit, and fifty Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 757 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial but will do so soon.

3. *United States v. Northrup*, No. ACM 40854 – This case has had eight enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains five Prosecution Exhibits, seven Defense Exhibits, and nine Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 191 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Champaco*, No. ACM S32828 – This case has had seven enlargements of time; an eighth was requested earlier today. The electronic record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of five Prosecution Exhibits, six Defense Exhibits, and twelve Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Davis*, No. ACM S32829 – This case has had seven enlargements of time; an eighth was requested earlier today. The electronic record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of six Prosecution Exhibits, one Defense Exhibit, and seven Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

6. *United States v. Brown*, No. ACM 25055 – This case has had seven enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 773 pages, consisting of five Prosecution Exhibits, forty-two Defense Exhibits, and three Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 195 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

7. *United States vs. Quijano*, No. ACM 25072 – This case has had five enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 1,769 pages, consisting of six Prosecution Exhibits, twenty-two Defense Exhibits, and twenty-five Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 876 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Since the last EOT in this case, undersigned counsel has completed the following work in higher priority cases: (1) in *United States v. Carlisle*, substantively reviewing the record of trial, conducting legal research, advising that appellant, and drafting the AOE brief, and (2) in *United States v. Binkley*, discussing the case with that appellant and civilian counsel.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors. Appellant provided limited consent for undersigned counsel to disclose the following confidential communications. Appellant was (1) advised of his right to a timely appeal, (2) updated on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case, and (3) advised of undersigned counsel's request for an enlargement of time. He asserts his right to a timely appeal but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that were docketed with this Honorable Court before his was, and one case requiring earlier review due to unique circumstances with another appellant's civilian counsel, he (4) agrees with the request for an enlargement of time.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 22 May 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
Appellee,	)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
	)	OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6)	)	
CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,	)	No. ACM 40903
United States Air Force.	)	
Appellant	)	27 May 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 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.

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

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 27 May 2026.

[redacted]
REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)))))))))	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SIXTH)** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 24 June 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant, moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file his Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **1 August 2026**. This Court received Appellant's notice of direct appeal pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 261 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 232 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. at 1, 13–14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890, and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. at 6–7, 68; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. XIV. The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000

pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Trial Tr. at 126; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action. The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned forty-seven cases. Forty of them are pending before this Court with thirty-one pending AOEs. Six cases currently have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Binkley*, No. ACM 40924 – This case has had three enlargements of time and would not ordinarily be prioritized over Appellant's case. However, its appellant retained civilian counsel who has already reviewed the record of trial and is prepared to advise on potential errors as soon as undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record of trial (this appellant is not waiving his Article 70, UCMJ, military defense counsel). Therefore, undersigned counsel must finish reviewing the record of trial as soon as possible to advise on potential errors and work on the brief with civilian counsel. The electronic record of trial contains 2,722 pages, thirteen Prosecution Exhibits, four Defense Exhibits, one Court Exhibit, and fifty Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 757 pages long. This appellant is *not* confined. His case was litigated. Undersigned counsel has not finished substantively reviewing the record of trial.

2. *United States v. Northrup*, No. ACM 40854 – This case has had nine enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains five prosecution exhibits, seven defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits. The transcript is 191 pages long. This case was a guilty plea. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Champaco*, No. ACM S32828 – This case has had eight enlargements of time, with a ninth requested earlier today. The electronic record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twelve appellate exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Davis*, No. ACM S32829 – This case has had eight enlargements of time, with a ninth requested earlier today. The electronic record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of six Prosecution Exhibits, one Defense Exhibit, and seven Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Brown*, No. ACM 25055 – This case has had eight enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 773 pages, consisting of five Prosecution Exhibits, forty-two Defense Exhibits, and three Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 195 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

6. *United States vs. Quijano*, No. ACM 25072 – This case has had six enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 1,769 pages, consisting of six Prosecution Exhibits, twenty-two Defense Exhibits, and twenty-five Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 876 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Since the last EOT in this case, undersigned counsel has completed the following work in higher priority cases: (1) in *United States v. Carlisle*, finishing substantive review of the record of trial, conducting legal research, advising that appellant, and filing the AOE brief, and (2) in *United States v. Binkley*, discussing the case with that appellant and civilian counsel, starting review of the record of trial, and conducting legal research.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors. Appellant provided limited consent for undersigned counsel to disclose the following confidential communications. Appellant was (1) advised of his right to a timely appeal, (2) updated on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case, and (3) advised of undersigned counsel's request for an enlargement of time. He asserts his right to a timely appeal but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that were docketed with this Honorable Court before his was, and one case requiring earlier review due to unique circumstances with that appellant's civilian counsel, he (4) agrees with the request for an enlargement of time.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 24 June 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES, *Appellee,*	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,** United States Air Force. *Appellant*	)	No. ACM 40903
	)	25 June 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 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.

