

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	NOTICE OF DIRECT
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPEAL PURSUANT TO
	)	ARTICLE 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ
v.	)	
	)	
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	No. ACM SXXXXXX
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	19 August 2025
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	


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

On 10 March 2024, Appellant, Technical Sergeant (TSgt) Devan B. Wedemeyer, was tried by a special court-martial comprised of a military judge alone at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16-17, 287. Consistent with his pleas, TSgt Wedemeyer was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. *Entry of Judgment in the Case of United States v. Airman First Class Devan B. Wedemeyer (EOJ)*, dated 10 March 2025.

The military judge sentenced TSgt Wedemeyer to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and to be confined for a period of five months. R. at 285-6. The convening authority took no action on the findings or the sentence. *Convening Authority Decision on Action – United States v. TSgt Devan B. Wedemeyer*, dated 11 April 2025.

On 21 May 2025, the Government mailed TSgt Wedemeyer the required notice of his right to appeal within ninety days. Pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ, 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A), TSgt Wedemeyer files his notice of direct appeal with this Court.

Respectfully submitted,



JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel
Air Force Appellate Defense Division



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 Appellate Government Division on 19 August 2025.

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Jordan L. Grande.

JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information of Jordan L. Grande.

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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM _____
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER	)	NOTICE OF
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	DOCKETING
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	

On 19 August 2025, this court received a notice of direct appeal from Appellant in the above-styled case, pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 866(b)(1)(A).

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

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

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

Accordingly, it is by the court on this 19th day of August, 2025,

ORDERED:

The case in the above-styled matter is referred to Panel 1.

It is further ordered:

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



FOR THE COURT



AGNIESZKA M. GAERTNER, Capt, USAF
Commissioner

UNITED STATES,	)	APPELLANT’S MOTION
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	FOR ENLARGEMENT
	)	OF TIME (FIRST)
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	12 October 2025

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(1) and (2) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time to file Assignments of Error. Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 60 days, which will end on **17 December 2025**.

Appellant's case was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 54 days have elapsed.¹ On the date requested, 120 days will have elapsed since docketing.

¹ The filing of this Motion is timely in accordance with Rule 23.3(m)(1) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure. In accordance with JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 15 and Rule 15 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the seventh calendar day before this AOE is due is calculated as 14 October 2025 because 11 through 13 October 2025 are days on which this Court is closed (Saturday, Sunday, and a federal holiday). This Court clarified its calculation of time in accordance with JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 15 in its 12 February 2025 Order in *United States v. Vongphachanh*, No. ACM 40741. In accordance with JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 15, when the last day of a period of time to be computed ends on "a Saturday, Sunday, holiday, or day on which the Court is closed," that period of time, "runs until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, holiday, or day on which the Court is closed." The last day of the period of time to be computed in this case (the seventh day before this AOE is due) was a Saturday, and therefore, in accordance with JT. CT. CRIM. APP. R. 15 and Rule 15 of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the end of that period runs until the next day this Court is not closed, which is 14 October 2025.

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

Respectfully submitted,

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

JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the contact information 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 Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 12 October 2025.

[REDACTED]

JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]

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. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	
	)	15 October 2025

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

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

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


[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[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 15 October 2025.



VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



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

UNITED STATES	)	No. ACM 25056
<i>Appellee</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	ORDER
Devan B. WEDEMEYER	)	
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
U.S. Air Force	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	Panel 1

On 12 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 20th 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 **17 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



CAROL K. JOYCE
Clerk of the Court

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,

Appellee,

V.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)

DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,

United States Air Force,

Appellant.

) APPELLANT'S MOTION

) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**

) OF TIME (SECOND)

)

) Before Panel No. 1

)

) No. ACM 25056

)

) 3 December 2025

**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 Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 January 2026**. Appellant’s direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 106 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 150 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

¹ One charge and two specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 920, one charge and eight specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 928, and one charge and one specification alleging a violation of 10 U.S.C. § 934 were withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a plea agreement. R. at 12-13, 133, 286; Appellate Exhibit I at 2.

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


Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. 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 undersigned 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 complete her review of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 3 December 2025.

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	5 December 2025

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

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

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

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

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

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was delivered to the Court and to the Air Force
Appellate Defense Division on 5 December 2025.

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

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

UNITED STATES,
Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,
United States Air Force,
Appellant.

