

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	NOTICE OF PANEL CHANGE
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	

It is by the court on this 4th day of August, 2025,


ORDERED:

That the Record of Trial in the above-styled matter is withdrawn from Panel 2 and referred to Panel 3 for appellate review.

This panel letter supersedes all previous panel assignments.



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 3

On 2 September 2025, counsel for Appellant moved this court to suspend the portion of Rule 23.3(m)(2) which provides for “up to 60 days” for Appellant’s first enlargement of time, and “to grant a 120-day enlargement of time.” *See* JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 32, A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 23.3(m)(2). Appellate government counsel consents to this suspension of Rule 23.3(m)(2).

In the event this court denies Appellant’s request for a 120-day enlargement of time, counsel for Appellant requests a 60-day enlargement of time.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 3d day of September, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion to Suspend Rule 23.3(m)(2) is **DENIED**.

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **13 November 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



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 (SECOND)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 3
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM 40851
JACOB R. RICE	)	
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 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 **13 December**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July. From the date of docketing to the present date, 101 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three on exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages.



GRANTED

3 Nov 2025



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,


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 26 October 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


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
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	Before Panel No. 3
JACOB R. RICE,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	No. ACM 40851
<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



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	NOTICE OF PANEL
Jacob R. RICE	)	CHANGE
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	

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 3 and referred to Panel 2 for appellate review.

This panel letter supersedes all previous panel assignments.



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 (THIRD)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 3
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM 40851
JACOB R. RICE	)	
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 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 **12 January 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 139 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action –



States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

GRANTED
18 DEC 2025


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 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,


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,

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 contact information.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 3
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<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.

[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 5 December 2025.

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[REDACTED]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	OUT OF TIME* (FOURTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
	)	9 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 fourth enlargement of time, out of time, to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **12 February 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 176 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial



of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103.

with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of

domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C.

GRANTED

14 JAN 2026

* Appellant's counsel is submitting this request for an enlargement of time out of time due to being on leave overseas from 17 December 2025 through 7 January 2026. On 18 December 2025, this Court granted Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Third). At the time of the Court's ruling, Appellant's counsel was on leave and travelling abroad. During leave, Appellant's counsel had long periods of limited internet connectivity and had difficulty accessing her OneDrive folder where her client case tracker is stored. Appellant's counsel made several submissions to the court based on the hand-written notes she took prior to leaving the country. Appellant's case was not on that list as the list predated this Court's 18 December 2025 ruling. While this request for enlargement of time is out of time, this oversight was not the result of bad faith and Appellant bears no responsibility for this delay.

§ 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

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 yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-two cases; twenty-two of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-one 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, six 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 2026.
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.

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, ⁶Capt, 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 9 January 2026.

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 the contact information of Olga Stanford.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME –
	)	OUT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	12 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 general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time, out 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 12 January 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, 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
	)	(FIFTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
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 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 **14 March 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 188 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.



GRANTED
27 JAN 2026

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 yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-five cases; twenty-five of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-two cases are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *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.
2. *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.
3. *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.
4. *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.

5. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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 21 January 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


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
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	Before Panel No. 2
JACOB R. RICE,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	23 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 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 23 January 2026.



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
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	6 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 (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 **13 April 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 232 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of 12 months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – U.S. Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.



GRANTED
12 MAR 2026

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 no longer confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned thirty cases; twenty-nine of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-seven cases are pending AOE's). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *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 completed her review of the record in this case and began drafting AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not 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. 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.

5. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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 6 March 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	10 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.


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 10 March 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, 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
	)	(SEVENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	6 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 (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 **13 May 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 263 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

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 no longer confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-four cases; twenty-three of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-three are pending AOE's). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *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 completed her review of the record in this case and began drafting AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not 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. 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.

5. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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 6 April 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	7 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.

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 started 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 April 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 6 April 2026, Appellant’s Counsel submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh) 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 7th day of April 2026,


ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **13 May 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



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(EIGHTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	6 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 (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his eighth 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 **12 June 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 293 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 330 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action –

Un. U.S. AIR FORCE Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.



GRANTED
11 MAY 2026

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 no longer confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-eight cases; twenty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-six are pending AOE's). Within the next six weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834. Within the next three weeks, the undersigned counsel expects to file a petition and supplement with the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855. Of the cases pending AOE brief, four cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *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.
3. *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.
4. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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 6 May 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	8 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.

