

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(FIRST)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	23 January 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1) and (2) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 60 days, which will end on **4 April 2026**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 5 December 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 49 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,

[REDACTED]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 23 January 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




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
	)	
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	Before Panel No. 2
BRYCEN E. JONES,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	No. ACM 40909
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	27 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 27 January 2026.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40909
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Brycen E. JONES	)	
Airman Basic (E -1)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 23 January 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a motion for an Enlargement of Time (First) requesting an additional 60 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. The Government opposed the motion.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 29th day of January, 2026,

ORDERED:

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

It is further ordered:

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



FOR THE COURT

[Redacted signature]

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
	)	(SECOND)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	25 March 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1), (3)-(4) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **4 May 2026**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 5 December 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 110 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed.

On 10 March 2025 and 27 June 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Trial Tr. 1, 15, 25. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and three specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 920; and one charge and four specifications of domestic violence in violation

of Article 128b, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 928b.¹ Trial Tr. 42-43, 131; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. V.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, confinement for eight months (served concurrently), and a dishonorable discharge. Trial Tr. 226; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 228 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains three Prosecution Exhibits, one Defense Exhibit, and eight Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not currently confined.

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

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

¹ Pursuant to a plea agreement, seven specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 920, were withdrawn and dismissed without prejudice, with prejudice to ripen upon the trial court's findings being approved in appellate review. Appellate Ex. V.

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

Respectfully submitted,




JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 25 March 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




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
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES,	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	27 March 2026

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

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

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



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 27 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
	)	(THIRD)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	24 April 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1), (3)-(4) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **3 June 2026**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 5 December 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 140 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 10 March 2025 and 27 June 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Trial Tr. 1, 15, 25. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and three specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ),

10 U.S.C. § 920; and one charge and four specifications of domestic violence in violation of Article 128b, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 928b.¹ Trial Tr. 42-43, 131; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. V.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, confinement for eight months (served concurrently), and a dishonorable discharge. Trial Tr. 226; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 228 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains three Prosecution Exhibits, one Defense Exhibit, and eight Appellate Exhibits. Appellant is not currently confined.

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

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

¹ Pursuant to a plea agreement, seven specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 920, were withdrawn and dismissed without prejudice, with prejudice to ripen upon the trial court's findings being approved in appellate review. Appellate Ex. V.

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

Respectfully submitted,




JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 24 April 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




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
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES,	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	27 April 2026

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

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

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


REGINA HENENLOTTER, 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 27 April 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(FOURTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	26 May 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **3 July 2026**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 5 December 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 172 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 10 March 2025 and 27 June 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Trial Tr. 1, 15, 25. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and three specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 920; and one charge and four specifications of domestic violence in

violation of Article 128b, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 928b.¹ Trial Tr. 42-43, 131; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. V.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, confinement for eight months (served concurrently), and a dishonorable discharge. Trial Tr. 226; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 228 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains three prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and eight appellate exhibits. Appellant is not currently confined.

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

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned thirty-eight cases; thirty-four cases are pending before this Court (thirty cases are pending assignments of error) and four cases are pending before the Court of Appeals for the

¹ Pursuant to a plea agreement, seven specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 920, were withdrawn and dismissed without prejudice, with prejudice to ripen upon the trial court's findings being approved in appellate review. Appellate Ex. V.

Armed Forces. To date, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Stewart*, ACM 40898 – The record of trial is nineteen volumes consisting of twenty-one prosecution exhibits, three defense exhibits, 150 appellate exhibits, and one court exhibit; the transcript is 1,644 pages. Undersigned counsel has completed review of the record of trial and is actively working on a brief of assignments of error.

2. *United States v. Montgomery*, ACM 40824 – The record of trial is four volumes consisting of six prosecution exhibits, three defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits; the transcript is 246 pages. A motion for withdrawal of appellate defense counsel is currently pending before the Court.

3. *United States v. Ledford*, ACM 40832 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twenty-four appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 582 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Stoiber*, ACM 40841 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of five prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and four appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 253 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Barwick*, ACM 40866 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, thirteen defense exhibits,

and ten appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 381 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

6. *United States v. Castle*, ACM S32830 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of twenty-nine prosecution exhibits, two defense exhibits, thirty-nine appellate exhibits, and six court exhibits; the trial transcript is 922 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

7. *United States v. Lopez*, ACM 40874 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eight prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and thirty-six appellate exhibits; the trial transcripts are 360 pages total. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

8. *United States v. Devine*, ACM 40871 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of four prosecution exhibits, nineteen defense exhibits, and seventy-nine appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 592 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

9. *United States v. Rayburn*, ACM 25083 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of six prosecution exhibits, ten defense exhibits, and three appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 258 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

10. *United States v. Holmes*, ACM S32835 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of twenty-six prosecution exhibits, eighteen defense exhibits, and five appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 223 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

11. *United States v. Fox*, ACM 40890 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eight prosecution exhibits, thirteen defense exhibits, and seventy-two appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 426 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

12. *United States v. Pray*, ACM 40895 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of six prosecution exhibits, four defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 110 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

13. *United States v. Lindsey*, ACM 40900 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of three prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, nineteen appellate exhibits, and three court exhibits; the trial transcript is 260 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

14. *United States v. Guillergan*, ACM 40897 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, zero defense exhibits, seventeen appellate exhibits, and four court exhibits; the trial transcript is 613 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,




JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 26 May 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




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
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES,	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	28 May 2026

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

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

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


REGINA HENENLOTTER, 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 May 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, 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 No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	23 June 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **2 August 2026**. The record of trial was docketed with this Court on 5 December 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 200 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 10 March 2025 and 27 June 2025, Appellant was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Trial Tr. 1, 15, 25. Appellant was found guilty, in accordance with his pleas and pursuant to a plea agreement, of one charge and three specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 920; and one charge and four specifications of domestic violence in

violation of Article 128b, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 928b.¹ Trial Tr. 42-43, 131; Entry of J.; Appellate. Ex. V.

