- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1116,
- 2 11 February 2015.]
- **3** MJ [COL POHL]: The commission is called to order. All
- 4 parties are again present that were present when the
- 5 commission recessed. The Special Review Team has been
- 6 replaced by the regular prosecutors.
- 7 And, General Martins, the same crew now that was here
- 8 last time?
- **9** CP [BG MARTINS]: Yes, Your Honor.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I wanted to talk to the government,
- 11 and this is kind of a scheduling issue. It deals with your
- 12 response, 334C. Who is going to speak for the government on
- 13 that? Mr. Trivett.
- 14 Okay. Here -- I just want to understand the
- 15 government's position.
- **16** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Okay.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: And this deals with the severance of the
- 18 Binalshibh case from the other four. And the government
- 19 adamantly opposes that severance; is that correct?
- 20 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: That's correct.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Now, understanding that the 292
- 22 series, which you are not a party of, I understand that, is
- 23 unresolved as far as it deals with Mr. Binalshibh's team, and

- 1 there is an argument that it's also unresolved for the other
- 2 teams, but I want to give you a hypothetical because I want to
- 3 understand the government's position on this.
- 4 Assuming it is resolved for the other four teams, but
- 5 not for Mr. Binalshibh's team, and therefore until it is
- 6 resolved by Mr. Binalshibh's team, if it is not severed, then
- 7 that will slow down all five other -- all the other four
- 8 cases, okay? Do you have the factual predicate to my
- 9 question?
- **10** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: So the government's position is no matter
- 12 how long it takes, that even if we could move the other four
- 13 forward, you oppose severance of the Binalshibh case?
- 14 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I wouldn't say it's our position no
- 15 matter how long it takes. Clearly we think that there is
- 16 significant progress that has been made recently with the
- 17 disclosure of classified information to Mr. Binalshibh's
- 18 detailed independent counsel, but clearly we feel like
- 19 additional time to resolve that, if necessary, is still in the
- 20 interests of justice to maintain the joint trial, even if the
- 21 other four are not moving forward.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: When we first had this discussion in
- 23 August, it was when you asked me to reconsider the severance

- 1 motion, and I held it in abeyance at the government's request.
- 2 In August the timeline was, well, this will be resolved by
- 3 October, okay? The October hearings were canceled because
- 4 there was nothing productive that could have been done because
- 5 it wasn't resolved. December rolls around, and again not
- 6 resolved, and the hearings are essentially canceled because of
- 7 that reason. We conducted two 802s with counsel, but nothing.
- 8 Now it is February, okay, and 292 is again
- 9 unresolved, and again I may be privy -- well, I am privy to
- 10 information that you are not.
- **11** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: And I am just saying, you say more time.
- 13 If it takes another year to resolve it for Mr. Binalshibh's
- 14 team and the other four are resolved, the government says we
- 15 want to wait a year to try this case, to get this case back on
- **16** path? Is that what you are saying?
- 17 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: One year from the date today, sir, is
- **18** that your hypothetical?
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: That's what I am saying, one year next --
- 20 what I am saying is you say the government doesn't say, no
- **21** matter how long it takes.
- 22 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Right.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Again, when this first discussion started,

- 1 the timeframe was August to October. So already, quite2 frankly, this has delayed everything since last April. I'm
- 3 not placing blame on either side, but at least since July,
- 4 when 292QQ was issued -- and, again, it has been asked to be
- 5 reconsidered, so I'm not deciding that it doesn't apply to the
- 6 other two -- other four, I'm sorry.
- 7 But since July, 292QQ was being issued, it's been
- 8 focused on one particular team. In August you said if it
- 9 takes until October it doesn't make any difference. Now we
- 10 are seven months later -- six months later in February and we
- 11 are still -- it's unresolved, and the government's pleading
- 12 saying unless the issue of severance has already been
- 13 predetermined -- and quite frankly, I don't predetermine
- 14 issues until I hear from the parties, the outstanding motions
- 15 surrounding the potential conflict of interests must and
- 16 should be resolved first. And so I'm just trying to figure
- 17 out how long are we talking about.
- 18 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Right. And clearly I am at a little
- 19 bit of a disadvantage in this argument, only because I don't
- 20 know everything that you believe to be unresolved. I do know
- 21 from the public filings of the Special Review Team that the
- 22 Special Review Team believes that you have everything that you
- 23 need to be able to make a determination yourself as the