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 even started review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


The United States further disagrees with the prioritization of United States v. Johnson, ACM No. 25090, over the above-captioned case. Johnson was docketed with this court on 19 August 2025 and the record of trial was received on 16 December 2025. The appellant in Johnson is not

confined. Starting from either the date of docketing or the date this Court received the record of trial, either 262 or 143 days have elapsed for Johnson. Johnson should not be prioritized over the above-captioned case, which was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025 and for which 295 days have elapsed as of the date of this filing.

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

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the government counsel.

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government


A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the 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 May 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(NINTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	1 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 (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for his ninth 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 **12 July 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 319 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 360 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.



Record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages.

GRANTED
4 JUN 2026

Appellant is no longer confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned thirty-one cases; thirty of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-eight are pending AOE). Within the next three weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834. Within the next week, the undersigned counsel expects to file a supplement with the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855. Of the cases pending AOE brief, four cases have priority over this case:


1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *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.
3. *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.
4. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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

A large black rectangular redaction box covering text, likely a contact address or phone number.


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 1 June 2026.

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 text, likely a date or reference number.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	3 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 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 360 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 6 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not even started review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


The United States further disagrees with the prioritization of United States v. Johnson, ACM No. 25090, over the above-captioned case. Johnson was docketed with this court on 19 August 2025 and the record of trial was received on 16 December 2025. The appellant in Johnson is not

confined. Johnson should not be prioritized over the above-captioned case, which was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025.

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

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the government counsel.

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government


A large black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information of the 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 3 June 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 2 July 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Tenth), requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error, to end on 11 August 2026. Counsel for Appellant states that “[t]hrough no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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.” The Government opposed the motion indicating if the new delay request was granted “the defense delay in this case will be 390 days in length. The Government also disagrees with Appellant counsel’s prioritization of her cases.

Requests for an enlargement of time beyond the first one “require[] a showing of good cause.” A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 24.3(b)(1). A showing of good cause shall contain the basis for the requested enlargement and include, *inter alia*, “a detailed explanation of the number and complexity of counsel’s pending cases If counsel’s workload is cited as the reason for the delay, an explanation of counsel’s other duties.” A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 24.3(b)(2). A showing of good cause shall also include a statement as to progress being made on the subject case, “to include whether counsel has begun or completed reviewing the record, whether any assignments of error have been identified, whether counsel has begun or completed drafting the assignments of error brief, and when counsel anticipates the assignments of error may be filed” *Id.* An enlargement of time “will only be granted when good cause is shown *with particularity*.” A.F. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 24.3(b)(1) (emphasis added).

Here, counsel for Appellant failed to make a showing of good cause. While counsel for Appellant listed her other cases, she does not provide the basis for the requested enlargement. Counsel for Appellant also provides conflicting information on her progress as she indicates “she has not yet completed her review of this case” and she “has been unable to begin her review” within the

same motion. This sparse and conflicting information does not provide adequate details on the progress being made on Appellant's case, her status in reviewing the record, whether she has identified any assignments of error, whether she has begun drafting the assignments or error brief, or when she anticipates the assignments of error brief may be filed.

We remind counsel to pay careful attention to this court's new Rules, specifically to the information required when requesting enlargements of time to file a brief. Should counsel for Appellant request an additional enlargement of time, particularity is required when addressing progress of the case.

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 13th day of July, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Tenth) is **DENIED**.



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
	)	(TENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	2 July 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 tenth 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 **11 August 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 350 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 390 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

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 no longer confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed her review of this case. Counsel is currently assigned thirty-six cases; thirty two of those cases are pending before this Court (thirty are pending AOE briefs). Of the cases pending AOE brief, four cases have priority over this case:



1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *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.
3. *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.
4. *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.

Through no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to begin 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 2 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, ^UUSAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	7 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 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 390 days in length. Appellant's more than 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 over two-thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 5 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not even started review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


The United States further disagrees with the prioritization of United States v. Johnson, ACM No. 25090, over the above-captioned case. Johnson was docketed with this court on 19 August 2025 and the record of trial was received on 16 December 2025. The appellant in Johnson is not

confined. Johnson should not be prioritized over the above-captioned case, which was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025.