[redacted]

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

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 25 June 2026.

[redacted]
HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)))))))))	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SEVENTH)** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 22 July 2026

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

MOTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m), 24.3(a)(1), and 24.3(b) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **31 August 2026**.

There is good cause to give Appellant an additional thirty days to file his AOE brief because his military appellate defense counsel under Article 70, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 870, the undersigned counsel, has been unable to begin substantively reviewing his record of trial because she currently has many other cases that were docketed with this Honorable Court before his was, one oral argument, and one pleading due to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces that she must work on first.

STATEMENT OF CASE

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. at 1, 13–14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90,

Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890, and one charge and one specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. at 6–7, 68; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. XIV.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Trial Tr. at 126; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

DATA REQUIRED BY A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 24.3(b)(2)

This Court received Appellant's notice of direct appeal pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 288 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 328 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 260 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed.

Appellant was found guilty of two specifications. Entry of J. One specification was withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice. *Id.*

The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains 847 pages, eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits.

Appellant is not confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently detailed to forty-eight pending cases. Forty-one of them, including this one, are pending before this Court (thirty-two are pending initial AOE

briefs), four are pending before the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and three are pending before the United States Supreme Court. Undersigned counsel currently has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

1. The undersigned counsel is assigned to *United States v. Turner*, No. ACM 24067, as Maj Trevor Ward's co-counsel and must necessarily prioritize preparation for oral argument on 29 July 2026.

2. *United States v. Binkley*, No. ACM 40924, is prioritized over Appellant's case because this appellant retained civilian counsel who is prepared to file the AOE brief by the current deadline of 29 July 2026, and this appellant is not waiving his Article 70, UCMJ, military defense counsel. Undersigned counsel must therefore prioritize this appellant's case to ensure this appellant gets the advice of military appellate defense counsel he is entitled to. This electronic record of trial contains 2,722 pages, thirteen Prosecution Exhibits, four Defense Exhibits, one Court Exhibit, and fifty Appellate Exhibits. The written trial transcript is 757 pages long. This appellant is not confined. His case was litigated. Undersigned counsel has finished substantively reviewing the record of trial and has identified AOEs. An initial AOE brief has been drafted by civilian counsel. The undersigned counsel has begun reviewing the draft but has not yet finished.

3. The undersigned military counsel has a petition to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791, due on 10 August 2026.

4. *United States v. Northrup*, No. ACM 40854 – This case has had ten enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains 715 pages, five prosecution exhibits, seven Defense Exhibits, and nine Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 191 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Champaco*, No. ACM S32828 – This case has had nine enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of five prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twelve appellate exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial.

6. *United States v. Davis*, No. ACM S32829 – This case has had nine enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of six Prosecution Exhibits, one Defense Exhibit, and seven Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial.

7. *United States v. Brown*, No. ACM 25055 – This case has had nine enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial is 773 pages, consisting of five Prosecution Exhibits, forty-two Defense Exhibits, and three Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 195 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial.

8. *United States v. Quijano*, No. ACM 25072 – This case has had seven enlargements of time. The electronic record of trial contains 1,769 pages, six Prosecution Exhibits, twenty-two Defense Exhibits, and twenty-five Appellate Exhibits. The written trial transcript is 876 pages long. This appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun substantively reviewing the record of trial.

Because the undersigned counsel's workload is the reason for this request, the undersigned counsel also shares the following information about other duties. Besides reading records of trial, identifying assignments of error, and drafting and filing pleadings before this Honorable Court, the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and the Supreme Court of the United States, the undersigned counsel has the following other duties (this list is non-exhaustive): timely communication with all clients at all phases of appeal via email, phone, and physical mail,

coordinating with counselors from multiple confinement facilities to plan communication with confined clients, conferring with civilian counsel on other cases that are not currently prioritized before Appellant's case, contributing to the planning of the upcoming Joint Appellate Advocacy Training, providing training and support to the Air Force Trial Defense Division (particularly in light of the Chief, Defense Counsel Assistance Program (DCAP), position remaining unfilled), and completing mandatory Air Force trainings and administrative measures.