- 1 military judge as to whether or not a conflict exists.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. At the end of the day, I understand
- 3 that a decision is going to be made about when it is resolved.
- 4 Okay? The SRT has got their view on it.
- **5** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Right.
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Other counsel may have their view on it
- 7 and, quite frankly, the only view that counts is when I think
- 8 it is resolved.
- **9** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: And I don't think it's resolved today.
- **11** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I understand.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: And my question is how long -- and I
- 13 want -- how long does the government maintain that we should
- 14 delay the other four until this issue is resolved? We have
- 15 already resolved it -- it's been seven months since you
- 16 requested reconsideration of the severance order.
- **17** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- **18** MJ [COL POHL]: Do you wish to confer?
- 19 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: At some point I am going to need to
- 20 confer, but I think what's important from the prosecution's
- 21 standpoint is that a severance right now is -- whatever little
- 22 short-term gain we receive, is going to be followed by a lot
- 23 of long-term pain for the government, for the judiciary, for

1 all of the resources that need to be used ----2 MJ [COL POHL]: Don't worry about the judiciary, okay? 3 will take care of that. I understand you are trying the case 4 twice. I got that. But don't worry about the judiciary. 5 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I understand. But it's not just 6 trying -- it's not just trying the case twice, it's litigating 7 all of these intertwined pretrial issues that may take quite a 8 long time prior to trial. 9 And at some point -- and I was trying to anticipate 10 what type of questions you may ask. And clearly there may be 11 a time when severance would be appropriate, and that's if 12 trial is set, we are on the eve of trial -- at some point due 13 to no fault of the prosecution, maybe an entire defense team 14 is disqualified on the eve of trial, at that point it might be 15 appropriate for severance. We are not there. We are not at 16 that stage because we have no deadlines set. There's no 17 discovery deadlines, there is no motion deadlines, there is no 18 trial deadlines, there is no evidentiary hearing deadlines. 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Isn't one reason why there are no deadlines because we have to resolve 292 first? You say that 20 21 in your own pleading. How could I set deadlines for anything 22 if there is still an outstanding question about defense

23

counsel on one team?

1 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: There hasn't been deadlines at any 2 point in time with the exception of the signing of the MOU 3 from the beginning. So that's just -- that's the reality of 4 what we are dealing with. Had there been deadlines and had we 5 been bumping up against deadlines, then I think the analysis 6 for severance is different. But in the absence of those 7 deadlines, without explaining or blaming anyone for the lack 8 of deadlines, because we have the lack of deadlines, because 9 we do not have any certainty moving forward, that it is still 10 appropriate to maintain this trial as a joint trial and 11 resolve the AE 292 issues. 12 And this is -- certainly in light of the events of 13 this morning it's clear that all five defense counsel believe 14 that they have to litigate issues that arose this week. 15 because of that, those are all going to be joint issues as 16 well. We are certainly not conceding that the Special Review 17 Team has to handle those, but at some point they are going to 18 be joint regardless. So there is a tremendous amount of 19 discovery coming down the pipe. 20 Just within this last month the defense counsel 21 requested the 6 million pages that the Senate Select Committee 22 on Intelligence used in their drafting of their report. They 23 want to see the entire 6,000-page report. These are all

- 1 issues that they are joining together. These are all
- 2 discovery issues that are going to come up as we proceed
- 3 toward trial that all need to be handled under -- many of them
- 4 under the 505 process. There is a tremendous amount of hard
- 5 litigation to come, and that's going to have to come at some
- 6 point after -- and should come after the resolution of 292.
- 7 It's clearly not the government's position that it's going to
- 8 take another year to resolve it.
- 9 Again, I don't know what I don't know. I'm at a
- 10 disadvantage here. Your Honor, you know far more about what
- 11 you are thinking about in regard to the conflict and what you
- 12 are thinking about in regard to what else needs to be
- 13 resolved. But we have made significant progress -- the SRT
- 14 has made significant progress in the continual updates to, as
- 15 well as the providing of classified information to independent
- 16 defense counsel.
- 17 And it's important to note too that this is the
- 18 visible part of the trial. But in actuality right now the
- 19 hearings for this trial are a very small portion of what's
- 20 going on. And what's going on, there is a tremendous amount
- 21 of work that can go on and continue to go on throughout
- 22 whatever delays it takes for the Special Review Team and
- 23 independent counsel to resolve this 292 issue. There is

