IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

UNITED STATES Appellee	**MOTION FOR EXTENSION (4)**
v.	Docket No. ARMY 20250162
Specialist (E-4) **JAIMIN P. PRAJAPATI,** United States Army, Appellant	Tried at Fort Knox, Kentucky, on 2 April 2025, before a special court-martial appointed by the Commander, 1st Theater Sustainment Command, Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin W. Hilner, military judge, presiding.

TO THE HONORABLE, THE JUDGES OF THE
UNITED STATES ARMY COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

COME NOW the undersigned appellate defense counsel, pursuant to Rules 23 and 24 of this court's Rules of Appellate Procedure, and move this court to grant appellant's Motion for Extension of Time. The undersigned appellate defense counsel request a 30-day extension of time until 7 April 2026 to file a Brief on Behalf of Appellant. The Brief on Behalf of Appellant is currently due on 8 March 2026. Pursuant to Rule 24.1(b), the undersigned counsel assert:

1. On 2 April 2025, a military judge sitting as a special court-martial convicted appellant, Specialist Jaimin Prajapati, in accordance with his pleas and subject to exception and substitution, of one charge and one specification of

Panel 3

conduct prejudicial to good order and discipline in the armed forces.[1] (R. at 415; Statement of Trial Results). That same day, the military judge sentenced appellant to reduction to the grade of E-2 and 100 days of confinement. (R. at 465).

On 16 April 2025, the convening authority approved the findings and adjudged sentence. (Action). On 6 May 2025, the military judge entered Judgment. (Judgment). Pursuant to Article 66(b)(1)(A), this court docketed appellant's case on 9 October 2025. (Referral and Designation of Counsel).

2. Appellant's record of trial was received in the Defense Appellate Division on 9 October 2025 and is 972 pages long. The current due date is 8 March 2026. Appellant is no longer in confinement and concurs with this request for delay.

3. The first undersigned counsel, Mr. William E. Cassara, has ten cases pending before this Court; three cases before the Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals; one case before the CAAF; eleven cases before the United States Court of Federal Claims; one case before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit; one petition for a writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court

[1] Pursuant to the plea agreement, the military judge dismissed without prejudice one charge and two specifications of unlawful viewing and recording; one charge and one specification of violating a lawful order; one charge and two specifications of unlawful recording and viewing; and one charge and one specification of obstruction of justice. (R. at 414–15).

for the District of Maryland; one Administrative Procedure Act case in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland; and three collateral attacks in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

4. Consistent with Georgia bar rules and Army Reg. 27-26, Rules of Professional Conduct for Lawyers, undersigned request additional time to conduct thorough review, investigation, research, and drafting of matters on behalf of appellant, ensuring compliance with counsel's ethical obligation to effectively represent appellant's interests.

WHEREFORE, appellate defense counsel respectfully request that this court grant the instant motion.

PANEL NO. 3

MOTION FOR EXTENSION (4)

GRANTED: _____

DENIED: _____

DATE: 5 March 2026

[redacted]
William E. Cassara
Civilian Defense Counsel

[redacted]
Andrew M. Hopkins
Major, Judge Advocate
Acting Branch Chief
Defense Appellate Division

CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was electronically filed with the Army Court and Government Appellate Division on March 3, 2026.

[redacted]

MELINDA J. JOHNSON
Paralegal Specialist
Defense Appellate Division