1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1403, 20 July 2 2016.] 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Commission is called to order. Trial 4 Counsel, any changes? 5 CP [BG MARTINS]: No. Your Honor. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Defense, any changes? Apparently not. 7 Mr. Bin'Attash, let me make sure I phrase this 8 exactly how I want you to answer, okay? Are you requesting 9 that Mr. Schwartz be removed without replacement, or are you 10 requesting whether Mr. Schwartz be removed with replacement? 11 ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: I request the removal of the 12 attorney Michael Schwartz. I would like a replacement, but if 13 the replacement took time, I'm not in a hurry for that. 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. 15 ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: The important thing is that the 16 courts and the procedures continue and there would be no 17 delays. 18 MJ [COL POHL]: My same question, just to clarify, because 19 I reviewed the record of previous proceedings with regard to

paguant 2

replacement or be removed without replacement? Which is your

position: Do you want Ms. Bormann to be removed with

23 request?

20

21

22

Ms. Bormann, but I want to make sure I understand your current

- **1** ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: I request that would be removed
- 2 from the team. There would be a replacement, but I give the
- 3 same answer that I gave before. The proceedings would
- 4 continue as-is. Any motions that I lose or does not get
- 5 discussed, I take responsibility and I assume responsibility
- **6** for that.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. Some of the things said
- 8 here may impact, arguably, potentially, on some of the other
- **9** defense teams. Do any of them want to be heard? Mr. Nevin?
- 10 You don't have to be. I just -- some of the remarks, I
- 11 think -- I want to make sure that your clients all understand
- 12 kind of where we're at.
- 13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: [Microphone button not pushed; no
- **14** audio.]
- **15** MJ [COL POHL]: Sure. Sure.
- 16 Mr. Harrington, do you want to be heard on this?
- 17 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: In just a minute, Judge. Thanks.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Connell? Same? Okay. Okay. Take
- **19** your time.
- 20 [Pause.]
- 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thanks for the opportunity, Your Honor,
- 22 but I don't have additional comments or any comments to make.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.

- 1 Mr. Harrington. 2 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, I've read 505(d) many, many 3 times now, and I don't think it's the best crafted section 4 that we have. But General Baker mentioned this morning that 5 subsection (A) about defense counsel talks about before 6 there's an attorney-client relationship, counsel being removed 7 without cause, and then this subsection (B) talks in 8 subsection (ii) about good cause for the record, and obviously 9 the difficulty we struggle with today, I think, is in the 10 middle of subsection (B) and subsection (i).
- this morning, I think there wasn't enough emphasis placed on the word "may" in your discretion, and had it been that there's no cause required, that the word wouldn't say "may"; it would say shall excuse somebody if either the accused asked for it, or if counsel asked to be relieved.

But I think -- and when I listened to the argument

- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: But arguably, the "may" language applies 18 to good cause also.
- 19 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Well, I don't know that it has to 20 be -- I mean, good cause is a ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: I would -- let me explain.
- **22** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Right.

11

MJ [COL POHL]: I don't want to go too far down that road

because I think, frankly, if the court found there was good 1 2 cause the "may" becomes awfully close to a "shall," if you 3 find good cause ----4 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I agree with that. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- the wav it's drafted. I tend to 6 agree with you it's not the best worded. I'm not sure which 7 is the best worded of these rules, but it's certainly ----8 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: But focusing just on subsection (i) 9 when it has "may" in there, it seems to me that that means 10 that there has to be some reason, whether we call it cause or 11 not good cause, whatever we call it, that there has to be 12 reason and different factors may impact on that, how close you 13 are to trial, how long the person has been involved in the 14 case, what role they play on the defense and all of the rest 15 of those things would obviously enter into the court's 16 discretion, and the court could conceivably say no when either 17 counsel asks for the -- or the accused asks for it, so that 18 there's no mandatory part of that. 19 So I think that it's not quite the open way that 20 Mr. Ryan argued today that somebody -- a defendant walks in 21 and says I don't want this guy and that guy's gone. I don't 22 think that's it at all. I think that there has to be some 23 merit or some reason to it. And you have very, very broad

- **1** discretion, according to the way this is written, in how you
- 2 do it. That was the only point that I wanted to raise.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- 4 Mr. Connell?
- 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, our position aligns with
- 6 virtually all of the parties in some extent and disagrees with
- 7 them in all extent.
- 8 The problem with the government's waiver idea is that
- 9 it doesn't apply in the Sixth Amendment context for this
- 10 particular reason: The Sixth Amendment, unlike virtually
- 11 every other right that a defendant has, is a right -- is the
- 12 right to counsel also contains the right not to have counsel.
- 13 There was -- and it's different from most rights where you can
- 14 simply have a waiver of it and then it goes away.
- 15 In one of the military commission's questions which I
- 16 thought was insightful, the commission asked the government,
- 17 are you saying this is like a sort of mini Farretta situation,
- 18 and the fact that Farretta provides a right not to be
- 19 represented by counsel as well as <a href="Gideon">Gideon</a> providing a right to
- 20 be represented by counsel, means that the third category that
- 21 the government is -- seems to be angling for of you could just
- 22 simply waive some counsel and that would be fine doesn't
- 23 exist.

