

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

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40662
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Adrian E. ROEDEL)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 17 October 2024, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) requesting an additional 60 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error. The Government 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 21st day of October, 2024,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **26 December 2024**.

Counsel should not rely on any subsequent requests for enlargement of time being granted. Each request will be considered on its merits.

Appellant’s counsel is advised that any subsequent motions for enlargement of time shall include, in addition to the 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. Counsel is not required to re-address item (1) in each subsequent motion for enlargement of time if counsel previously replied in the affirmative.

Counsel may request, and the court may order *sua sponte*, a status conference to facilitate timely processing of this appeal.

Appellant's counsel is further advised that any future requests for enlargements of time that, if granted, would expire more than 330 days after docketing, will not be granted absent exceptional circumstances.



FOR THE COURT



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS


UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (FIRST)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airmen (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL)	
United States Air Force)	17 October 2024
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1) and (2) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 60 days, which will end on **26 December 2024**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 50 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 120 days will have elapsed.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Appellate Government Division on 17 October 2024.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


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))	ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL, USAF,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	Panel No. 2
)	

**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.



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 18 October 2024.



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (SECOND)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	16 December 2024
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **25 January 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 110 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65.

The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 16 December 2024.

Respectfully submitted,



Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


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))	ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL, USAF,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	Panel No. 2
)	

**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.



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 December 2024.



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (THIRD)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	16 January 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **24 February 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 141 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65.

The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 16 January 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


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))	ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL, USAF,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	Panel No. 2
)	

**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.



JENNY A. LIABENOW, Lt Col, USAF
Director of Operations
Government Trial and Appellate Operations
Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 21 January 2025.



JENNY A. LIABENOW, Lt Col, USAF
Director of Operations
Government Trial and Appellate Operations
Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (FOURTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	17 February 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **26 March 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 173 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65.

The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 26 cases; 19 cases are pending before this Court (17 cases are pending AOE). To date, five cases have priority over the present case.

1. *United States v. Cabrie*, No. ACM 40615 – The ROT is 3 volumes and consists of 5 Prosecution Exhibits, 6 Defense Exhibits, and 12 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 138 pages. Appellant is not currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed her review of the record of trial.

2. *United States v. Capers*, No. ACM 40641 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 3 Prosecution Exhibits, 5 Defense Exhibits, 14 Appellate Exhibits, and 4 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 405 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Griffin*, No. ACM 40642 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Anderson*, No. ACM 40654 – The ROT is 12 volumes and consists of 15 Prosecution Exhibits, 14 Defense Exhibits, and 96 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 1229 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

5. *United States v. Hooker*, No. ACM 40646 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 4 Prosecution Exhibits, 16 Defense Exhibits, and 32 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 683 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

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

Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 17 February 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


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))	ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL, USAF,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	Panel No. 2
)	

**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 Assignments of Error in this case.


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



THOMAS J. ALFORD, Lt Col, USAFR
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 18 February 2025.



THOMAS J. ALFORD, Lt Col, USAFR
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and
Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (FIFTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	14 March 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **25 April 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 198 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65.

The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 24 cases; 20 cases are pending before this Court (17 cases are pending AOE). To date, five cases have priority over the present case.

1. *United States v. Cabrie*, No ACM 40615 – The ROT is 3 volumes and consists of 5 Prosecution Exhibits, 6 Defense Exhibits, and 12 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 138 pages. Appellant is not currently confined. Counsel has begun drafting the AOE.

2. *United States v. Capers*, No ACM 40641 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 3 Prosecution Exhibits, 5 Defense Exhibits, 14 Appellate Exhibits, and 4 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 405 pages. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Griffin*, No ACM 40641 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Anderson*, No. ACM 40654 – The ROT is 12 volumes and consists of 15 Prosecution Exhibits, 14 Defense Exhibits, and 96 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 1229 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Although this case was docketed on 13 August 2024, undersigned counsel has prioritized this case to keep pace with the Appellant’s civilian counsel.