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



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government




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 July 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	OUT OF TIME* (TENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	13 July 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 tenth 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 **11 August 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on **17 July 2025**. From the date of docketing to the present date, 361 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 390 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of do § 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, 6 months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening



GRANTED

17 JULY 2026

* Appellant's counsel is submitting this request for an enlargement of time out of time following this Court's 13 July 2026 Order denying the original Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fifth) timely filed with this Court on 2 July 2026. While this request for enlargement of time is out of time, this oversight was not the result of bad faith and Appellant bears no responsibility for this delay.

authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice*.

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 not confined.

Counsel is currently assigned thirty-nine cases; thirty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (thirty-two are pending AOE). Within the next five weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file an answer brief in *United States v. Cunningham*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-06, an Article 62, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 862, appeal.[†] Of the cases pending AOE, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Based on her review of the record thus far, the undersigned counsel has identified one possible issue but has not yet identified all potential issues due to the ongoing substantive review of the record. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the AOE brief in this case. Based on the above-listed priorities, the undersigned counsel had to shift the expected completion date for this AOE brief from the end of August 2026 to the end of September 2026.
2. *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

[†] In accordance with JT. R. APP. PROC. 20(d), undersigned counsel is required to give “priority over all other proceedings where practicable” to appeals filed pursuant to Article 62, UCMJ.

seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

3. *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 substantively reviewed the record of trial.
4. *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 not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Undersigned counsel's other duties include: timely communication with all clients via email and phone, planning and implementation of the upcoming training for onboarding Appellate Defense Division members, 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, through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has not begun her substantive review of the record of trial. In preparing this motion for EOT, the undersigned counsel reviewed the following: EoJ, Convening Authority Decision on Action, and pages from the record of trial referenced in this motion. Undersigned counsel has not yet identified any assignments of error. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the 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 the AOE brief will be filed.



Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant was informed of his right to speedy appellate review.
- (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) He asserts his right to speedy appellate review but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that hold a higher priority over Appellant's case, he agrees with this request for an enlargement of time.

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.

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 13 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	15 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.

The United States respectfully maintains that under extraordinary circumstances, it should not take appellate almost 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 390 days in length. Appellant's delay ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court's appellate processing standards. Appellant has consumed nearly 13 months of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which leaves about 5 months for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not completed their review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


The United States further disagrees with the prioritization of United States v. Johnson, ACM No. 25090, over the above-captioned case. Johnson was docketed with this court on 19 August 2025, and the record of trial was received on 16 December 2025. The appellant in Johnson is not confined. Johnson should not be prioritized over the above-captioned case, which was

docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025 and for which 365 days have elapsed as of the date of this filing.

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




REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government




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 15 July 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	OUT OF TIME (ELEVENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	31 July 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 eleventh 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 **10 September 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on **17 July 2025**. From the date of docketing to the present date, 379 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 420 days will have elapsed.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice*.

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 not confined.

Counsel is currently assigned thirty-nine cases; thirty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (thirty-two are pending AOE's). Within the next three weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file an answer brief in *United States v. Cunningham*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-06, an Article 62, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 862, appeal.* Within the next two months, undersigned counsel expects to file writs or certiorari before the Supreme Court of the United States for two cases. Of the cases pending AOE's, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Based on her review of the record thus far, the undersigned counsel has identified one possible issue but has not yet identified all potential issues due to the ongoing substantive review of the record. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the AOE brief in this case. Based on the above-listed priorities, the undersigned counsel had to shift the expected completion date for this AOE brief from the end of August 2026 to the end of September 2026.
2. *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 confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

* In accordance with JT. R. APP. PROC. 20(d), undersigned counsel is required to give “priority over all other proceedings where practicable” to appeals filed pursuant to Article 62, UCMJ.

3. *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 substantively reviewed the record of trial.
4. *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 not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Undersigned counsel's other duties include: timely communication with all clients via email and phone, planning and implementation of the upcoming training for onboarding Appellate Defense Division members, 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, through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has not begun her substantive review of the record of trial. In preparing this motion for EOT, the undersigned counsel reviewed the following: EoJ, Convening Authority Decision on Action, and pages from the record of trial referenced in this motion. Undersigned counsel has not yet identified any assignments of error. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the 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 the AOE brief will be filed.

Appellant has provided limited consent to disclose confidential communications, wherein:

- (1) Appellant was informed of his right to speedy appellate review.
- (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) He asserts his right to speedy appellate review but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that hold a higher priority over Appellant's case, he agrees with this request for an enlargement of time.


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.

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, *OL* Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


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 31 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	OUT OF TIME
	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	3 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 appellate 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 420 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 consumed nearly 14 months of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which leaves about 4 months 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.


