1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1120,
2 29 October 2015.]

MJ [COL POHL]: Commission is called to order. At least
from my perspective, all parties again are present that were
present when the commission recessed. If that's incorrect,
let me know.

7 I hear nothing; therefore, that is correct. Okay. 8 Again, as stated before we recessed, I want to 9 address part of 350, and that deals with the -- what I'm 10 referring to as the Touhy notice requirements. Okay? So --11 and this may end up being more question and answer, but, 12 Mr. Connell, are you first out of the box for the defense? 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Your Honor, the military commission 14 clearly has some unclassified path in mind. I do want to say 15 that I have five arguments on the <u>Touhy</u> issue, and one of them 16 is classified.

17 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: So I'm not sure that we're able to19 dance around the need for a 505(h) hearing.

20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Let's start the dance, and then
21 we'll see whether we can complete it.

22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir. I just wanted to be clear23 that I have moved for a 505(h) hearing, and I want to be

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 heard ----

MJ [COL POHL]: I got it. I got it. If necessary, we will do that, like I said, following the process. I have what I think is a relatively narrow <u>Touhy</u> issue, and I just want to make sure, if we can address it now, perhaps we can move this issue further down the road, rather than not. Okay.

7 Let me ask you this: The defense, okay, under <u>Touhy</u>,
8 when you're requesting in this case an agency witness, what do
9 you believe the defense has to provide under <u>Touhy</u> and the
10 relevant CIA regulations?

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: So every agency's <u>Touhy</u> regs are
different. The CIA <u>Touhy</u> regulations are found at 32 Code of
Federal Regulations 1905.1 to .4. The regulations -- these
particular regulations impose no specific duty on the defense.

15 The operative language -- and I have lots of reasons 16 why these regulations themselves don't even apply in our 17 current situation. And I'm happy to begin the argument on 18 that, though one of those arguments is classified. But I want 19 to answer your specific question as well.

There are two actual requirements that are contained within these <u>Touhy</u> regulations that impose a duty upon someone to do something. The first of those is found at 1905.4, and that is subsection (a), "when a demand for production is made

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 upon an employee" -- and we're going to have to come back to 2 that word "employee," because it's important -- "the employee 3 shall immediately notify the litigation division, which shall 4 follow the procedures set forth in this section."

So in section (a) it imposes, these regulations
impose a duty on two different bodies. The first of those is
the employee, a notification requirement, and the second of
those is the office of general counsel, which has to follow
the regulations.

10 The second duty which is imposed in 1905.4 is found 11 in subsection (d), and it says, "If oral or written testimony 12 is sought by a demand in a case or matter in which the CIA is 13 not a party," put an asterisk there, "a reasonably detailed 14 description of the testimony sought in the form of an 15 affidavit or, if that is not feasible, a written statement by 16 the parties seeking the testimony or by the party's attorney 17 must be furnished to the CIA Office of General Counsel."

So the duty of the party's attorney in that situation is to produce an affidavit or a written statement. We have done so in 350A and in 350Y. There is no duty imposed upon the defense to be the party who furnishes it to the CIA Office of General Counsel, and I can only assume that the prosecution has done so.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Let me -- you -- my question is, is 2 you believe you complied with your <u>Touhy</u> notice, for want of a 3 better term, in which exhibits again, please? 4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: A, 350A, and 350Y, those are the 5 505(q) notices. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: And those are classified? 7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The notices themselves are 8 unclassified. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But how about the underlying 10 document? Isn't there an underlying exhibit? 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. Both ----12 MJ [COL POHL]: My question -- and, again, this is why I 13 don't need to talk about classified, I'm just saying, because 14 my first question is: Do you believe you've complied with the 15 <u>Touny</u> notice requirement? And, if so, which specific exhibits 16 contain that notice, understanding it may be a classified 17 exhibit? So I'm not talking about what's in it, just a 18 number. 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right. 350A and Y. I believe that 20 those documents themselves are unclassified. 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But is your Touhy notice contained 22 in that or in the underlying classified document? 23 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: All right. I wanted to be a hundred

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 percent clear on a couple of things.

2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: First, we have not gotten to the point
4 of whether these regulations apply in this situation in this
5 tribunal.