) **APPELLANT’S MOTION**
) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**
) **OF TIME (THIRD)**
)
) Before Panel No. 1
)
) No. ACM 25056
)
) 4 January 2026

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (4) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **15 February 2026**. Appellant's direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 138 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 180 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

1

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


Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. 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 undersigned 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 complete her review of Appellant's case. An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	5 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.


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 5 January 2026.

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

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

UNITED STATES,) **MOTION FOR WITHDRAWAL**
) **OF APPELLATE DEFENSE**
) **COUNSEL**
)
) Before Panel No. 1
)
) No. ACM 25056
)
) 28 January 2026

Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)

DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,

United States Air Force,

Appellant.

Pursuant to Rules 12(b), 12.4, and 23.3(h) of this Honorable Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, undersigned counsel requests to withdraw in the above-captioned case. In order to best allocate resources within the Air Force Appellate Defense Division and support speedy appellate review for clients, undersigned counsel's docket has been reviewed and several cases, including Appellant's case, have been redistributed among counsel within the Division. Major Samantha Castanien has been detailed counsel to Appellant's case and made her notice of appearance on 3 December 2025. Counsel have completed a thorough turnover of the record.

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

WHEREFORE, Appellant respectfully requests that this Court grant this Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 28 January 2026.

[REDACTED]

JORDAN L. GRANDE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]

UNITED STATES,
Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,
United States Air Force,
Appellant.

) **APPELLANT’S MOTION**
) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**
) **OF TIME (FOURTH)**
)
) Before Panel No. 1
)
) No. ACM 25056
)
) 5 February 2026

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **17 March 2026**. Appellant's direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 170 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 210 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

1

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

Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. Appellant is not currently confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned 17 cases; 11 cases are pending before this Court (6 cases are pending AOE's; 1 case is pending an Article 62, UCMJ, appeal; 1 case is pending a petition for new trial), 2 cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF), and 4 cases are pending before the Supreme Court of the United States (2 cases are pending filing an individual petition for a writ of certiorari). To date, undersigned counsel has seven cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Buckley*, No. ACM 40764 – This appellant elected to withdraw from appellate review on 3 February 2026. Unless and until this Court grants the withdrawal motion, this case remains prioritized over Appellant's.

2. *United States v. Galvin*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-01 – The Government filed its Article 62, UCMJ, brief on 30 January 2026. Undersigned counsel is assigned to *Galvin* as Article 70, UCMJ, counsel and is assisting civilian appellate defense counsel in filing the respondent's brief, due 19 February 2026.

3. *United States v. Tyson*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-02 – A petition for new trial was filed on 23 January 2026. The Government has 30 days to respond, with a current deadline of 22 February 2026. Thereafter, this petitioner will have 7 days to respond, barring any extensions due to oral argument (below).

4. *United States v. Marin Perez*, USCA Dkt. No. 25-0238/AF – Oral argument is scheduled for 25 February 2026. Undersigned counsel will be preparing for oral argument while working *Galvin*.

5. *United States v. Chatman*, No. ACM 40779 - The trial transcript is 965 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains fourteen Prosecution Exhibits, six Defense Exhibits, and forty-six Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is currently confined. Civilian appellate defense counsel has reviewed the record and begun drafting the appeal, but undersigned counsel has not yet begun her review of the record. This appellant has not waived his right to have undersigned counsel review his record.

6. *United States v. Carlisle*, No. ACM 40784 – The electronic record of trial is twenty-eight volumes, with Volume 1 containing most of the record. It is 2,209 pages. The trial transcript is 273 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains four Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, and thirty-five Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet reviewed the record of trial.

7. *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791 – The trial transcript is 549 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains seven Prosecution Exhibits, three Defense Exhibits, and forty Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet reviewed the record of trial.

Major Jordan Grande, who was originally detailed to this case, filed a motion to withdraw as appellate defense counsel on 28 January 2026. That motion is still pending before this Court, so she remains detailed to this case until such time as this Court approves her withdrawal. Major Grande is currently assigned 19 cases; 16 cases are pending before this Court (4 cases are pending AOE). She is currently preparing for oral argument in two cases: *United States v. Hunt*, USCA

Dkt. No. 25-0257/AF; ACM No. 40563, scheduled at the CAAF on 25 February 2026; and *United States v. Reese*, ACM No. 24069, scheduled at Syracuse Law School on 27 February 2026. While **four** cases have priority over the present case, in light of the pending motion to withdrawal, it is anticipated that Major Grande's priorities will not have an impact on Appellant's case. Those priorities are as follows:

1. *United States v. Declue*, ACM No. 40769 – The record of trial consists of one e-ROT with six volumes, containing sixteen Prosecution Exhibits, five Defense Exhibits, and fifty Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 626 pages long. This appellant is not currently confined. Major Grande has completed her review of the record for this case.

