



THE LAW FIRM OF PUCKETT AND FARAJ, PC

---

November 6, 2011

**Via email**

Major Cory Wick  
Investigating Officer  
U.S. v. LCpl Bobby Litton

*Re: Request for Delay in the case of United State v. LCpl Bobby Litton*

Dear Major Wick,

I am the retained civilian counsel for LCpl Litton. I respectfully request a one day continuance of the Article 32 hearing currently scheduled for November 8, until November 9.

LCpl Litton retained me to represent him a number of weeks ago. At the time I was retained I requested and was granted delay of the Article 32 hearing until November 8, 2011. A few days ago, I was informed that due to certain plea negotiations the Article 32 would be canceled. Accordingly, I scheduled other matters on November 7 and 8 under the assumption that Article 32 in this case will be canceled.

On November 7, I have a hearing in a criminal matter in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. I will also be meeting with a military officer client who has been authorized travel to Virginia from Kansas City specifically to meet and prepare for his upcoming trial.

On November 8, 2011, I anticipate a 39a on an emergency motion to relieve counsel in the case of U.S. v. Rowe. The 39a should take place either at Quantico or at the Navy Yard in Washington DC.

On Friday November 4, at 1830 E.S.T., I was informed by LCpl Litton that he intended to go forward with the Article 32 hearing. As you can glean from the facts I have provided to you, I now have a scheduling conflict that I cannot resolve and must request a one day continuance of the Article 32 so that I may be present to represent LCpl Litton.

I have identified a flight that leaves the DC metro area for Southern California on Tuesday evening. I can be available for the Article 32 hearing on November 9. I regret any inconvenience my request creates. This request is not for the purpose of unfair delay or tactical advantage. It arises out of a bona fide conflict that I cannot resolve.