6 MJ [COL POHL]: I've got that.

7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I understand you're trying to do it
8 the easy way first, and I get that. I would do the same
9 thing. That's not with any sort of judgment. The easy way
10 is, well, if the <u>Touhy</u> regulation is complied with, then we
11 don't have to make any decisions on whether it applies or not.

All that is required of the party seeking testimony, which also requires an asterisk, because in the military commission the prosecution is always the party seeking testimony. They are responsible for all witnesses. But in its narrowest reading, a written statement by the party seeking the testimony or by the party's attorney, that is what we have produced.

19 MJ [COL POHL]: Back to my question.

20 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: In our 505(g) notices, which are 350A
21 and 350Y ----

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So 350A and 350Y are the 505(g)
notices, the unclassified notices, and underlying them is

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 classified information ----

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: In 350, in 350C, in 350H.
MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I'm just saying if -- and, again, I

4 know you want to be heard on what you have to do, but I just5 want to get this little box drawn for me.

6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's right.

7 MJ [COL POHL]: What specific exhibits, classified or
8 unclassified, by number, constitute your <u>Touhy</u> notice?

9 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: 350A and 350Y are the notices
10 themselves. They incorporate, by reference, the information
11 in AE 350, AE 350C, and AE 350H.

MJ [COL POHL]: And some of those are classified?
LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right. There is -- I should add 350X
as well.

15 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it. Okay.

16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And in 3500, Attachment B, there is a
17 classified attachment which is also subsumed within the same
18 issue.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Now, if a <u>Touhy</u> notice is required,
and you're going to discuss with me whether it's ----

21 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure.

MJ [COL POHL]: ---- I'm simply saying you believe -well, let me ask this: All you can require is -- excuse me.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 All you're going to give, based on what you know, is 2 contained in those exhibits? So that would be a complete 3 Touhy notice? 4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, there's an issue -- and I 6 understand if it goes up -- and they're going to say it's not 7 complete or it's a not a summary or whatever. I've got that. 8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: But I just want to make it clear, there's 10 nothing additional. If I said, Mr. Connell, have you provided 11 all notice under <u>Touhy</u> if it's required, you're going to say 12 yes, and here is where it is. 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Understand I'm going to go back to the 15 government to make sure. 16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Go ahead. 18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Our classified pleading in AE 380B 19 relates to the -- which is another 505 notice -- relates to 20 the fifth argument that I want to make today, the one that I 21 think has to be made in -- or at least the prosecution will no 22 doubt claim needs to be made in a closed hearing. 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: So that's the universe, if that's what2 you're asking me.

3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Now, the thing that I also want to say 5 to that, if the military commission decides that this is 6 deficient as to form rather than content, deficient as to 7 form, because these say -- are addressed to the United States 8 Government as opposed to addressed to the Office of the 9 General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, then when 10 you say is that all the Touhy notice you're going to provide, in that situation, of course, if it's merely a deficiency as 11 12 to the addressee, I would rewrite it in another form and send 13 it to the addressee identified in the regulation.

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah. Is it my position -- rephrase that.

As I understand this process, you comply, assuming it's required -- I'm going to hear you on that. I know we're getting to a point you don't think we ought to get to. But I want to get to it anyway -- is that whether or not it's reasonably detailed, the first cut of that, I'm assuming, would be the agency involved?

21 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I'm sure that -- I don't know what
22 they consider reasonably detailed, Your Honor.

23 MJ [COL POHL]: Neither do I. That's my point. Okay. So

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 go ahead.

2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: So the 505 notice serves the same 3 purpose as the Touhy notice. And there's no -- the thing that 4 I -- you know, you started this guestion with: What are the 5 duties imposed by this regulation? And there are other Touhy 6 regulations for other agencies that impose a different set of 7 duties, but for this set of regulations, it is worded in the 8 passive, "must be furnished." And it doesn't impose any 9 responsibility on the defense to furnish it directly to the 10 CIA; it simply says the defense duty, the party seeking the 11 testimony, is to provide reasonably detailed descriptions. So 12 it is the same as my 505(g)(1)(A).

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Just so I'm clear, because you said
something earlier that caused me a little pause, which you
said everything is the government.

16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, shall we move to that question?
17 MJ [COL POHL]: No, we're not going to move to that
18 question yet.

19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Okay.