2. *United States v. Hepburn*, ACM No. 40778 – The record of trial consists of one e-ROT with five Prosecution Exhibits, seven Defense Exhibits, and thirteen Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 107 pages long. This appellant is currently confined. Major Grande has completed her review of this case. If the EOT filed on 2 February 2026 is approved, the AOE will be due on 10 March 2026. Major Grande does not anticipate requesting an additional EOT in this case.

3. *United States v. Pryce*, ACM No. 25014 – The record of trial consists of one e-ROT with eight Prosecution exhibits, fourteen Defense Exhibits, and twenty-one Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 442 pages long. This appellant is not currently confined. Major Grande has not completed her review of this case.

4. *United States v. Harrington*, ACM No. 39825 – The record of trial for the rehearing consists of sixteen volumes with five Prosecution Exhibits, ten Defense Exhibits, and thirty Appellate Exhibits; the transcript is 663 pages long. This appellant is not currently confined. Major Grande has completed her review of the record in this case.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on his case and was advised of Major Grande's motion to withdraw. 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 begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial yet—aside from what is necessary to complete this EOT motion. *See* A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(4) (requiring a limited review of the record to assert the number of litigated specifications, the approved findings and sentence, the length of the transcript, and the number of exhibits). An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
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



UNITED STATES,

Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)

DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,

United States Air Force,

Appellant.

) **APPELLANT’S MOTION**

) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**

) **OF TIME (FIFTH)**

)

) Before Panel No. 1

)

) No. ACM 25056

)

) 4 March 2026

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3) and (6) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 April 2026**. Appellant's direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 197 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 240 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

1

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

Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. Appellant is not currently confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned 15 cases; 11 cases are pending before this Court (7 cases are pending AOE's; 1 case is pending a petition for new trial), 2 cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF), and 2 cases are pending before the Supreme Court of the United States (both pending filing an individual petition for a writ of certiorari). To date, undersigned counsel has **five** cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Tyson*, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-02 – The Government filed its response to the petition for new trial was filed on 23 February 2026. Undersigned counsel requested a seven-day extension on the reply brief, which was granted (due 9 March 2026).

2. *United States v. Chatman*, No. ACM 40779 – The trial transcript is 965 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains fourteen Prosecution Exhibits, six Defense Exhibits, and forty-six Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is currently confined. Civilian appellate defense counsel has reviewed the record and begun drafting the appeal, but undersigned counsel has not yet begun her review of the record. This appellant has not waived his right to have undersigned counsel review his record.

3. *United States v. Brunson*, No. ACM 25006 – Since Appellant's last EOT, undersigned counsel was detailed to this case to take over for a different appellate defense counsel. This guilty plea, appealing pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ, is pending a motion for EOT 11, as of this

filing. The record of trial includes three Prosecution Exhibits, four Defense Exhibits, and nineteen Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 229 pages. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun her review of the record of trial.

4. *United States v. Carlisle*, No. ACM 40784 – The electronic record of trial is twenty-eight volumes, with Volume 1 containing most of the record. It is 2,209 pages. The trial transcript is 273 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains four Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, and thirty-five Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet reviewed the record of trial.

5. *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791 – The trial transcript is 549 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains seven Prosecution Exhibits, three Defense Exhibits, and forty Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet reviewed the record of trial.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on 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 begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial yet—aside from what is necessary to complete this EOT motion. *See* A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(4) (requiring a limited review of the record to assert the number of litigated specifications, the approved findings and sentence, the length of the transcript, and the number of exhibits). An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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


IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' GENERAL
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	6 March 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 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 6 March 2026.

[REDACTED]

VANESSA BAIROS, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,

Appellee,

V.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)

DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,

United States Air Force,

Appellant.

) APPELLANT'S MOTION

) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**

) OF TIME (SIXTH)

)

) Before Panel No. 1

)

) No. ACM 25056

)

) 6 April 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3), (4), and (6) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **16 May 2026**. Appellant's direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 230 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 270 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

¹ One charge and two specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 920, one charge and eight specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 928, and one charge and one specification alleging a violation of 10 U.S.C. § 934 were withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a plea agreement. R. at 12-13, 133, 286; Appellate Exhibit I at 2.