- 1 discovery requests that come in almost every day. There is
- 2 discovery responses that goes out. There is affirmative
- 3 discovery that go out. There is continual filings, none of
- 4 which are stopping, including from Mr. Harrington himself, who
- 5 is also filing continuing motions. So there is tremendous
- 6 amount of progress that's being made, it's just not visible.
- 7 And I can understand the frustration in that there
- 8 are some things that are outstanding that Your Honor feels he
- 9 can't get to and resolve, but there still is a tremendous
- 10 amount of activity going on, there is a tremendous amount of
- 11 progress being made, and we think that that progress is still
- 12 best utilized by continuing to work the process outside of the
- 13 court while the court resolves the 292 issue.
- 14 So we don't anticipate it being a year. Again, I
- 15 don't know what I don't know on that, but it is clearly our
- 16 position that it should be resolved in a fairly timely manner,
- 17 again notwithstanding how this recent development may impact
- 18 that as well.
- So our position -- and I would like to confer -- if
- 20 you need a specific answer on this, if it takes one year, I
- 21 would like to confer on that.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: My only -- my real question is this: This
- 23 thing, like many investigations or many processes, gets

- 1 piecemealed. And when we sit in August -- we say August,
- 2 that's two full months away, it doesn't seem that far away.
- 3 And now we are in February from August and maybe it will be
- 4 resolved by next summer, maybe not. I don't know. Next week
- 5 would be hardly unlikely, but it may be resolved in a month,
- 6 it may not be. But the government position is because we
- 7 don't know, I'll tell you I don't know, okay, when it's going
- 8 to be resolved, or resolvable. I just want to make it very
- 9 clear, the government position is, as in your pleading, that
- 10 until 292 is resolved, we can't go forward on other stuff.
- 11 Now 350 may create a different issue which we may be able to
- 12 go forward on, I got that. But the substantive -- as you list
- 13 48 motions that are out there that need to be discussed and
- 14 resolved, the government position is until 292 is resolved,
- 15 the government wants -- opposes severance, for want of a
- 16 better term, no matter whether it takes two months, four
- 17 months, six months -- it's already taken seven, and I'm doing
- 18 it from July now. It has already taken since that time. So
- 19 just so I am clear, the government position is we oppose any
- 20 severance at this time, understanding it may be months before
- **21** 292 is resolved?
- 22 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, that is the government's
- 23 position. At some point if we are told by the Special Review

- 1 Team, without getting into classified information, that this
- 2 is going to take -- if we have a more definitive timeframe and
- 3 that timeframe is a longer time than we are willing to wait to
- 4 maintain a joint trial to bring justice to the families, then
- 5 we may come back at some point and say at this point we
- **6** would ----
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me ask you a question, because your
- 8 response precipitates this: Do you understand the need for
- 9 the Special Review Team to do the substantive work on 292 and
- 10 the regular prosecution team be walled off?
- **11** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Do you feel that wall would prevent the
- 13 SRT from telling you about when they anticipate an
- 14 investigation or whatever or resolution of this thing?
- 15 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I would like to confer on that, if I
- 16 can get a second.
- **17** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Go ahead.
- 18 Mr. Trivett.
- 19 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you, sir. We have obviously
- 20 had limited coordination with the SRT mostly on administrative
- 21 matters. There is always someone there monitoring to ensure
- 22 that nothing that may be privileged is made privy to the
- 23 normal prosecution team. That being said, it's an

- 1 administrative -- we believe it's an administrative process to
- 2 ask them how long they believe, that will be appropriate for
- 3 us to talk to them about. And we would actually like to be
- 4 able to do that now, to get as much information as possible
- 5 under the protocol that we have in place to determine how long
- 6 they think this may be to resolve before giving you a final
- 7 answer. But clearly it would have to be a period longer than
- 8 April or June timeframe. Clearly within those next two
- 9 sessions we believe it's completely appropriate.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: You understand they will give you their
- 11 view of what the timeline is ----
- **12** MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I understand that.
- MJ [COL POHL]: ---- which may not be the same as my view,
- 14 you understand that? That was the nature of my question.
- **15** Okay.
- 16 But, again, remember it's -- okay. If your position
- 17 changes on severance, it was your motion that asked me to
- 18 reconsider it, so if you want me to reconsider the
- 19 reconsideration because of the timeframe, feel free to do it.
- 20 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Are you with me on the procedure in this?
- 22 What I am saying is it was placed in abeyance at the
- 23 government's request.

- 1 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Right. 2 MJ [COL POHL]: I brought it back up this time just to 3 make it clear as to where we are going forward, and I may be 4 bringing it up every time we meet ----5 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I understand. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- just to see -- because the government 7 appears to be adamant no severance and equally adamant that 8 292 must be resolved and obviously 350. Okay. Got it. Thank 9 you. That's all I want on that. 10 MDTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Connell, on the 505(h) hearing?
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Yes, we are back to 350 on that. Given

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: With respect to 350, sir.