1 There are really only two boxes here, and the 2 significance of that is the -- if there is a right not to be 3 represented by some particular counsel, then that is 4 Mr. Bin'Attash's right under this sort of mini Farretta 5 analysis. If on the other hand there is no right, then it's a 6 rule-based analysis, and the military commission constructs 7 the Rule 505, Rule for Military Commission 505, as best it 8 can. 9 But the idea that the government can come up here and 10 analyze the situation as it's gotten very bad, there's almost 11 no hope, it's coming to a head, we're at a crisis point, but 12 at the same time it could take the position that, well -- and 13 all of that can be solved by a simple waiver is not consistent 14 with the unusual binary nature of the Sixth Amendment, which 15 has both a right to counsel and a right not to have counsel. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Did you -- I know this wasn't your motion, 17 but did you read the government's pleading? 18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I did. 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And if I am misstating this, I'm 20 sure Mr. Ryan will correct me, but there appears to be at 21 least some argument about waiver of -- when you talk about 22 waiver of learned counsel, in that the cases that they rely on 23 for that proposition really are all pro se cases.

- 1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: In fact, most of these waiver cases, the
- 3 choice is pro se or not pro se.
- **4** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: And perhaps I misunderstood him, but I
- 6 thought he said that the accused could waive learned counsel,
- 7 as long as it's a knowing waiver, without good cause.
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right. And I don't think that's -- I
- 9 don't think that's accurate.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Perhaps I misunderstood him, but I thought
- 11 that that's what he said.
- 12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And I understand why the government is
- 13 doing it. I'm not blaming them for it. They're trying to
- 14 create a very careful category where Mr. Bin'Attash could
- 15 basically eviscerate his lawyers -- his legal team but still
- 16 have it be minimally legally sufficient. I understand. It
- 17 strategically makes sense as a position.
- 18 But legally it doesn't make sense as a position,
- 19 because either -- and, you know, I think the reason why most
- 20 of these cases are pro se cases is because it is difficult for
- 21 judges to walk the line between respecting both the right to
- 22 counsel and respecting the right not to have an attorney.
- 23 I've always -- I've always felt that the bench has a

- 1 difficult, you know, line that it has to walk there. But it
- 2 is binary. There's not some third category of you could
- 3 simply waive some aspects and maintain other aspects.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah.
- 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
- 7 Mr. Ruiz, do you wish to be heard on this?
- **8** LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I do not.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Perry, do you have anything to add?
- **10** That was a no?
- 11 DC [MR. PERRY]: No, Your Honor.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: General Baker, anything further? And then
- 13 to end this, Mr. Ryan, you will have the last word. You will
- 14 have the second to the last word.
- 15 CDC [BG BAKER]: Very briefly, Your Honor, as I looked
- 16 again at Rule 505, and I know we're almost at the point where
- 17 we're beating a dead horse, but it's important. When you look
- 18 at 505...(B)(i), the accused -- at the request of the accused
- 19 or at the application for withdrawal by such counsel, there's
- 20 no specific good cause tied in there except for as I've argued
- 21 before. But certainly, you have required good cause. There's
- 22 a requirement for good cause when an attorney requests to be
- 23 withdrawn. Similarly, there's a good cause -- again, to go

- 1 back to my argument, there's a good cause requirement when the
- 2 accused requests to change counsel.
- 3 So you know, in that good cause -- in that good cause
- 4 requirement is captured because in, A, there's a requirement
- 5 that you can excuse an attorney without showing good cause,
- 6 but then when you get down to B, we're in the showing good
- 7 cause stage, and certainly upon the application for withdrawal
- 8 by such counsel, you have required good cause.
- **9** That's all I have, sir.
- **10** MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
- 11 Mr. Ryan? As I said, the second to the last word.
- 12 Go ahead.
- TC [MR. RYAN]: Your Honor, the -- I just want to make one
- 14 last point with regard to the issue of waiver of learned
- 15 counsel. In the earlier version of the Military Commissions
- 16 Act there was no provision for learned counsel. In current
- 17 military practice, as I understand it, there is no provision
- 18 for learned counsel to be provided to a servicemember accused
- 19 in a capital case.
- 20 Congress, in the Military Commissions Act that we
- 21 serve under right now, provided for learned counsel, as I
- 22 said, for the first time; and then in discussing the issue of
- 23 pro se, certainly allowed for the accused to go pro se if he