The United States further disagrees with the prioritization of United States v. Johnson, ACM No. 25090, over the above-captioned case. Johnson was docketed with this court on 19 August 2025, and the record of trial was received on 16 December 2025. The appellant in Johnson

is not confined. Johnson should not be prioritized over the above-captioned case, which was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025 and for which 384 days have elapsed as of the date of this filing.

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




CATHERINE D. MUMFORD, 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 3 August 2026.



CATHERINE D. MUMFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 31 July 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time Out of Time (Eleventh), requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. On the date requested, 420 days will have lapsed from the date this case was docketed. The Government opposes the motion and disagrees with Appellant's counsel's prioritization of her cases.

On 6 August 2026, the court held a status conference. Major Olga Stanford represented Appellant; Major Spencer Nelson from the Appellate Defense Division was also present. Major Catherine Mumford represented the Government. Major Stanford explained she has recently been assigned to file an answer to an Article 62, UCMJ, appeal, in addition to her other caseload. Major Stanford has not begun a substantive review of the record of trial, and explained that she prioritized a case docketed more recently, because of a unique administrative issue for the appellant in that case. Major Mumford stood on the written response to 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 the 6th day of August, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time Out of Time (Eleventh) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error no later than **10 September 2026**.

It is further ordered:

At the time of filing any further motions for enlargement of time, Appellant's counsel will, in addition to matters required by the court's rules and by prior orders of the court, specifically identify the assignments of error Appellant reasonably expects to raise to the court, recognizing such identification

will not bind or constrain Appellant with respect to which assignments he ultimately raises.



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 13 August 2026, Appellant submitted a Motion to Examine Sealed Material: Appellate Exhibits VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII; transcript pages 31–61; and the audio of the closed Article 39(a) session corresponding to those transcript pages. Both parties at trial had access to those sealed materials and the Government does not oppose so long as both parties are permitted to examine the sealed materials.

Upon the court’s review of the requested sealed material, the court discovered that it cannot open the audio file that corresponds with the closed session of Appellant’s court-martial because the file type is in the .fsl format, which does not play on Windows Media Player®. The file is thus not in compliance with paragraph 2.2.4.2 of the Department of the Air Force Manual 51-203, *Records of Trial* (21 Apr. 2021, as amended by DAFGM 2026-01, 14 Jul. 2026). The court will direct appropriate action in its decretal paragraph below. However, the court is satisfied appellate counsel can review the corresponding transcript pages to the closed session.

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 (R.C.M) 1113(b)(3)(B)(i), *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.) (*MCM*).

Appellant’s counsel made a colorable showing that review of the material is necessary to fulfill counsel’s duties of representation to Appellant.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 19th day of August, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion to Examine Sealed Material is **GRANTED IN PART**. Appellate defense counsel and appellate government counsel may view

Appellate Exhibits VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, and transcript pages 31–61, subject to the following conditions:


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

It is further ordered:

Not later than **3 September 2026**, counsel for the Government shall **SHOW GOOD CAUSE** as to why this court should not return Appellant's case to the Chief Trial Judge, Air Force Trial Judiciary, for correction of the record relating to the closed session audio pursuant to R.C.M. 1112(b)(1) and 1112(d)(2)–(3) (*MCM*).



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 TO
	)	EXAMINE SEALED MATERIAL
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	13 August 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 3.1(c)(3) and 23.3(f) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and Rule for Courts-Martial 1113(b)(3)(B)(i), *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.), Appellant moves for both parties to be permitted to examine the following sealed materials:

- Appellate Exhibits VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII
- The transcript of the closed Article 39(a) session at Trial Tr. 31–61
- Audio of the closed Article 39(a) session at Trial Tr. 31–61

Both parties at trial had access to those sealed materials. *See* Trial Tr. 26–29, 109.

In accordance with R.C.M. 1113(b)(3)(B)(i), which requires a colorable showing that examination of these matters is reasonably necessary to appellate counsel’s responsibilities, undersigned counsel asserts that review of the referenced items is necessary to conduct a complete review of the record of trial and be in a position to advocate competently on behalf of Appellant. As such, examination of the sealed material is reasonably necessary since appellant’s counsel cannot fulfill their duties of representation under Article 70, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 870, without first reviewing the complete record of trial.

