

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM S32831
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
India Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 8 October 2025, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (First) requesting an additional 60 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. The Government opposed the motion.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 15th day of October, 2025,

ORDERED:

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

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 block]

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 (FIRST)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	8 October 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,




OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
	)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
	)	OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	9 October 2025

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its general opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file 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 9 October 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (SECOND)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	9 December 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her second enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **18 January 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 110 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of \$10,000.00 at which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.



GRANTED

11 DEC 2025

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.


The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages.

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 9 December 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information.

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)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	10 December 2025

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

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

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

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel


[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 10 December 2025.



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 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	17 December 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her second enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 February 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 118 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of restitution. At this point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.



GRANTED
22 DEC 2025

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.



The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages.

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,


OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 17 December 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD,  Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	OPPOSITION TO APPELLANT'S
	)	MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT
v.	)	OF TIME
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	Before Panel No. 2
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	No. ACM S32831
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	19 December 2025
	)	


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

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

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




KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 19 December 2025.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FOURTH)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	5 February 2026
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her fourth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **19 March 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 168 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of

stitution at which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.



GRANTED
10 FEB 2025

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-seven cases; twenty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-four are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, ten cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fife*, ACM No. 40829 – The digital record of trial is 837 pages consisting of twenty-two appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, six defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 319 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense

exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

5. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
6. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
7. *United States v. Doby*, ACM No. 40794 – The digital record of trial is 393 pages, consisting of four appellate exhibits and 3 prosecution exhibits. The transcript is 101 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has completed her review of the record.
8. *United States v. Champaco*, ACM No. S32828 – The digital record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of 12 appellate exhibits, 5 prosecution exhibits, and 6 defense exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
9. *United States v. Davis*, ACM No. S32829 – The digital record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of 7 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, and 1 defense exhibit. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.


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

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,




OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 5 February 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	9 February 2026

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

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

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



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 9 February 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME (FIFTH)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	6 March 2026
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her fifth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **18 April 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 197 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of  months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of re which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.

GRANTED
12 MAR 2026

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned thirty cases; twenty-nine of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-seven cases are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, eight cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel completed her review of the record in this case and began drafting AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense

exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

5. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
6. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
7. *United States v. Champaco*, ACM No. S32828 – The digital record of trial is 945 pages, consisting of 12 appellate exhibits, 5 prosecution exhibits, and 6 defense exhibits. The transcript is 243 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
8. *United States v. Davis*, ACM No. S32829 – The digital record of trial is 430 pages, consisting of 7 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, and 1 defense exhibit. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

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

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


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

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,




OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	10 March 2026

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

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

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


VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel


CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 10 March 2026.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM S32831
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
India Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 13 April 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Sixth) requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant's assignments of error. The Government opposes the motion.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 16th day of April, 2026,


ORDERED:

Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Sixth) is **GRANTED**. Appellant shall file any assignments of error not later than **18 May 2026**.

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



FOR THE COURT



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 (SIXTH)
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel 2
	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	No. ACM S32831
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
United States Air Force	)	13 April 2026
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her sixth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **18 May 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 235 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of restitution at which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-four cases; twenty-three of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-two are pending AOE). Undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Anderson*, ACM No. 40850. Of the cases pending AOE brief, six cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834 – The digital record of trial is 1557 pages consisting of twenty-nine appellate exhibits, twenty-seven prosecution exhibits, and seven defense exhibits. The transcript is 744 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel completed her review of the record in this case and began drafting AOE brief.
2. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense

exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

5. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
6. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the Appellate Defense Counsel.


OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the Appellate Defense Counsel.


CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 13 April 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, ^UCapt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	15 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.



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 15 April 2026.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(SEVENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	6 May 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her seventh enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 June 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 258 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of  nths of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of re  nch point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.

GRANTED
8 MAY 2026

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned twenty-eight cases; twenty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-six are pending AOE's). Within the next six weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834. Within the next three weeks, the undersigned counsel expects to file a petition and supplement with the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.


4. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
5. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,

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


OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	8 May 2026

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


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

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



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 8 May 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(EIGHTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	4 June 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her eighth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 July 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 287 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 330 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of restitution. At each point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.



GRANTED
8 JUN 2026

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned thirty-two cases; thirty-one of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-nine are pending AOE). Within the next two weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file reply brief in one of the cases pending before this court: *United States v. Broadway*, ACM No. 40834. Within the next week, the undersigned counsel expects to file a supplement with the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Bogert*, ACM No. 40855. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.


4. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
5. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,



OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 4 June 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	5 June 2026

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


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

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

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



HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 5 June 2026.

[REDACTED]

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[REDACTED]

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(NINTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	7 July 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Honorable Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her ninth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 August 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 320 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 360 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of restitution at which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined. Counsel is currently assigned thirty-six cases; thirty-four of those cases are pending before this Court (thirty-two are pending AOE). Within the next week, the undersigned counsel expects to submit a filing in *United States v. Gavin*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-01. Of the cases pending AOE brief, five cases have priority over this case:

1. *United States v. Johnson*, ACM No. 25090 – The digital record of trial is 1506 pages, consisting of 27 appellate exhibits, 15 prosecution exhibits, and 17 defense exhibits. The transcript is 989 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
3. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.
4. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen

defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not completed her review of the record in this case.


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

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


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

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

Respectfully submitted,




OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 7 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
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 23.2 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the United States hereby enters its opposition to Appellant's Motion for Enlargement of Time to file an Assignment of Error in this case.

The United States respectfully maintains that short of a death penalty case or other extraordinary circumstances, it should not take any appellant nearly a year to submit an assignment of error to this Court. If Appellant's new delay request is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 360 days in length. Appellant's nearly year-long delay practically ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court's appellate processing standards. Appellant has already consumed almost two-thirds of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which only leaves about 6 months combined for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not started her 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.




REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 9 July 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM S32831
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
India Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 7 July 2026, counsel for Appellant submitted a Motion for Enlargement of Time (Ninth), requesting an additional 30 days to submit Appellant’s assignments of error, to end on 16 August 2026. Counsel for Appellant states that “[t]hrough no fault of Appellant, the undersigned counsel has been unable to complete her review and prepare a brief of Appellant’s case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel time to fully review Appellant’s case and advise Appellant regarding potential errors.” The Government generally opposed the motion.

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

Here, counsel for Appellant failed to make a showing of good cause. Counsel for Appellant does not provide the basis for the requested enlargement and does not provide any details on the progress being made on Appellant’s case, provides no further information as to whether she has begun reviewing the record, whether she has identified any assignments of error, whether she has begun drafting the assignments or error brief, or when she anticipates the assignments of error brief may be filed.

We remind counsel to pay careful attention to this court’s new Rules, specifically to the information required when requesting enlargements of time to

file a brief. Should counsel for Appellant request an additional enlargement of time, particularity is required when addressing progress of the case.

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 13th day of July, 2026,

ORDERED:

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



FOR THE COURT



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION FOR
<i>Appellee</i>	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	OUT OF TIME¹ (NINTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	13 July 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m), 24.3(a)(1), and 24.3(b) of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her ninth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 August 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 326 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 360 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without



GRANTED

15 JULY 2026

¹ Appellant’s counsel is submitting this request for an enlargement of time out of time following this Court’s 13 July 2026 Order denying the original Motion for Enlargement of Time (Fifth) timely filed with this Court on 7 July 2026. While this request for enlargement of time is out of time, this oversight was not the result of bad faith and Appellant bears no responsibility for this delay.

confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The convening authority took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the three months of hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant's payment of restitution at which point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted. Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages. Appellant is not confined.