20 MJ [COL POHL]: What I am saying is I have a motion for me
21 to produce a witness, slash, to conduct a deposition.

22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Which I think are analytically23 distinct, but I'll go with you.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL POHL]: They are. But fundamentally the bottom
 line is production of sworn testimony, for want of a better
 term.

4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I do want to draw a distinction there, 5 because there is no -- in 350C, the motion for deposition, 6 there is no Touhy issue. In fact, the government 7 distinguished in its response 350F. It distinguished between 8 deposition, which it didn't take any position on whether <u>Touhy</u> 9 notice was required, and a session or evidentiary hearing in 10 its phrase where the government said that it believed Touhy 11 compliance would be required.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So just so I understand your
position that -- because you've asked for, I think in the
alternative, a deposition or live testimony.

15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Because of the sequence in which16 things occurred.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And I understand how you're reading
it. You read the <u>Touhy</u> notice -- and, again, we're looking at
the CIA regulations, because that's the one that controls in
this. It talks about trial testimony. And so your position
is that there's no <u>Touhy</u> notice required for depositions?
LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No. I'm suggesting that the
government has not raised any -- let's go there now, because I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

suggest that <u>Touhy</u> regulations have no place in a military
 tribunal.

3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Tell me that. I know you wanted to4 get to that ----

5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.

6 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- and I short-circuited you. Go ahead,
7 Mr. Connell.

8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: In AE 036, we litigated the question 9 of compulsory process for the defense, because in one of these 10 other courts that are so often referenced, the defense has the 11 ability to go down to the clerk's office, get a subpoena, 12 issue it to a witness, have that -- and compel that process to 13 appear.

We lost that issue, right? We lost the issue of compulsory process for the defense. We asked for it, and it was -- the military commission ruled. We understand the military commission's ruling. But what that means is, is that the R.M.C. 703, and, to another extent, R.M.C. 702 for the deposition, the prosecutor is responsible for the production of all witnesses.

I have no authority, ability, capacity or anything
else to produce a witness. All I can do under R.M.C. 703 is
to submit a list of witnesses that I think are necessary to

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the prosecution -- for the prosecution to produce them.

2 And so when I do so, I don't have any authority to 3 compel a witness to appear and, thus, I have no responsibility 4 under any agency's Touhy regulations, because the fear -- the 5 idea behind <u>Touhy</u> regulations is that my investigator might 6 show up with a subpoena, serve it on some low-level employee 7 or high-level employee, some employee, and the interests of 8 the agency would not be represented because they would never 9 know that John Jones, CIA employee, had been subpoenaed to 10 testify in Fairfax, Virginia Circuit Court. And the Touhy 11 regulations give them an opportunity to weigh in.

In this situation, there is no production -- there is
no demand for a person. There's no civil deposition request.
There's no subpoena in a criminal case, and any witness who
appears in this building or in a deposition does so on the
authority of the prosecution. Sometimes, as happened in.

AE 050, 0-5-0, the military commission orders them to
produce someone, but it's always the trial counsel. It's
never the defense counsel. We have no compulsory process
right.

So both the letter and the spirit of the <u>Touhy</u> -- of
 <u>Touhy</u> regulations have no applicability in the military
 commissions.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Now, that leads very much to ---MJ [COL POHL]: You see the <u>Touhy</u> regulations as a
preemptive prophylactic to avoid, in this case, CIA employees
being deposed or called into court without notice to the
agency?

6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes.

MJ [COL POHL]: So, really, <u>Touhy</u> is just a notice -- for
want of a better term, a notice to the agency that one of
their employees is being asked to talk about something? In
that sense, you provide the notice to the Government to
produce the witness, and the Government, big G, then therefore
knows about it; therefore, there's no surprise; therefore,
there's no <u>Touhy</u> reg.

14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And to add to that, it is in fact the 15 government -- the big G, little G thing doesn't make a hundred 16 percent -- so I'm going to say it is this part of the 17 government that is sitting right here today that actually 18 produces the witness for the deposition or for the testimony 19 here today. So there's exactly zero chance that the United 20 States Government and all its component parts as represented 21 by these prosecutors who sit here today does not know about 22 the situation.

23

And there's a reason, Your Honor, why there is not a

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

single <u>Touhy</u> case in any military court, and the reason for
 that is <u>Touhy</u> just doesn't have any application in that
 situation, because it is always a military prosecutor who is
 producing the witnesses for a court-martial or, in this case,
 for a military commission.

