

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

MATTHEW D. CORLISS,
Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

**Application to the Hon. John G. Roberts, Jr.
for Extension of Time to File a
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces**

LUKE D. WILSON
Air Force Appellate Defense Div.
1500 West Perimeter Road
Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762

DWIGHT H. SULLIVAN
Counsel of Record
Air Force Appellate Defense Div.
1500 West Perimeter Road
Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762
dwight.sullivan.1@us.af.mil

Counsel for Applicant

No. _____

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

MATTHEW D. CORLISS,
Applicant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent.

**Application to the Hon. John G. Roberts, Jr.
for Extension of Time to File a
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rules 13(5), 22, and 30, the Petitioner, Matthew D. Corliss, requests a 60-day extension of time, to and including June 20, 2026, to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. Unless an extension is granted, the deadline for filing the petition for certiorari is April 21, 2026. This Application is being filed more than 10 days before that date.

In support of this application, Applicant states the following:

1. The Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF) rendered its decision denying review of Applicant's case on January 21, 2026. This Court has jurisdiction

under 28 U.S.C. § 1259(3). A copy of the CAAF's order denying review appears in this application's appendix.

2. Applicant, then a member of the United States Air Force, was tried by a general court-martial composed of a military judge alone at Moody Air Force Base, GA, on May 29, 2024. Consistent with his plea, he was found guilty of one specification of larceny of military property under Article 121, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 921. The military judge sentenced Applicant to be reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for six months, separated from the Air Force with a bad-conduct discharge, and fined \$15,000 with six additional months of confinement if Applicant failed to pay the fine.

3. At the Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals (AFCCA), Applicant challenged the portion of his sentence providing for contingent confinement. On October 27, 2025, the AFCCA affirmed the findings and sentence.

4. Applicant sought discretionary review by the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (CAAF). He raised the same issue that he had raised at the AFCCA level. On January 21, 2026, the CAAF denied Applicant's petition to review his case.

5. Good cause exists to grant the requested extension. Since the CAAF's decision declining to grant review in this case, Applicant's primary appellate defense counsel, Lieutenant Colonel Luke Wilson, United States Air Force Reserve, has been fulfilling statutory obligations in representing other clients, which required him to complete briefings in a variety of other cases before the AFCCA and the CAAF.

6. Further, the printing process required for Applicant's petition must be processed through a federal government agency (the Air Force), which has payment and processing requirements a private firm does not. The procurement process for a printing job cannot be forecasted with certainty, often has delays, and cuts approximately two weeks out of undersigned counsel's time to finalize the petition for a writ of certiorari.

7. Applicant thus requests a 60-day extension for the filing of Applicant's certiorari petition.

8. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that an order be entered extending the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari up to, and including, June 20, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,



DWIGHT H. SULLIVAN
Counsel of Record
Air Force Appellate Defense Division
1500 West Perimeter Road, Suite 1100
Joint Base Andrews, MD 20762
dwight.sullivan.1@us.af.mil
(240) 612-4770

April 10, 2026

APPENDIX

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Armed Forces
Washington, D.C.**

United States,
Appellee

USCA Dkt. No. 26-0070/AF
Crim.App. No. 40656

v.

ORDER DENYING PETITION

Matthew D.
Corliss,
Appellant

On consideration of the petition for grant of review of the decision of the United States Air Force Court of Criminal Appeals, it is by the Court, this 21st day of January, 2026,

ORDERED:

That the petition is hereby denied.

For the Court,

/s/ Malcolm H. Squires, Jr.
Clerk of the Court

cc: The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force
Appellate Defense Counsel (Wilson)
Appellate Government Counsel (Payne)