5. *United States v. Hooker*, No. ACM 40646 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 4 Prosecution Exhibits, 16 Defense Exhibits, and 32 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 683 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant’s case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant’s case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors.

Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 14 March 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


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))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force.)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	18 March 2025

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

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

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



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 18 March 2025.



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (SIXTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	15 April 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **25 May 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 230 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65.

The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 24 cases; 21 cases are pending before this Court (20 cases are pending AOE). To date, five cases have priority over the present case.

1. *United States v. Cabrie*, No ACM 40615 – The ROT is 3 volumes and consists of 5 Prosecution Exhibits, 6 Defense Exhibits, and 12 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 138 pages. Appellant is not currently confined. Counsel is finalizing the AOE.

2. *United States v. Capers*, No ACM 40641 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 3 Prosecution Exhibits, 5 Defense Exhibits, 14 Appellate Exhibits, and 4 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 405 pages. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Griffin*, No ACM 40641 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Anderson*, No. ACM 40654 – The ROT is 12 volumes and consists of 15 Prosecution Exhibits, 14 Defense Exhibits, and 96 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 1229 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Although this case was docketed on 13 August 2024, undersigned counsel has prioritized this case to keep pace with the Appellant's civilian counsel.

5. *United States v. Hooker*, No. ACM 40646 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 4 Prosecution Exhibits, 16 Defense Exhibits, and 32 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 683 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

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

Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 15 April 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO
)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force.)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	17 April 2025

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

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

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



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 April 2025.



JOCELYN Q. WRIGHT, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (SEVENTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	15 May 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **24 June 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 260 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 25 cases; 21 cases are pending before this Court (20 cases are pending AOE). To date, three cases have priority over the present case.

1. *United States v. Capers*, No ACM 40641 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 3 Prosecution Exhibits, 5 Defense Exhibits, 14 Appellate Exhibits, and 4 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 405 pages. Counsel has completed her review of the ROT and is finalizing the AOE.


2. *United States v. Griffin*, No ACM 40641 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Hooker*, No. ACM 40646 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 4 Prosecution Exhibits, 16 Defense Exhibits, and 32 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 683 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 15 May 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES'
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO
)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force.)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	19 May 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 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 is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 300 days in length. Appellant's nearly year-long delay practically ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court's appellate processing standards. Appellant has already consumed almost two thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 8 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not completed review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


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



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 19 May 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40662
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Adrian E. ROEDEL)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 15 May 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh), requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error. The Government opposes the motion.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 20th day of May, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Seventh) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **24 June 2025**.

Further requests by Appellant for enlargements of time may necessitate a status conference.



FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (EIGHTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	13 June 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **24 July 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 289 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 330 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 27 cases; 18 cases are pending before this Court (18 cases are pending AOE's). To date, two cases have priority over the present case.


11. *United States v. Griffin*, No ACM 40641 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has begun, but not completed, her review of the record of trial.

2. *United States v. Hooker*, No. ACM 40646 – The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 4 Prosecution Exhibits, 16 Defense Exhibits, and 32 Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 683 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of the undersigned counsel.

JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 June 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force,)	17 June 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>)	

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

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

The United States respectfully maintains that short of a death penalty case or other extraordinary circumstances, it should not take any appellant nearly a year to submit an assignment of error to this Court. If Appellant's new delay request is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 330 days in length. Appellant's nearly year-long delay practically ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court's appellate processing standards. Appellant has already consumed almost two-thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 7 months for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not completed review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


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



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial & Appellate Operations
1500 W. Perimeter Road, Suite 1190
Joint Base Andrews, MD
DSN: 612-4809

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 June 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial & Appellate Operations
1500 W. Perimeter Road, Suite 1190
Joint Base Andrews, MD
DSN: 612-4809

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (NINTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	14 July 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **23 August 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 320 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 360 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.