MJ [COL POHL]: Now, Mr. Connell, I -- you made a very
broad statement there, and I would agree that there's not a
lot of <u>Touhy</u> litigation in military courts. I'm not sure your
statement is totally accurate.

10 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: All right.

MJ [COL POHL]: Maybe an outlier or two out there. But,
as a general rule, I understand what you are saying, but I
think part of that's because it does not come up frequently in
military courts. But go ahead. I gotcha.

15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I couldn't find any. Maybe the16 military commission found some with ----

MJ [COL POHL]: I may be aware of some others, but that's
okay. Your basic argument is that <u>Touhy</u> is a notice
requirement more than anything else, and, therefore, since
they're on notice because they're going to -- they have to
produce, therefore, <u>Touhy</u> doesn't apply.

22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right. That's right.

23 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me ask you this.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes.

MJ [COL POHL]: So let's go down that a little bit. If -because basically what you're saying is that the <u>Touhy</u> notice is simply a double-tap when the government has to produce a witness to begin with; therefore, they already know about it, in essence.

7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's one way to structure the
8 argument. I think it's a bit broader than that, but I'm happy
9 to go with that for these purposes here.

MJ [COL POHL]: Let me ask you this: If the normal <u>Touhy</u> scenario with the Central Intelligence Agency, for example, and the <u>Touhy</u> notice goes to the OGC and they say we want six topics covered by this person, as I understand it, and correct me if I'm wrong, is then the OGC makes a scrub and says you can talk about 1, 4 and 6 ----

16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: To their employee.

MJ [COL POHL]: To the employee, and then the employee is
done, okay. So there is a role under that scenario for the
0GC -- and I understand that's not the end of the inquiry.
There may be judicial involvement after that.

21 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure.

MJ [COL POHL]: But the bottom line is that under the
normal <u>Touhy</u> procedure the OGC can limit, at least initially,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

what they're going to permit their employee to testify to.
 0kay.

3 Under your -- under your reading of the <u>Touhy</u> notice
4 issue, which you just discussed, does the OGC have any role in
5 delineating how much the witness can testify to?

6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: We in this courtroom are the tiny tip 7 of a gigantic triangle of government agencies that are 8 involved in a wide variety of decisions, from who has a 9 security clearance, to who gets read on, to what ACCM to what 10 the classification is to begin with, to where the wires in the 11 courtroom run and everything else.

When a JTF -- when JTF's equities are at stake, the SJA for JTF does not show up here in court. When some other unnamed OCA's equities are at stake, their lawyer does not show up in court. Here in this court, the United States Government's interests -- and I think in your dichotomy that is big G, but the whole United States Government's interests are represented by these prosecutors here.

MJ [COL POHL]: So under my scenario, just so I understand
it, is that the OGC can weigh in any way they like, but they
weigh into the commission through the prosecutors?

22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. And that is, in fact, what23 the -- how I read the regulation to require it, because the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

regulation requires that the written summary, in this case the
 505(g) notices, must be furnished to the OGC, and then the OGC
 has certain duties and factors that it takes into account.
 And all of that happens behind the scenes, right? I'm not - the defense is not involved in any of that.

6 The communication between the Office of the Chief 7 Prosecutor and the Office of General Counsel of the CIA or any 8 other agency, we just don't have any role in that. We 9 don't -- we can't make it happen. We can't stop it from 10 happening. We don't get a vote. All of that happens behind 11 the scenes in the rest of the giant triangle that is the 12 military commissions.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So you've made an argument why
<u>Touhy</u> does not apply procedurally because the government
produces the witness or anything. I thought you made some
reference that you're not sure it even applied to this
particular individual.

18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. That's right. And if I could19 have the court's indulgence for just a moment?

20 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure.

21 [Pause.]

MJ [COL POHL]: And I know you know this, Mr. Connell,
probably better than most, is that some of this is classified,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 so we have to be careful.