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

Respectfully submitted,




OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 13 August 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION TO
	)	EXAMINE SEALED MATERIAL
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
JACOB R. RICE,	)	No. ACM 40851
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	17 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 does not oppose Appellant's Motion to examine sealed material so long as both parties are permitted to examine the sealed material.

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

[REDACTED]

Associate Chief, Government Trial and

[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 17 August 2026.



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION TO
	)	WITHDRAW FROM APPELLATE
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	REVIEW AND ATTACH
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel No. 2
	)	
Airman (E-2)	)	No. ACM 40851
Jacob R. Rice,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	25 August 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 16 of the Joint Rules of Appellate Practice for Courts of Criminal Appeals (JRAP), Rule 23.3(i) of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, and Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1115, *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.), Appellant, Airman Jacob R. Rice, moves to withdraw his case from appellate review. Appellant has consulted fully with Dwight H. Sullivan, 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 his case from appellate review.


Further, pursuant to Rules 23(b) of the JRAP and Rule 23.3(b) and (i) of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel asks this Court to attach the document appended to this motion 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 23.3(i) 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,




Dwight H. Sullivan
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 25 August 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



Dwight H. Sullivan
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40851
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Jacob R. RICE	)	
Airman (E-2)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 25 August 2026, Appellant moved to withdraw his case from appellate review and attach his DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial Subject to Review by a Court of Criminal Appeals*, signed by both Appellant and Appellant's civilian defense counsel on 25 August 2026.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 31st day of August, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion to Withdraw from Appellate Review and Attach is **GRANTED**. Appellant's case is forwarded to the Appellate Records Branch (JAJM) for further processing in accordance with Rules for Courts-Martial 1115(f)(3) and 1201, *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.).

It is further ordered:

This court's 19 August 2026 show cause order is hereby rescinded.



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S CONSENT MOTION
	)	TO SUSPEND RULE 23.3(m)(2)
	)	AND APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
v.	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIRST)
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	Before Panel 3
JACOB R. RICE	)	
United States Air Force	)	No. ACM 40851
	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	2 September 2025

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

Pursuant to Rules 32 of the Joint Rules of Appellate Procedure for Courts of Criminal Appeals and 23.3(r) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, and with consent of the Government, Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice (Appellant) hereby moves this Court to suspend the portion of Rule 23.3(m)(2) which provides that “[a]n appellant’s first motion for enlargement may be granted for up to 60 calendar days” Additionally, pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1) and (2) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant moves for his first enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE); Appellant specifically moves this Court to grant a 120-day enlargement of time. The requested enlargement for a period of 120 days will end on **13 January 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 17 July 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, forty- seven days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed. Appellate government counsel have been consulted about this motion and consent to the suspension of Rule 23.3(m)(2) requested by Appellant.

On 24 October 2024 and on 1 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 103. Consistent with his pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of three specifications of

domestic violence, all in violation of Article 128b, Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. § 928b. R. at 111, 178. On 1 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, nine months of confinement, and reduction to pay grade E-1. R. at 233. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence and waived automatic forfeitures for a period of six months. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman Jacob R. Rice.

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 yet completed her review of this case.

Undersigned counsel is currently assigned thirteen cases; thirteen of those cases are pending before this Court (thirteen cases are pending AOE's). Six 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 not completed her review of the record in this case.
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.


Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to prepare a brief for Appellant's case. Furthermore, the cumulative time spent filing requests for enlargements of time takes focus away from substantive work on behalf of Appellant and the undersigned counsel's other clients, twelve of whom are pending initial AOE's before this Court. Given her caseload, the undersigned counsel spends one to two hours a week on motions for enlargements of time.

This time could otherwise be spent working on substantive matters for Appellant's case and other cases pending initial AOE's before this Court. An enlargement of 120 days would allow counsel to focus on reviewing Appellant's record of trial, identifying potential errors, advising Appellant of his options, and filing a brief, rather than on preparing and filing multiple motions for enlargements of time.


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

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests this Honorable Court, with consent of the Government, grant this consent motion and suspend the provision of Rule 23.3(m)(2) that caps an appellant's first motion for enlargement at 60 days. Appellant further requests this Honorable Court grant a 120-day enlargement of time. In the event this Court denies the Consent Motion to Suspend Rule 23.3(m)(2), Appellant respectfully requests this Honorable Court grant the Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) in accordance with the provisions of Rule 23.3(m)(2).

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 electronically delivered to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 2 September 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

OLGA STANFORD, [✓]Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information.