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

Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. Appellant is not currently confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned 14 cases; 10 cases are pending before this Court (6 cases are pending AOE), 2 cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF), and 2 cases are pending before the Supreme Court of the United States (both pending filing an individual petition for a writ of certiorari). To date, undersigned counsel has **three** cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Chatman*, No. ACM 40779 – This AOE is due this Thursday, 9 April 2026. Undersigned counsel drafted six assignments of error and reviewed three more for this 2,339-page electronic record of trial. She also assisted this appellant, who is confined, with raising matters pursuant to *United States v. Grostefon*, 12 M.J. 431 (C.M.A. 1982). The AOE is currently undergoing final review.

2. *United States v. Brunson*, No. ACM 25006 – This guilty plea, appealing pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), UCMJ, is on for EOT 12, which is anticipated to be the last EOT. The record of trial includes three Prosecution Exhibits, four Defense Exhibits, and nineteen Appellate Exhibits. The transcript is 229 pages. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not begun her review of the record of trial.

3. *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791 – The trial transcript is 549 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains seven Prosecution Exhibits, three Defense Exhibits, and forty


Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has not yet reviewed the record of trial.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on 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 begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial yet—aside from what is necessary to complete this EOT motion. *See* A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(4) (requiring a limited review of the record to assert the number of litigated specifications, the approved findings and sentence, the length of the transcript, and the number of exhibits). An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

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



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, 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. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	6 April 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 23.2 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 6 April 2026.



KATE E. LEE, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel



UNITED STATES,
Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,
United States Air Force,
Appellant.

) **APPELLANT’S MOTION**
) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**
) **OF TIME (SEVENTH)**
)
) Before Panel No. 1
)
) No. ACM 25056
)
) 28 April 2026

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3), (4), and (6) of this Court’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **15 June 2026**. Appellant’s direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 252 days have elapsed.¹ On the date requested, 300 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.² The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

² One charge and two specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 920, one charge and eight specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 928, and one charge and one specification alleging a violation of 10 U.S.C. § 934 were withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a plea agreement. R. at 12-13, 133, 286; Appellate Exhibit I at 2.

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

Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. Appellant is not currently confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned 13 cases; 7 cases are pending before this Court (3 cases are pending AOE's), 3 cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF) (one case is pending a petition for grant of review and accompanying supplement), and 3 cases are pending before the Supreme Court of the United States (one case is pending filing an individual petition for a writ of certiorari). Since Appellant's last motion for an EOT, undersigned counsel completed reviewing the record in *United States v. Chatman*, No. ACM 40779, drafted six out of the nine assignments of error, assisted this appellant with personally raised issues, and filed the fifty-nine page AOE. To date, undersigned counsel has three cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791 – The trial transcript is 549 pages long. The electronic record of trial contains seven Prosecution Exhibits, three Defense Exhibits, and forty Appellate Exhibits. This appellant is not currently confined. Undersigned counsel has begun reviewing the record of trial.

2. *United States v. Tyson*, No. ACM 40617, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-02 – This appellant's supplement to the petition for grant of review is due before 12 June 2026. Depending on timing, this petition and supplement may take precedence over Appellant's AOE.

3. *Chatman (supra)* – The Government's Answer Brief is due no later than 15 June 2026.


Depending on *Cooper*, *Tyson*, and when the Government files, this appellant's reply brief may take priority over Appellant's case.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on 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 begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial yet—aside from what is necessary to complete this EOT motion. *See* A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(4) (requiring a limited review of the record to assert the number of litigated specifications, the approved findings and sentence, the length of the transcript, and the number of exhibits). An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 28 April 2026.

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES'
	)	OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	30 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 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 completed their review of the record of trial at this late stage of the appellate process.

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

[REDACTED]

REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government

[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 30 April 2026.



REGINA HENENLOTTER, Maj, USAF
Appellate Government Counsel, Government



UNITED STATES,

Appellee,

v.

Technical Sergeant (E-6)

DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,

United States Air Force,

Appellant.

) **APPELLANT’S MOTION**

) **FOR ENLARGEMENT**

) **OF TIME (EIGHTH)**

)

) Before Panel No. 1

)

) No. ACM 25056

)

) 1 June 2026

Pursuant to Rule 23.3(m)(3), (4), and (6) of this Court's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Appellant hereby moves for an enlargement of time (EOT) to file Assignments of Error (AOE). Appellant requests an enlargement for a period of 30 days, which will end on **15 July 2026**. Appellant's direct appeal was docketed with this Court on 19 August 2025. From the date of docketing to the present date, 286 days have elapsed. On the date requested, 330 days will have elapsed from docketing.