2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Well, I keep asking, Your Honor. 3 MJ [COL POHL]: I know, but I'm trying to do what we can, 4 pursuant to the rules, as much in an open setting as possible. 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure. The court's indulgence for just one moment. I think my staples might be off. 6 7 [Pause.] 8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Your Honor, I have a document here 9 which I have -- would like marked as the next appellate 10 exhibit. May I approach? 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure. Have you got a copy for the 12 government? Have you given a copy to the government? 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. This will be -- whatever. 15 TC [MR. RYAN]: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt, sir. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: No problem. 17 TC [MR. RYAN]: Counsel, I believe, is getting marked a 18 declaration that he handed to me just before Your Honor came 19 back on the bench. I didn't finish reading it. And although 20 I certainly respect counsel's assessment as to whether it's 21 classified, this should be reviewed before it's discussed in 22 open court.

23 MJ [COL POHL]: [Conference with court personnel] Okay.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Mr. Ryan, your motion not to refer to it until at 2 least we've got to a classification review is granted. Ι 3 mean, my court security officer hasn't seen this either. 4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I'm not at a microphone. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: I know. 6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Your Honor, I'm a stickler for 7 procedure, and the procedure got away from me while I was away 8 from the microphone. I intended to put on the record that I 9 have provided a copy of this document, which is AE 350I ----10 MJ [COL POHL]: II. 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: ---- double India, to the government 12 and to counsel for each defendant. This document has not been 13 reviewed for classification. 14 The question which arises is whether this Touhy --15 and which is what the military commission addressed to me, is 16 whether this Touhy regulation applies to the individual in 17 question at all. And that's a factual question as to whether 18 the person falls under the definition of employee under 19 1905.2(c), and whether he falls under the scope of former 20 employees under 1905.3. 1905.3 states that the regulation 21 applies -- and let me ----

22 MJ [COL POHL]: I've got it in front of me.

23 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: ---- to former employees to the extent

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 consistent with applicable nondisclosure agreements. In this 2 situation we do not -- you know, we have been directed to 3 refer to the individual as the former CIA employee who --4 excuse me, "former CIA linguist utilized by Mr. Binalshibh's 5 defense team," but we have zero information as to -- in the 6 words of the regulation, the applicable nondisclosure In fact, there's a substantial debate as to the 7 agreements. 8 applicable nondisclosure agreements and, in fact, whether the 9 person would fall under the definition of employee at all.

And the declaration that I have just provided does
11 have information -- I won't refer to it in open court, but it
12 does have information relevant to that topic.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I can read it for myself, and then
we won't reference it until we're sure it's unclassified.
Okay.

16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The last argument that I have to make17 is itself classified, and I can't make it in open session.

18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Then I don't want you to make it
19 in -- so ----

20 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I repeat my request for a 505(h)21 hearing.

MJ [COL POHL]: I still remember it. It isn't that longago. Okay. Got it. Thank you.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you.

MJ [COL POHL]: Any other defense counsel have anything to
add to Mr. Connell's presentation? Again, we're narrowly
addressing simply the <u>Touhy</u> issue.

5

Apparently not.

6

Trial Counsel? Mr. Ryan.

TC [MR. RYAN]: Your Honor, counsel indicated that in
regard to the invoking of <u>Touhy</u> regulations, I believe his
statement was that -- well, first to say that in his initial
pleading, which is Charlie, I know that the accused's counsel
did not raise <u>Touhy</u> at all, made no description, no statement
as to efforts or any movement towards trying to satisfy <u>Touhy</u>.

Now, in his -- in our reply to that, which counsel I believe said we did not refer to <u>Touhy</u>. I just want to point out that we did, in fact, in footnote 1 of our response, which is F, states -- specifically cites <u>Touhy</u> and states that any testimony must be in compliance with 505(g) of M.C.R.E. and the CIA's <u>Touhy</u> regulations, 32 CFR, et cetera.

19 The relevant portion of that is if oral -- and this 20 is a big part of the discussion between the commission and 21 both parties. If oral or written testimony is sought by a 22 demand in a case or matter in which the CIA is not a party, a 23 reasonably detailed description of the testimony sought, in