The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 27 cases; 18 cases are pending before this Court (18 cases are pending AOE). To date, one case before the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces take priority over this case: *United States v. Menard*. The Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces has ordered a brief be filed no later than 29 July 25. To date, one case at this Court has priority over the present case: *United States v. Griffin*, No ACM 40641 – The ROT is 6 volumes and consists of 24 Prosecution Exhibits, 29 Defense Exhibits, 30 Appellate Exhibits, and 1 Court Exhibits; the transcript is 605 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel is finalizing the AOE.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant’s case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant’s case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel’s progress on Appellant’s case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 14 July 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES’
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT’S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
)	OF TIME
v.)	
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	Before Panel No. 2
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	
)	15 July 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 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 more 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 for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant’s counsel has not completed review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


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



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	APPELLANT’S CONSENT MOTION
<i>Appellee</i>)	TO EXAMINE SEALED
)	MATERIAL
v.)	
)	Before Panel 1
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	1 August 2025

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

Pursuant to Rules 3.1(c) 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 examine the following sealed material:

- 1) Prosecution Exhibit 1, Attachment 1.
- 2) PHO Exhibits 3 and 4.

All parties at trial reviewed the exhibit. R. at 24. Prosecution Exhibit 1, Attachment 1 was subsequently sealed after trial by the military judge. Appellate Ex. VIII. All parties at the preliminary hearing reviewed the PHO exhibits. DD Form 457, *Preliminary Hearing Officer’s Report*. PHO Exhibit 3 was subsequently sealed at the Government’s Request. Appellate Ex. X. 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 counsels’ 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 these exhibits is reasonably necessary since undersigned counsel cannot fulfill their duties of representation under Article 70, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 870, without first reviewing the complete record of trial.

Appellate defense counsel's review of the sealed materials is necessary to conduct a complete review of the record of trial and to be able to advocate competently on Appellant's behalf.

Appellate Government Counsel have been consulted about this motion and consents to the relief sought by Appellant.

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

Respectfully submitted,




JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

Counsel for Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Appellate Government Division on 1 August 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40662
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Adrian E. ROEDEL)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 1 August 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Consent Motion to Examine Sealed Materials, requesting appellate counsel for both parties be allowed to examine Attachment 1 of Prosecution Exhibit 1 and Preliminary Hearing Officer (PHO) report Exhibits 3 and 4, which were reviewed by trial counsel and trial defense counsel and sealed by the military judge and PHO. The Government consents to the motion.

Upon examining the requested sealed material, the court found the data on the disc comprising Exhibit 4 of the PHO report is in an inaccessible format.

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

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 5th day of August 2025,
ORDERED:

Appellant's Consent Motion to Examine Sealed Materials dated 1 August 2025 is **GRANTED**.

Appellate defense counsel and appellate government counsel may examine **Attachment 1 of Prosecution Exhibit 1** and **PHO report Exhibits 3 and 4**, subject to the following conditions:

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


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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:

Not later than **18 August 2025**, counsel for the Government shall **SHOW GOOD CAUSE** as to why this court should not return the record for correction.



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner


record of trial must have all the exhibits. R.C.M. 1112(b)(5)). Since PHO Exhibit 4 does not exist in an accessible format and involves sealed materials, the government acknowledges that this case should be remanded for correction under R.C.M. 1112(d).

WHEREFORE, the United States respectfully requests this Court remand the record for correction.

Respectfully submitted,




TYLER L. WASHBURN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
1500 W. Perimeter Rd., Ste. 1190
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762
(240) 612-4800



MARY ELLEN PAYNE
Associate Chief, Government Trial and Appellate
Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
1500 W. Perimeter Rd., Ste. 1190
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762
(240) 612-4800

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Appellate Defense Division on 7 August 2025.