Regarding undersigned counsel's progress with the subject case, undersigned counsel has not begun reviewing the record of trial; undersigned counsel has only reviewed the portions of the record necessary to make this motion, including the Entry of Judgment, Convening Authority Decision on Action, exhibit index, plea agreement, Appellant's pleas, the findings announced at trial, the sentence announced at trial, and Appellant's forum selection. No AOEs have been identified yet (nor has undersigned counsel determined if there are any AOEs to identify). Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the initial AOE brief. Due to the number of cases that have priority over the present case, undersigned counsel is unable to provide a realistic estimate of when an initial AOE brief will be filed.

Appellant provided limited consent for undersigned counsel to disclose the following confidential communication. Appellant was informed of his right to speedy appellate review and of this request for an enlargement of time. He asserts his right to speedy appellate review but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that were docketed with this Honorable Court before his was, he agrees with this request for an enlargement of time.

CONCLUSION

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to start working on Appellant's case due to having other cases that were docketed with this Honorable Court prior to

Appellant's case, one upcoming oral argument, and one pleading due to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces soon. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case, advise him regarding potential errors, and draft and file any identified AOEs.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 22 July 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES, *Appellee,*	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,** United States Air Force. *Appellant*	)	No. ACM 40903
	)	24 July 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 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.

[redacted]

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[redacted]

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 24 July 2026.

[redacted]
HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (EIGHTH)**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	18 August 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m), 24.3(a)(1), and 24.3(b) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file his initial Assignments of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **30 September 2026**. This Court received Appellant's notice of direct appeal pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 315 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 358 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 287 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 330 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. 1, 13–14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890, and one charge and one

specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. 6–7, 68; Entry of J.; App. Ex. XIV.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two-months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Trial Tr. 126; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains 847 pages, eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 24.3(b)(2), undersigned counsel provides the following information.

Undersigned counsel is currently assigned ten pending cases, all of which are pending before this Court (all cases are pending initial AOE briefs). The present case is currently prioritized over all of undersigned counsel's other cases pending before this Court. Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete working on Appellant's case due to undersigned counsel's recent arrival to the Appellate Defense Division as of 23 July 2026, and his remaining commitments related to ongoing Trial Defense Division cases. An EOT is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case, advise him regarding potential errors, and draft and file any identified AOEs. The undersigned counsel has started substantively reviewing the record of trial but has not yet finished. No AOEs have been identified yet (nor has undersigned counsel determined if there are any AOEs to identify). Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the initial brief. Undersigned counsel estimates the initial AOE brief will be filed no later than 30 October 2026.

To best allocate resources within the Air Force Appellate Defense Division and support speedy appellate review for Appellant, undersigned counsel was recently detailed to this case to replace Capt Paige Markley Denton, who is expected to file her motion for withdrawal imminently.

Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose the following information required by this Court: Appellant was informed of his right to speedy appellate review, Appellant was advised of counsel's progress on his case, and Appellant was advised of this request for an EOT. Appellant agrees to this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]
ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 18 August 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]
ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES, *Appellee,*	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITON TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,** United States Air Force.	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	20 August 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 330 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 7 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.

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel,
[redacted]

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 20 August 2026.

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	**No. ACM 40903**
Appellee	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	**ORDER**
Christopher B. MEEKER	)	
Colonel (O-6)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
Appellant	)	**Panel 1**

On 7 October 2025, Appellant's case was docketed with this court. The current deadline for Appellant to file his assignments of error brief is 30 September 2026.

On 18 September 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (EOT) (Ninth), requesting an additional 30 days until 30 October 2026 to submit Appellant's assignments of error.

The Government opposed the motion, asserting that Appellant's requested enlargement of time will result in 388 days of defense delay and contending that such delay should be reserved for "extraordinary circumstances."

In the motion, Appellant's counsel averred that one case is prioritized higher than Appellant's case and that Appellant's assignments of error brief is expected to be filed with this court no later than 30 October 2026.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 23d day of September, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Ninth) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **30 October 2026**.

It is further ordered:

Given the number of enlargements of time granted thus far, Appellant's counsel is advised that additional enlargements of time beyond 30 October 2026 will not be granted absent exceptional circumstances demonstrating good cause.