- 14 that -- and I don't know -- well, given that I have no
- 15 response from the defense on the pleadings or anything else,
- 16 is it ripe to have that hearing now, or would it be more
- 17 useful to have it once the issue is more fully developed?
- 18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir, that will be fine.
- MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, it just strikes to me it's not
- **20** ripe.

12

- 21 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No, no, I was rushing to get my
- 22 materials together for it. So, I mean, it makes sense to me
- 23 that additional facts may emerge in the near future.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. That being said, is there anything
- 2 else we can accomplish during these sessions? I am turning to
- 3 the government. General Martins?
- 4 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, our position is that we have
- 5 lots of motions to address. If the commission's resolve is
- 6 that we are not going to complete 292, we are here. If 350 is
- 7 something the commission seeks to proceed to, I draw attention
- 8 to our pleading on 350, which was -- and it's on page 4 of
- **9** that -- if the commission decides to go down this road.
- 10 There were representations of counsel this morning,
- 11 defense counsel, that we were seeking this relief regardless.
- 12 We are seeking that relief if the commission decides it needs
- 13 to take it up and continue. So we are here. We are all here.
- 14 It's an accelerated timeline. Why don't we get that done?
- 15 Let's work on it.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm not sure, what do you mean, "Get that
- 17 done."
- 18 CP [BG MARTINS]: In terms of if that's on the docket, we
- 19 are all here. You approved an accelerated timeline,
- 20 Your Honor, and we have a 505(h), we do a
- 21 use/relevance/admissibility of what needs to be done in a
- 22 classified session or closed session, if necessary, we request
- 23 that you make an 806 determination for all of that. There is

- 1 lots of work that we could do. We are all down here.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: One moment, please. In the 334C, dealing
- 3 with the government motion for amendment of the docket sheet,
- 4 the government says, "The outstanding motions surrounding the
- 5 potential conflict of interest, including the SRT's motion to
- 6 reconsider, must and should be resolved first."
- 7 If that needs to be resolved first, how can we do
- 8 anything on 350 this week?
- 9 CP [BG MARTINS]: That was before 350 and we have ----
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me ask you this: Conceptually, why
- 11 does 350 change that? What I am saying is 292 needs to be
- 12 resolved before we can do anything else because the issue is
- 13 whether or not one defense team should be -- can or should be
- **14** representing one accused. Does 350 change that?
- 15 CP [BG MARTINS]: We haven't received their pleadings on
- **16** it and ----
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm sorry, on what?
- 18 CP [BG MARTINS]: We haven't received their pleadings on
- 19 it, don't know what relief they seek, we don't know what
- 20 allegations they make, if it's something deserving relief. We
- 21 prefer to examine that before we determine what the impact is.
- 22 There was some suggestion by defense counsel for
- 23 Mr. Binalshibh that he was fusing it somehow with 292, so we

- 1 would like to view that, give them an a accelerated timeframe
- 2 to respond, let's have the 505(h) that counsel have sought and
- 3 appear to be gearing up to do and ----
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: What are we going to accomplish with the
- **5** 505(h)?
- **6** CP [BG MARTINS]: I'm sorry?
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: What's going to be accomplished with the
- 8 505(h) hearing given the fact that we have no other pleadings.
- **9** Right now all we have is your pleading.
- 10 CP [BG MARTINS]: Right. Your Honor, we would just ----
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Which isn't really a pleading, it is
- 12 simply a request for a court order.
- 13 CP [BG MARTINS]: If the court sees it necessary to take
- 14 it up -- you had spoke this morning about giving them a chance
- 15 to respond. Let's do that while we are here and look at what
- 16 we have got at that point and then have another scheduling
- 17 determination. We could then meet with across -- using the
- 18 protocol, meet with the Special Review Team on this aspect of
- 19 seeing if there is anything we can appropriately get regarding
- 20 to timeline, but do not -- we are not supporting calling it
- **21** quits for the week.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: But how can Mr. Binalshibh's team
- 23 participate in the 350 litigation when 292 is still out there?