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	the form of an affidavit or, if that is not feasible, a
2	written statement by the party seeking the testimony or by the
3	party's attorney, must be furnished to Office of General
4	Counsel. So that's first. This was put in the forefront.
5	The accused then in his reply to our response
6	essentially says what was told to you today, it's the
7	government's job to do that.
8	Now, we take, as it would not surprise you, Judge,
9	obvious issue with that statement.
10	MJ [COL POHL]: Let me kind of break this up in two parts.
11	TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.
12	MJ [COL POHL]: Because part of it is just the processing
13	of the <u>Touhy</u> notice and whether service on the government here
14	meets the requirement of service on the CIA.
15	TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.
16	MJ [COL POHL]: There's that issue there, and I think
17	there's case law that kind of goes both ways on that, but I
18	don't want to get into that because I see that as kind of a
19	Western Union issue of how the mail is going to be delivered,
20	not that it doesn't need to be delivered, but talking about
21	how it's got to get to the places it's got to get to.
22	TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.
00	

23 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me put that aside, because Mr. Connell

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

mentioned it once, and, again, it doesn't strike to me as a
 particular issue. I may be wrong. If you enlighten me, and
 if you have an issue, I will certainly listen to it.

4 If Touhy notice is required -- and the government 5 position obviously it is, okay. And this is why I asked Mr. Connell about do you think you -- what is your Touhy 6 7 notice? And he listed, I believe, five separate exhibits, 8 okay? Now, is that -- just on a procedural perspective, I'm 9 not saying it will necessarily mean they get it, but if that's 10 all they got, is that a format that you believe is okay, or do 11 they got to make a separate piece of paper altogether with 12 specificity?

13 TC [MR. RYAN]: They do have to make it a separate piece 14 of paper with specificity, just based on the reading. I take 15 great issue with this concept, because in a military 16 commission, the accused didn't have right of compulsory 17 process, at least the way they describe it; that somehow now 18 everything is the government's problem when it comes to 19 witnesses.

The regulations say specifically "seeking testimony,"
not who's compelling. We're not seeking the testimony of this
person; the accused is. Now, that's sort of parsing the
language specifically.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	But getting further from there, Your Honor, I would
2	suggest for plain reasons, for reasons you would see easily,
3	the government should not be in a position of having to try
4	and figure out, with sufficient specificity, what it is the
5	defense is seeking in terms of testimony. And the proof is
6	right here. As Your Honor noted, counsel says, well, we've
7	given everything that we need to, and it's plenty specific
8	enough. I take great issue with that.
9	The reason the <u>Touhy</u> regulations exist in general, as
10	in the entire big G, small G, whatever G you like, government,
11	is each agency has some interest in what its employees talk
12	about in terms of the inner deliberative work product, inner
13	workings of the United States Government and its respective
14	agencies. That's the big G.
15	As to this specific part of it, the CIA, the need,
16	the concerns are even greater because, as here, there is
17	automatically I shouldn't say "automatically," but
18	frequently going to be the implication of classified
19	information. So their general counsel is in a position of
20	even greater importance than most other situations in terms of
21	knowing what its employees, former employees, whoever, are
22	going to be talking about in terms of what goes on inside the
23	agency because of that, because so much of what they do is

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 classified.

2 The accused's notice that come in the form of various 3 pleadings are broad and vague and speak in generalities. 4 Words like, guote, knowledge. They want knowledge of this 5 area, knowledge of that area. In short, it's they want to 6 roam around in these big areas, and they want you to sanction 7 it first by giving them this. But in terms of <u>Touhy</u>, what 8 they're saying is that's good enough for you to know what we 9 want.

10 Well, I'd submit, Judge, it's absolutely not, because 11 it doesn't give them any kind of discussion. And this goes 12 again to why the government, meaning the prosecution, 13 shouldn't be trying to translate any kind of discussion that 14 goes on about this, because they're going to keep it vague so 15 we don't know. I understand that. But it doesn't counteract 16 the fact that Touhy requires that the agency understand what 17 sort of information might be going out there. They have a 18 right to know "with reasonable specificity," I think is the 19 exact language.

I would submit what the defense has submitted in
terms of why they want to talk to this individual in a
testimonial setting is not reasonably specific.

23 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me make sure, Mr. Ryan. I have before

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 me a number of different motions about -- a number of motions,
2 but it talks about a deposition, talks about witness
3 production.

4 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.

5 MJ [COL POHL]: When I looked at this, it struck to me is 6 the threshold inquiry is the <u>Touhy</u> notice. It just strikes to 7 me that before I can rule on that, I've got to address if 8 <u>Touhy</u> applies and if it does apply after it's been done. Do 9 you agree with that, that I can't get to the substance of this 10 until we decide the <u>Touhy</u> issue?