Undersigned counsel is currently assigned thirty-nine cases; thirty-seven of those cases are pending before this Court (thirty-two are pending AOE's). Within the next five weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file an answer brief in *United States v. Cunningham*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-06, an Article 62, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 862, appeal.² Of the cases pending AOE's, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

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

² In accordance with JT. R. APP. PROC. 20(d), undersigned counsel is required to give "priority over all other proceedings where practicable" to appeals filed pursuant to Article 62, UCMJ.

above-listed priorities, the undersigned counsel had to shift the expected completion date for this AOE brief from the end of August 2026 to the end of September 2026.

2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.
3. *United States v. Tiexeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.
4. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.
5. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Undersigned counsel's other duties include: timely communication with all clients via email and phone, planning and implementation of the upcoming training for onboarding Appellate Defense Division members, providing training and support to the Air Force Trial Defense Division (particularly in light of the Chief, Defense Counsel Assistance Program (DCAP), position remaining unfilled), and completing mandatory Air Force trainings and administrative measures.

Regarding undersigned counsel's progress with the subject case, through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has not begun her substantive review of the record of trial. In preparing this motion for EOT, the undersigned counsel reviewed the following: EoJ, Convening Authority Decision on Action, and pages from the record of trial referenced in this motion. Undersigned counsel has not yet identified any assignments of error. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the AOE brief. Due to the number of cases that have priority over the present case, undersigned counsel is unable to provide a realistic estimate of when the AOE brief will be filed.


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

- (1) Appellant was informed of her right to speedy appellate review.
- (2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.
- (3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on her case.
- (4) She asserts her right to speedy appellate review but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that hold a higher priority over Appellant's case, she agrees with this request for an enlargement of time.


Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise her regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.


OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information.

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 13 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Capt, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	TO APPELLANT'S MOTION
	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	OUT OF TIME
	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
India Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	14 July 2026

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


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

The United States respectfully maintains that under extraordinary circumstances, it should not take appellate almost a year to submit an assignment of error to this Court. If Appellant's new delay request is granted, the defense delay in this case will be 360 days in length. Appellant's delay ensures this Court will not be able to issue a decision that complies with our superior Court's appellate processing standards. Appellant will have consumed nearly 12 months of the 18-month standard for this Court to issue a decision, which leaves about 6 months for the United States and this Court to perform their separate statutory responsibilities.

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


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

HEATHER R. BEZOLD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel


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

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 14 July 2026.



HEATHER R. BEZOLD, 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
	)	(TENTH)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	6 August 2026

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

Pursuant to Rules 23.3(m), 24.3(a)(1), and 24.3(b) of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for her tenth enlargement of time to file an Assignment of Error (AOE) brief. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **15 September 2026**. This case was docketed with this Court on 21 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 350 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 390 days will have elapsed.

On 29 April 2025, Appellant was tried by a special court-martial consisting of a military judge alone at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona. Record (R). at 1, 13. Consistent with her pleas, the military judge found Appellant guilty of two specifications of attempted debit card fraud in violation of Article 80, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), and two specifications of credit card fraud in violation of Article 121a, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 921a. R. at 18, 106. On 29 April 2025, the military judge sentenced Appellant to a bad conduct discharge, hard labor without confinement for three months, reduction to pay grade E-1, and a reprimand. R. at 167. The conveyance of the sentence took no action on findings and the following action on sentence: suspension of the hard labor without confinement conditional upon Appellant’s payment of restitution. At this point the suspended hard labor without confinement would be remitted.


GRANTED
13 AUG 2026

Record of Trial (ROT), Vol. 1, Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. Senior Airman India Y.L.D. Taylor.

The digital record of trial is 864 pages, consisting of 8 appellate exhibits, 6 prosecution exhibits, 5 defense exhibits, and 2 court exhibits. The transcript is 168 pages.

Appellant is not confined.