- 1 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, we are getting discovery
- 2 requests, all sorts of pleadings in writing from defense
- **3** counsel right now.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Well then, how do you say the positions of
- **5** 292 ----
- **6** CP [BG MARTINS]: That was prior to this arising of this
- **7** 350 matter.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: The 350 matter, okay. Let me ask you
- 9 this: Prior to 350 being raised, why was it the government's
- 10 position that 292 must be resolved before anything else can be
- **11** addressed?
- 12 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, I prefer not to answer 292
- 13 questions. You have got the position of the United States on
- 14 292 from the Special Review Team. My position is that we not
- 15 simply recess until some other time, that we at this point
- 16 allow us to meet with the Special Review Team, we have this
- 17 350 matter, which was not present, as you have acknowledged,
- 18 when we filed our 334 filing, and let's hold open the
- 19 possibility we can get some productive work done.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I understand your position, but I find
- 21 it a little inconsistent that on the one hand you say I don't
- 22 want to address the 292 issues because that's for the SRT, but
- 23 in a pleading submitted by I believe you and Mr. Trivett, you

- 1 do address the 292 issues.
- 2 And again, my question goes back to why can't we --
- 3 you had that position before 350, because I am assuming it
- 4 meant that you had concerns whether one team could
- **5** participate.
- 6 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, I understand you perceive
- 7 that we are on the horns of a dilemma and inconsistent. I
- 8 would like to confer and we would like to have an opportunity
- 9 to provide you an answer to that. What I am requesting is
- 10 that we not just quit for the week.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Well, I will listen to an argument
- 12 if we can do anything more. I'm sure the defense wants to be
- 13 heard on it also.
- 14 Let's do this. You need to confer. Defense probably
- 15 needs to talk to each other. I'm always amenable to move
- 16 things along if they can be moved along. What is your
- 17 proposed timeline there, General Martins, so the defense knows
- 18 what you are talking about to see so they can provide a cogent
- **19** response?
- 20 CP [BG MARTINS]: It is 1142. I recommend we recess for
- 21 lunch and if there is a prayer time near that ----
- **22** MJ [COL POHL]: I think it's 1215.
- 23 CP [BG MARTINS]: ---- we have a chance to do what we

- 1 said, talk to the Special Review Team, come back after that,
- 2 and then we can discuss those scheduling matters and I may
- 3 have a better answer to your question.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Let's do this. We will take an extended
- 5 lunch break. No decision obviously has been made about going
- 6 forward. We will reconvene at 1400. During that time, Trial
- 7 Counsel, you obviously do what you need to do. Also confer
- 8 with defense, when you talk about an expedited schedule, what
- 9 you mean in reality. And then, defense, you will get your
- 10 opportunity to respond, and then after 1400 we will decide the
- 11 way forward. All is clear?
- 12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Just one question.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure.
- 14 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Would we be permitted to sit in on the
- 15 discussion with the Special Review Team about an estimate of
- 16 time? It seems to me we should be permitted to do that.
- **17** MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel?
- **18** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I join that.
- **19** MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel?
- 20 CP [BG MARTINS]: We oppose that, Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Do you have any authority for that
- 22 position, Mr. Nevin?
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: They are supposedly walled off from the

- 1 Special Review Team, but now the wall is going to come down a
- 2 little bit or a brick is going to get pulled out or something.
- 3 And we are walled off as well because the Special Review Team
- 4 is not providing us with this information.
- 5 So again it's a situation where the information is
- 6 not going to be spread evenly and it's not classified. There
- 7 is nothing -- there shouldn't be any problem with conveying
- 8 that information.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Your concern is that it may extend beyond
- 10 the discussions of time?
- 11 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: My only concern is that if -- the
- 12 regular prosecution team has taken the position that it's
- 13 walled off from this part of the case. If they are not going
- 14 to be walled off anymore, then we are having kind of a change
- 15 in circumstances here, and I would just like to be part of it.
- **16** It seems that that would only be fair.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: General Martins, you understand what the
- 18 risk of any contact with the SRT is?
- 19 CP [BG MARTINS]: We do, Your Honor. We do, Your Honor.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And so any discussions you have
- **21** with them ----
- 22 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, we have a protocol in place
- 23 to ensure that no privileged matters, and that the wall has

1	integrity and that it's in place.
2	MJ [COL POHL]: Do you envision there is anything you
3	would discuss with them that you could not disclose to the
4	defense?
5	CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, I would propose that we
6	recess, allow us to confer. You have posed a number of
7	questions. We oppose this suggestion of the defense.
8	MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin, I understand your position.
9	There may be many ways to document the communication between
10	the two. The risks the government takes are obviously the
11	risk the government takes on how far they go on it.
12	Since the issue just came up, I am going to give time
13	for people to think their way ahead. So at this time I am not
14	going to order you that the defense be there for any type of
15	discussion between the SRT and the regular prosecutors.
16	That being said, we are in recess until 1400.
17	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1146, 11 February 2015.]
18	[END OF PAGE]
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	