11 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.

12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

13 TC [MR. RYAN]: As a threshold matter, yes, sir.

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

TC [MR. RYAN]: Finishing up the last part of what I said,
Judge, here is a good piece of proof for you as to why it
was -- this process has been deficient on the defense's part.
I shouldn't even say "deficient"; they ignored it for the most
part. But now they're saying to you, "We've done enough."
Their general description of things like knowledge as to
various areas is what they present to you.

22 They know much more than that. They could be much23 more specific. I know that because two minutes before Your

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Honor walked out and I got this declaration, it concerns
 matters of much greater detail of what they want to talk
 about, what they want to hear about.

MJ [COL POHL]: Of course, at the end of the day -- at the
end of the day, what they choose to disclose in their <u>Touhy</u>
notice is up to them, and whether it's sufficiently -- if it's
required, if it's reasonably detailed enough for the OGC to
respond, then that's up to him, correct?

9 TC [MR. RYAN]: That is certainly true, Judge.

MJ [COL POHL]: You may be -- because you indicated you know stuff that they know that you don't believe is in their notice. But let's assume I tell them that they've got to put their notice in one piece of paper -- rephrase that -- one --I don't care if it's one or 20 pieces of paper, but in a separate specific notice marked their <u>Touhy</u> notice.

16 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL POHL]: Then if there's other stuff that they
could have put in there and chose not to, is that not their
decision, even though -- and then it goes to the CIA, and they
do what they do?

TC [MR. RYAN]: It is their decision. And they may choose
not to, but then they may not like the answer that comes
because of ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL POHL]: Oh, I understand that. I understand that. 2 Let me ask you one other question -- I'm sorry. 3 Do you want to be heard more on that? 4 TC [MR. RYAN]: No, Your Honor. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me go on to what I call the Western 6 Union issue. If they submit a Touhy notice, and I understand your point about -- let's just say, as I say, you've got to 7 8 provide a Touhy notice, and you've got to give it to the trial 9 counsel, and they're responsible for getting it over to the 10 OGC CIA. 11 TC [MR. RYAN]: That being their position. 12 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I'm just talking about how it gets 13 there now that simply. It strikes to me is my concern is 14 if -- if when you say it goes to the CIA, why can't they just 15 give it to you and you take it over to whomever? I just don't 16 want to get into an issue it goes in the wrong in box. 17 TC [MR. RYAN]: I understand, Judge. 18 MJ [COL POHL]: I don't see that as a particularly onerous 19 requirement. I'm just simply saying they serve it on you, and 20 then the government carries it over to wherever the CIA has to 21 see it.

22 TC [MR. RYAN]: I don't know ----

23 MJ [COL POHL]: Because I think the case law can kind of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

go both ways, whether service on you or service on them. Just
 that way it gets in the government channels, and you're in a
 better position to ensure it gets to the right person. That's
 where I am at.

5 TC [MR. RYAN]: Certainly we'll do whatever we can to try
6 to facilitate the process. If there is some reasons I am not
7 seeing, God knows what happened.

8 MJ [COL POHL]: If I issue an order to that effect and9 there is something that has changed, let me know.

10 TC [MR. RYAN]: Thank you, Judge.

11 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Connell.

12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The first question that the 13 prosecution raises is purely a procedural one. When -- who 14 mentioned Touhy first and what did they say about it? There 15 are two separate pleadings, of course, right? There's ----16 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Connell, I know, and I hear from both 17 sides continually, and I know there's a lot of this, well, we 18 said it here and they said, no, they didn't hear, and 19 Mr. Swann made comments about Ms. Bormann's comments and 20 things like that. I've got it. It's not productive for me 21 for you to spend your valuable time to say "I said it first." 22 I know Mr. Ryan did. I can read the pleadings, I know what it 23 But let's get to the substance. is.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure. Here's the substance. With
 respect to the Western Union issue, the government, the Office
 of the Chief Prosecutor, cannot pick and choose which parts of
 the United States Government it represents in its tactical
 interests in any particular hearing.