The military judge sentenced Appellant to a reprimand, confinement for eight months (served concurrently), and a dishonorable discharge. Trial Tr. 226; Entry of J. The convening authority took no action on the findings or sentence. Convening Authority Decision on Action.

The trial transcript is 228 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains three prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and eight appellate exhibits. Appellant is not currently confined.

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

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned forty-seven cases; thirty-five cases are pending before this Court (thirty cases are pending assignments of error), nine cases pending before the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (three cases pending decision), and three cases pending before the United

¹ Pursuant to a plea agreement, seven specifications of abusive sexual contact in violation of Article 120, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 920, were withdrawn and dismissed without prejudice, with prejudice to ripen upon the trial court's findings being approved in appellate review. Appellate Ex. V.

States Supreme Court (for petition for writ of certiorari). To date, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Stewart*, ACM 40898 – The record of trial is nineteen volumes consisting of twenty-one prosecution exhibits, three defense exhibits, 150 appellate exhibits, and one court exhibit; the transcript is 1,644 pages. Undersigned counsel has completed review of the record of trial and is actively working on a brief of assignments of error.

2. *United States v. Braddy*, ACM 40810 – The appellant’s petition to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, if any, is due on 4 August 2026.

3. *United States v. Fundis*, ACM 40689 – The appellant’s petition to the Supreme Court of the United States, if any, is due on 10 August 2026.

4. *United States v. Anderson*, ACM 40752 – The appellant’s petition to the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, if any, is due on 17 August 2026.

5. *United States v. Ledford*, ACM 40832 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and twenty-four appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 582 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

6. *United States v. Stoiber*, ACM 40841 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of five prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and four appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 253 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

7. *United States v. Barwick*, ACM 40866 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, thirteen defense exhibits, and ten appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 381 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

8. *United States v. Castle*, ACM S32830 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of twenty-nine prosecution exhibits, two defense exhibits, thirty-nine appellate exhibits, and six court exhibits; the trial transcript is 922 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

9. *United States v. Lopez*, ACM 40874 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eight prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, and thirty-six appellate exhibits; the trial transcripts are 360 pages total. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

10. *United States v. Devine*, ACM 40871 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of four prosecution exhibits, nineteen defense exhibits, and seventy-nine appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 592 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

11. *United States v. Rayburn*, ACM 25083 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of six prosecution exhibits, ten defense exhibits, and three appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 258 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

12. *United States v. Holmes*, ACM S32835 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of twenty-six prosecution exhibits, eighteen defense

exhibits, and five appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 223 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

13. *United States v. Fox*, ACM 40890 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eight prosecution exhibits, thirteen defense exhibits, and seventy-two appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 426 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

14. *United States v. Pray*, ACM 40895 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of six prosecution exhibits, four defense exhibits, and nine appellate exhibits; the trial transcript is 110 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

15. *United States v. Lindsey*, ACM 40900 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of three prosecution exhibits, one defense exhibit, nineteen appellate exhibits, and three court exhibits; the trial transcript is 260 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

16. *United States v. Guillergan*, ACM 40897 – The record of trial is one electronic volume consisting of eleven prosecution exhibits, zero defense exhibits, seventeen appellate exhibits, and four court exhibits; the trial transcript is 613 pages. Undersigned counsel has not yet completed review of the record of trial.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,


[REDACTED]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel


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

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 23 June 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



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
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES,	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	24 June 2026

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

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

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

[REDACTED]

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 24 June 2026.

[REDACTED]

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[REDACTED]

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 40909
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Brycen E. JONES	)	
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 23 June 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fifth), requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. On the date requested 240 days will have passed.

On 25 June 2026, the court held a status conference on the enlargement of time. Captain John Fredericks represented Appellant and Lieutenant Colonel (Lt Col) Allen S. Abrams from the Appellate Defense Division was present. Major Heather R. Bezold represented the Government. We discussed the cases assigned to appellate counsel (47) and the resultant challenge that poses. Lt Col Abrams described manning shortages in the division and explained efforts to manage cases. Appellate counsel anticipates filing five more requests for enlargements of time. Government generally opposed the motion for an enlargement of time.

The court 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 26th day of June, 2026,

ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fifth) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **2 August 2026**.



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES <i>Appellee</i>	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION TO
	)	WITHDRAW FROM
	)	APPELLATE REVIEW AND
	)	ATTACH
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Airman Basic (E-1)	)	
BRYCEN E. JONES	)	No. ACM 40909
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	9 July 2026

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 9 July 2026.



JOHN M. FREDERICKS, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