FOR THE COURT

[redacted]

AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (NINTH)**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	18 September 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m), 24.3(a)(1), and 24.3(b) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file his initial Assignments of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of thirty days, which will end on **30 October 2026**. This Court received Appellant's notice of direct appeal pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A) on 6 October 2025 and docketed Appellant's case on 7 October 2025. This Court received the record of trial on 4 November 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 346 days have elapsed. From the date of docketing to the date requested, 388 days will have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the present date, 318 days have elapsed. From the date this Court received the record of trial to the date requested, 360 days will have elapsed.

On 15 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. Trial Tr. 1, 13–14. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and one specification of willfully disobeying a superior commissioned officer in violation of Article 90, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 890, and one charge and one

specification of fraternization in violation of Article 134, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 934. Trial Tr. 6–7, 68; Entry of J.; App. Ex. XIV.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, to forfeit $7,000 pay per month for two months, and confinement for twenty-one days. Trial Tr. 126; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 129 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains 847 pages, eleven Prosecution Exhibits, eight Defense Exhibits, and eighteen Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 24.3(b)(2), undersigned counsel provides the following information.

Undersigned counsel is currently assigned twelve pending cases, all of which are pending before this Court (all cases are pending initial AOE briefs). To date, undersigned counsel has the following case prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Stoiber*, No. ACM 40842 – This case has had thirteen EOTs. The e-ROT is 1,737 pages and contains a 253-page transcript, five prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and four appellate exhibits. This appellant is confined. The undersigned counsel has completed his review of the record of trial as of 17 September 2026, and, barring any unforeseen developments, anticipates submitting this appellant's case to this Court on its merits with no specific assignments of error soonest, but no later than 11 October 2026.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete working on Appellant's case due to the aforementioned prioritized case, undersigned counsel's recent arrival to the Appellate Defense Division as of 23 July 2026, and his remaining commitments related to ongoing Trial Defense Division cases. An EOT is necessary to allow

counsel to fully review Appellant's case, advise him regarding potential errors, and draft and file any identified AOEs.

The undersigned counsel has completed his review of the record of trial and is carefully investigating multiple identified potential AOEs. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the initial brief. Undersigned counsel estimates the initial AOE brief will be filed no later than 30 October 2026.

Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose the following information required by this Court: Appellant was informed of his right to speedy appellate review, Appellant was advised of counsel's progress on his case, and Appellant was advised of this request for an EOT. Appellant agrees to this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]
ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 18 September 2026.

[redacted]
ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES, *Appellee,*	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITON TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER,** United States Air Force.	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	22 September 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 over 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 388 days in length. Appellant's over a 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 nearly two-thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 6 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities.

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

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel,
[redacted]

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 22 September 2026.

[redacted]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, [redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee*	)	**MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL OF APPELLATE DEFENSE COUNSEL**
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Colonel (O-6) **Christopher B. MEEKER** United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40903
Appellant	)	8 September 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 12(b), 12.2, and 23.3(h) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel respectfully requests to withdraw as counsel in the above-captioned case. Undersigned counsel is withdrawing to allow a more available appellate defense counsel to take over Appellant's case. Capt Rolf Tilley has been detailed substitute appellate military counsel in undersigned counsel's stead and made his notice of appearance on 18 August 2026. Counsel have completed a thorough turnover of the case. Appellant has been advised of this motion to withdraw as counsel and consents to undersigned counsel's withdrawal. A copy of this motion will be delivered to Appellant following its filing.

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court grant this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 8 September 2026.

[redacted]

PAIGE F. MARKLEY DENTON, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES *Appellee* v. Colonel (O-6) **CHRISTOPHER B. MEEKER** United States Air Force *Appellant*	)	**APPELLANT'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW FROM APPELLATE REVIEW AND ATTACH** Before Panel No. 1 No. ACM 40903 13 October 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 16 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure and Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1115, Appellant moves to withdraw his case from appellate review. Appellant has fully consulted with Capt Rolf Tilley, his appellate defense counsel, regarding this motion to withdraw. No person has compelled, coerced, or induced Appellant by force, promises of clemency, or otherwise, to withdraw their case from appellate review.

Further, pursuant to Rules 23(b) and 23.3(b) of this 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 Court grant this motion to withdraw from appellate review and attach matters to the record.

Respectfully submitted,



ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 13 October 2026.

[redacted]
ROLF W. TILLEY, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
[redacted]