TYLER L. WASHBURN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
1500 W. Perimeter Rd., Ste. 1190
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762
(240) 612-4800

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

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40662
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Adrian E. ROEDEL)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	
U.S. Air Force)	
<i>Appellant</i>)	Panel 2

On 15 August 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Tenth), 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, prior filings in this case, case law, and this court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 22d day of August, 2025,

ORDERED:

Appellant’s Motion for Enlargement of Time (Tenth) is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **8 September 2025**.

It is further ordered:

Counsel for the parties will coordinate with the court a time to hold a status conference at the earliest opportunity.



FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF
<i>Appellee</i>)	TIME (TENTH)
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	15 August 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file an Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **22 September 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 352 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 390 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a Dishonorable Discharge. R. at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Counsel has


reviewed the transcript in this case. The Government has responded to this Court's 1 August 25 show cause order acknowledging the need for this case to be remanded for correction.

The undersigned counsel is currently assigned 29 cases; 21 cases are pending before this Court (16 cases are pending AOE's). To date, one case before the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces takes priority over this case: *United States v. Menard*. Counsel is finalizing the brief and will file with the court on 18 August 25. Counsel's upcoming reply brief in *United States v. Pettigrew*, is the only matter before this court with priority over the present case.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief for Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors. Appellant was advised on his right to a timely appeal, was provided an update of the status of counsel's progress on Appellant's case, was consulted with regard to enlargements of time, and agrees with necessary requests for enlargements of time, including this request.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the undersigned counsel.

JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 15 August 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES’
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT’S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
)	OF TIME
v.)	
)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	19 August 2025
)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its 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 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 more than 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 completed review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.


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



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 19 August 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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

UNITED STATES)	No. ACM 40662
Appellee)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Adrian E. ROEDEL)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	Panel 2
U.S. Air Force)	
Appellant)	3 September 2025

The purpose of this order is to create a record of the status conference regarding this case held on 2 September 2025.

On 5 August 2025, this court issued an order that, *inter alia*, directed the Government to show good cause as to why this court should not return the record for correction in light of the court’s discovery that the disc comprising Exhibit 4 of the Preliminary Hearing Officer (PHO) report is in an inaccessible format.

On 7 August 2025, the Government responded to the court’s order, “acknowledg[ing] that this case should be remanded for correction under R.C.M. 1112(d).”

On 15 August 2025, Appellant moved for a tenth enlargement of time of 30 days in which to file his assignments of error, requesting a new due date of 22 September 2025. The Government opposed the motion.

On 22 August 2025, this court granted in part and denied in part Appellant’s tenth motion for an enlargement of time; the court set a new due date of 8 September 2025. In addition, this court ordered counsel for the parties to coordinate a status conference at the earliest opportunity.

On 2 September 2025, the court held a status conference to discuss the progress of this case. Appellant was represented by Captain Joyclin N. Webster; Lieutenant Colonel Allen S. Abrams and Mr. Dwight Sullivan from the Appellate Defense Division were also present. Major Vanessa Bairos represented the Government. In response to questions from the court in light of the Government’s position that the case should be remanded for correction, Major Bairos agreed that not all omissions from a record of trial are prejudicial. Captain Webster stated Appellant’s position that remand to correct the record was appropriate, that Appellant had incorporated the issue regarding PHO report Exhibit 4 into the assignments of error, and that she intended to file the

assignments of error no later than the current due date of 8 September 2025.
Major Bairos did not contest any of the representations by the Defense.



FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (ELEVENTH) OOT¹
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	3 September 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to submit a DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial* to this Honorable Court. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **8 October 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 371 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 406 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a dishonorable discharge. R.

¹ Counsel acknowledges that this motion is out of time. The Assignment of Errors was initially intended to be filed on 8 September 2025. However, due to the case now proceeding as a withdrawal from appellate review, additional time is needed to coordinate with the Appellant. This change in procedural posture necessitates the out of time enlargement of time.

at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Counsel has had an opportunity to review the entire record of trial and no other case has priority to the current case.