On 10 March 2025, Appellant was tried by a military judge, sitting as a special court-martial, at Ramstein Air Base, Germany. R. at 1, 16, 287. Consistent with his pleas, Appellant was found guilty of one charge and eight specifications of assault consummated by a battery in violation of Article 128, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 928. R. at 12-13, 18, 161.¹ The military judge sentenced Appellant to be reprimanded, reduced to the grade of E-3, and confined for a total of five months (confinement periods running concurrently). R. at 285-86.

¹ One charge and two specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 920, one charge and eight specifications alleging violations of 10 U.S.C. § 928, and one charge and one specification alleging a violation of 10 U.S.C. § 934 were withdrawn and dismissed with prejudice pursuant to a plea agreement. R. at 12-13, 133, 286; Appellate Exhibit I at 2.

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

Undersigned counsel's copy of the record of trial is electronic and is one volume that is 731 pages in length. There are five Prosecution Exhibits, nine Defense Exhibits, four Appellate Exhibits, and three Court Exhibits. The transcript is 287 pages. Appellant is not currently confined.

Pursuant to A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(6), undersigned counsel provides the following information. Undersigned counsel is currently assigned 11 cases; 8 cases are pending before this Court (2 cases are pending AOE's), and 3 cases are pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF) (one case is pending a petition for grant of review and accompanying supplement). Since Appellant's last motion for an EOT, undersigned counsel completed reviewing the record in *United States v. Cooper*, No. ACM 40791, and filed a merits brief on that appellant's behalf. To date, undersigned counsel has **two** cases prioritized over the present case:

1. *United States v. Tyson*, No. ACM 40617, Misc. Dkt. No. 2026-02 – This appellant's supplement to the petition for grant of review is due before 12 June 2026. Additional time may be requested, but would not exceed 29 June 2026.

2. *United States v. Chatman*, No. ACM 40799 – The Government's Answer Brief is due no later than 15 June 2026. Depending on *Tyson*, and when the Government files, this appellant's reply brief may take priority over Appellant's case.

Appellant was advised of his right to a timely appeal. Appellant has been provided an update on the status of undersigned counsel's progress on 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 begin substantive review of Appellant's record of trial yet—aside from what is necessary to complete this EOT motion. *See* A.F. Ct. Crim. App. R. 23.3(m)(4) (requiring a limited review of the record to assert the number of litigated specifications, the approved findings and sentence, the length of the transcript, and the number of exhibits). An enlargement of time is necessary to allow counsel to fully review Appellant's case and advise him regarding potential errors.

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

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel

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

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the original and copies of the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Air Force Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 1 June 2026.



SAMANTHA M. CASTANIEN, Maj, USAF
Appellate Defense Counsel



IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES,	)	UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR
	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
v.	)	
	)	Before Panel No. 1
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	
DEVAN B. WEDEMEYER,	)	No. ACM 25056
United States Air Force.	)	
<i>Appellant</i>	)	3 June 2026

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

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

The United States respectfully maintains that short of a death penalty case or other extraordinary circumstances, it should not take any appellant nearly a year to submit an assignment of error to this Court. It appears that Appellant's counsel has not yet reviewed 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.

[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 3 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 TO
	)	WITHDRAW FROM APPELLATE
<i>Appellee,</i>	)	REVIEW AND ATTACH
	)	
v.	)	Before Panel No. 1
	)	
Technical Sergeant (E-6)	)	No. ACM 25056
Devan B. Wedemeyer,	)	
United States Air Force,	)	
<i>Appellant.</i>	)	2 July 2026

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

Pursuant to Rule 16 of the Joint Rules of Appellate Procedure for Courts of Criminal Appeals (JRAP) and Rule for Courts-Martial (R.C.M.) 1115, *Manual for Courts-Martial, United States* (2024 ed.), Appellant, Technical Sergeant Devan B. Wedemeyer, moves to withdraw his case from appellate review. Appellant has consulted fully with Dwight H. Sullivan, his appellate defense counsel, regarding this motion to withdraw. No person has compelled, coerced, or induced Appellant by force, promises of clemency, or otherwise, to withdraw his case from appellate review.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing was sent via email to the Court and served on the Government Trial and Appellate Operations Division on 2 July 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

[REDACTED]

Dwight H. Sullivan
Appellate Defense Counsel

[REDACTED]