- 1 so wishes, and only then put in the provision that detailed
- 2 military counsel will remain as ----
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: But that was in the context of a pro se
- 4 representation and detailed counsel will be the stand-by
- **5** counsel.
- 6 TC [MR. RYAN]: I agree. That is correct. I do agree
- 7 that it is not completely on all fours by any stretch. My
- 8 only point in making this is Congress, in putting this
- 9 together, has not seen learned counsel -- I shouldn't say --
- 10 has provided for learned counsel but has also provided that
- 11 there are circumstances that they believe -- that Congress
- 12 believes it would become unnecessary. And that would be the
- 13 pro se context, I agree, but still, keeping detailed military
- **14** only and letting, for the expulsionary ----
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: But you would agree with me that even
- 16 under a pro se issue, if you had a learned counsel who had
- 17 been on the case for four or five years, there would be
- 18 certain discretion to tell them to stay on the case as a
- **19** stand-by counsel.
- TC [MR. RYAN]: I do, Judge. I absolutely do. I think
- 21 that's where we go from statute to the wise discretion of a
- 22 judge who has to run a courtroom, and I recognize that
- 23 discretion.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- 2 The commission agrees with the defense that they
- 3 deserve an answer today before we go forward, that
- 4 Mr. Bin'Attash deserves an answer today to go forward, and
- 5 there will be a specific ruling that was put out.
- 6 The regulation is not as clear as it could be, but
- 7 I'm not sure it really makes too much difference because I
- 8 think you go back to what the -- and I'm not addressing the
- 9 issue about whether -- what parts of the Constitution apply to
- 10 this commission or do not apply, but I think on an issue like
- 11 this, we have to look at what the appellate courts have said,
- 12 as everybody is aware of, that this commission falls under the
- 13 direct appellate authority of the D.C. Circuit Court of
- **14** Appeals.
- 15 In general I don't do this, but I'm going to read
- 16 from Bostick, which is a 2015 opinion from that court. And
- 17 this is a case involving indigent defendants.
- 18 "When a defendant asks the district court to replace
- 19 appointed counsel, the court generally has an obligation to
- 20 engage the defendant in a colloquy on the record for the cause
- 21 of the defendant's dissatisfaction" ----
- 22 ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] Slow down.
- 23 Please, slow down. No translation.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Got it. I'll start again. I know how
- **2** Mr. Connell feels.
- 3 "When a defendant asks the district court to replace
- 4 appointed counsel, the court generally has an obligation to
- 5 engage the defendant in a colloquy on the record concerning
- 6 the cause of the defendant's dissatisfaction with his
- 7 representation. The defendant bears the burden of showing
- 8 good cause to replace appointed counsel."
- 9 Now, <u>Bostick</u> is not a replacement case. <u>Bostick</u> is a
- 10 removal case. The facts of Bostick is he wanted to remove a
- 11 counsel. He wasn't talking about replacing counsel. The
- 12 District Court in Bostick, though, took the language from the
- 13 replacement situation and applied it to the removal situation.
- 14 In some ways that doesn't really impact on what we're doing
- 15 here because my understanding is, from what Mr. Bin'Attash has
- 16 said, is we're talking about replacement anyway. But
- 17 following the language of <u>Bostick</u>, the direction of <u>Bostick</u>,
- 18 which I feel I'm compelled to do, is it really doesn't make
- 19 any difference whether it's removal or replacement, there's a
- 20 good cause requirement to be shown.
- 21 Accordingly, it is -- and, again, it's a little
- 22 unclear. This really, I believe, started out as a government
- 23 motion, oral motion, so I'm going to treat it as such just for

1	this ruling.
2	The government's motion for Mr. Schwartz to be
3	excused at the request of Mr. Bin'Attash under the state of
4	the record is denied. The court commission holds that for
5	excusal of counsel under these circumstances, it adheres to
6	its other original finding that good cause is required and
7	that accordingly, since no good cause exists, the request to
8	excuse Mr. Schwartz is denied.
9	And just so everybody is clear, is and there will
10	be again, like I said, there will be a written ruling
11	coming, but I want to make sure Mr. Bin'Attash understands
12	that his options are to take the defense team or to represent
13	himself. Those are the two options.
14	Given the nature of this issue and quite frankly,
15	obviously, the emotionalism that was displayed earlier in the
16	case, I want to give Mr. Bin'Attash an opportunity to think
17	about the way ahead. Accordingly, I'm going to recess early
18	today, and tomorrow we begin at 0900 with AE 355.
19	The commission is in recess.
20	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1427, 20 July 2016.]
21	[END OF PAGE]
22	

23