The undersigned respectfully requests an enlargement of time to finalize the coordination of a withdrawal of appellate review with Appellant who is currently housed in a civilian confinement facility. The unique circumstances of the Appellant's confinement have imposed significant logistical constraints on counsel's ability to communicate and obtain the necessary documentation and constitute exceptional circumstances.


Specifically, the facility does not permit electronic communication or FedEx delivery, and the only available method for delivering legal documents is through the United States Postal Service. As a result, counsel must mail a DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial* to Appellant and await a physical response. This process is inherently time-consuming, subject to postal delays, and further complicated by the facility's internal mail handling procedures.

Appellant has been informed of the need for this motion and has expressly consented to both the request for an enlargement and a limited release of confidentiality for the purpose of facilitating communication regarding the withdrawal from appellate review.

Given these circumstances, the requested enlargement is necessary to allow for the transmission of documents and to ensure compliance R.C.M. 1115 and Rule 16 and 16.1 of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 September 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' NON-
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
)	OF TIME
v.)	
)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	4 September 2025
)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby does not oppose 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
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 4 September 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (TWELFTH)
<i>Appellee</i>)	
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force)	1 October 2025
<i>Appellant</i>)	

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m)(1) and 23.3(m)(3) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to submit a DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial* to this Honorable Court. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **7 November 2025**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 28 August 2024. From the date of docketing to the present date, 399 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 436 days will have elapsed.

On 30 May 2024, consistent with his pleas, Appellant was convicted at a general court-martial at Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, of one charge with one specification of possession of child pornography in violation of Article 134, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Record (R.) at 53. The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for one year, and to be discharged from the service with a dishonorable discharge. R. at 65. The Convening Authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action – *United States v. SrA Adrian E. Roedel*, undated.

The electronic ROT is 1 volume and consists of 1 Prosecution Exhibit, 11 Appellate Exhibits, and 1242 pages; the transcript is 65 pages. Counsel has had an opportunity to review the entire record of trial and no other case has priority to the current case.

The undersigned respectfully requests an enlargement of time to finalize the coordination of a withdraw of appellate review with Appellant who is currently housed in a civilian confinement facility. The unique circumstances of the Appellant's confinement have imposed significant logistical constraints on counsel's ability to communicate and obtain the necessary documentation and constitute exceptional circumstances.

Specifically, the facility does not permit electronic communication or FedEx delivery, and the only available method for delivering legal documents is through the United States Postal Service. As a result, counsel mailed a DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial* to Appellant and is still awaiting a delivery of the signed form. This process is inherently time-consuming, subject to postal delays, and is further complicated by the facility's internal mail handling procedures.

Appellant has been informed of the need for this motion and has expressly consented to both the request for an enlargement and a limited release of confidentiality for the purpose of facilitating communication regarding the withdrawal from appellate review.

Given these circumstances, the requested enlargement is necessary to allow for the transmission of documents and to ensure compliance R.C.M. 1115 and Rule 16 and 16.1 of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

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

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 October 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	UNITED STATES' NON-
<i>Appellee,</i>)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
)	OF TIME
v.)	
)	
)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4))	
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	No. ACM 40662
United States Air Force,)	
<i>Appellant.</i>)	3 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 does not oppose 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
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

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 October 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel
Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division
Military Justice and Discipline Directorate
United States Air Force
(240) 612-4800

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,)	MOTION TO WITHDRAW
<i>Appellee,</i>)	FROM APPELLATE REVIEW
)	
v.)	Before Panel No. 2
)	
Senior Airman (E-4))	No. ACM 40662
ADRIAN E. ROEDEL,)	
United States Air Force,)	29 October 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>)	

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


Pursuant to Rule 16 of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure and Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1115, Appellant, Senior Airman Adrian E. Roedel moves to withdraw his case from appellate review.

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,




JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil

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 29 October 2025.

Respectfully submitted,



JOYCLIN N. WEBSTER, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews NAF, MD 20762-6604
Office: (240) 612-4770
Email: joyclin.webster.1@us.af.mil