Counsel is currently assigned thirty-four cases; thirty-two of those cases are pending before this Court (twenty-nine are pending AOE's). Within the next two weeks, undersigned counsel expects to file an answer brief in *United States v. Cunningham*, an Article 62, UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 862, appeal pending docketing with this Court.* Within the next two months, undersigned counsel expects to file writs or certiorari before the Supreme Court of the United States for two cases. All three cases have priority over Appellant's case. Of the cases pending AOE's, undersigned counsel has the following cases prioritized over the present case:

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

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

2. *United States v. Fowler*, ACM No. S32821 – The digital record of trial is 346 pages consisting of three appellate exhibits and four prosecution exhibits. The transcript is seventy-nine pages long. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel completed her review of the record of trial and identified one issue.
3. *United States v. Teixeira*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 1530 pages consisting of forty appellate exhibits, five prosecution exhibits, and fourteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 146 pages long. Appellant is currently confined. Undersigned counsel completed her review of the record of trial and identified three issues.
4. *United States v. Marin*, ACM No. 40831 – The digital record of trial is 2287 pages, consisting of fifty-one appellate exhibits, sixteen prosecution exhibits, and sixteen defense exhibits. The transcript is 788 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.
5. *United States v. Rice*, ACM No. 40851 – The digital record of trial is 610 pages, consisting of twenty appellate exhibits, three prosecution exhibits, eleven defense exhibits, and one court exhibit. The transcript is 234 pages. Appellant is not confined. Undersigned counsel has not substantively reviewed the record of trial.

Undersigned counsel's other duties include: timely communication with all clients via email and phone, planning and implementation of the upcoming training for onboarding Appellate Defense Division members, providing training and support to the Air Force Trial Defense Division (particularly in light of the Chief, Defense Counsel Assistance Program (DCAP), position remaining unfilled), and completing mandatory Air Force trainings and administrative measures.

Regarding undersigned counsel's progress with the subject case, through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has not begun her substantive review of the record of trial. In

preparing this motion for EOT, the undersigned counsel reviewed the following: EoJ, Convening Authority Decision on Action, and pages from the record of trial referenced in this motion. Undersigned counsel has not yet identified any assignments of error. Undersigned counsel has not begun drafting the AOE brief. Due to the number of cases that have priority over the present case, undersigned counsel is unable to provide a realistic estimate of when the AOE brief will be filed.



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

- (1) Appellant was informed of her right to speedy appellate review.
- (2) Appellant has been advised of this request for enlargement of time.
- (3) Appellant has been apprised of the status of undersigned counsel's progress on her case.
- (4) She asserts her right to speedy appellate review but, recognizing that undersigned counsel is working on other cases that hold a higher priority over Appellant's case, she agrees with this request for an enlargement of time.

Through no fault of Appellant, undersigned counsel has been unable to begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise her regarding potential errors.

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


Respectfully submitted,


OLGA STANFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

Respectfully submitted,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

OLGA STANFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information area.

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)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR,	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	10 August 2026

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


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

The United States respectfully maintains that short of a death penalty case or other extraordinary circumstances, it should not take any appellant 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 over 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 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.



CATHERINE/D. MUMFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel




CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 10 August 2026.



/ aj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM S32831
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
India Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 2

On 2 September 2026, Appellant submitted a motion to withdraw from appellate review, along with a request to attach Appellant's DD Form 2330, *Waiver/Withdrawal of Appellate Rights in General and Special Courts-Martial Subject to Review by a Court of Criminal Appeals*, signed by Appellant on 1 September 2026 and Appellant's counsel on 2 September 2026.

The Government did not file a response.

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 11th day of September, 2026,

ORDERED:

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



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES	)	MOTION TO WITHDRAW
	)	FROM APPELLATE REVIEW
<i>Appellee</i>	)	AND ATTACH
	)	
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel 2
Senior Airman (E-4)	)	
INDIA Y.L.D. TAYLOR	)	No. ACM S32831
United States Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	2 September 2026

**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 (SrA) India Y.L.D. Taylor, moves to withdraw her case from appellate review.

Appellant has fully consulted with Mr. Dwight H. Sullivan and Major Olga Stanford, her appellate defense counsel, regarding this motion to withdraw. No person has compelled, coerced, or induced Appellant to withdraw her 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,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the Appellate Defense Counsel.


OLGA STANFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the Appellate Defense Counsel.


CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing were sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 2 September 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

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

OLGA STANFORD, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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