6 The prosecution was very careful not to say that the 7 Office of General Counsel, you know, didn't know about this 8 request, doesn't know about the former CIA interpreter 9 utilized by Mr. Binalshibh's team, hasn't been intimately 10 involved. He doesn't make any of those claims. And, in fact, 11 the prosecution here, their coin, their e-mail addresses and 12 everything else, are the prosecution task force, which is a 13 multi-agency task force set up, which includes the FBI, the 14 CIA, other agencies of the United States Government, to be 15 involved in the prosecution of this case.

16 In fact, one of the strangest facts in the whole case 17 is that when we get a bounced e-mail from the prosecution, 18 it's returned by a server, cia.gov. The idea that the Office 19 of the General Counsel of the CIA does not know about this and 20 hasn't seen our 505 issues really just kind of defies -- I 21 don't want to go so far. I will say instead that the United 22 States Government as a whole is well aware of this notice. 23 MJ [COL POHL]: But you seem to be conflating two issues

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 here, okay? By that I mean you talked about the Western Union 2 issue. I'm just talking about how it gets from you to the 3 CIA. Then you conflated back they're already on notice of it, 4 okay? That's a separate -- that remark about Western Union 5 was only to facilitate if there needed to be facilitation, to 6 get, if required, <u>Touhy</u> notice from you to the deputy general 7 counsel of the CIA.

8 And, again, the cases appear they can go both ways,
9 on service, when the U.S. Government is a party, whether
10 service on them suffices as opposed to service directly on the
11 OGC.

I don't want to come back in two months and hear,
well, you didn't give it -- you know, he never got the mail.
LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.

15 MJ [COL POHL]: That's all I was trying to resolve in16 that.

17 The other issue ----

18 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: In the Pentagon mail system, I can19 completely understand your concern about that.

MJ [COL POHL]: The other issue I think you conflated with
is, again, a variation of your earlier argument that they're
already on notice. Okay.

23

Now, let me ask you this: How do you address Mr. --

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 you indicated to me your Touhy notice that you don't believe 2 is required, but let's say for the sake of this discussion it 3 is required, is contained in at least five, and perhaps six, 4 separate exhibits. To meet the intent of Touhy, is that how 5 it should be done; that it's look here, here, here and here, 6 and you'll find it? Or shouldn't it be in one neat little 7 package with a reasonably detailed description of the 8 testimony sought?

9 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Your Honor ----

10 MJ [COL POHL]: Aren't you putting a burden on the OGC to11 kind of figure out what you mean?

12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I fully endorse the idea that 13 classified information should be delivered in a neat little 14 package with all available information, context sufficient to 15 understand it, and reasonable specificity. I fully endorse 16 that idea.

17 The rest of us, however, who live in the real world, 18 have to deal with dribbled discovery, pleadings which come up 19 as information is obtained, and some of which is under seal, 20 classified, classified at different levels and different 21 compartments, et cetera. If the military commission orders me 22 to, you know, compile everything I know at this time and put 23 it in one place -- but just imagine -- let's just talk for a

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 moment what would this have actually looked like in the 3502 series.

So as soon as I wanted to -- I asked the military commission for the deposition on the day after the individual in question appeared in court, because I -- I'm speaking in an unclassified way -- wanted to, thought that it would be most efficient and efficacious to do the deposition right then and there.

9 To give a <u>Touhy</u> notice in that situation, I would
10 have to provide -- I would have to do exactly what I did in
11 350A, which is give -- when I gave 505(g) notice, I would have
12 to provide the information that I had.

Now, a couple of days later, through an
investigation, we provide more information. Then I need to
provide that to the Office of General Counsel. A little bit
later than that, the prosecution produces some discovery
that's relevant, I put in that information.

So in the ideal world, we would all exchange nicely indexed and complete packets of information, but it doesn't actually happen that way. We are operating in a duck blind with a hole about this big where we peek out, and different pieces of classified information flutter by our field of vision. And when we find out those pieces of information, we

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

write them down in a notice, and we provide them to the
 government. And that's all that this regulation or 505
 require.

4 MJ [COL POHL]: So what you're saying is it's too
5 difficult for you to compile all this information in one set
6 of ----

7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I'm not saying it's too difficult.
8 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- but the OGC is supposed to figure it
9 out for you?

10 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I'm not saying it's too difficult at11 all, because I do it.

MJ [COL POHL]: At one point in time -- I know you do it,
because -- that's why I think you're selling yourself short.

What I'm saying is if a <u>Touhy</u> notice is required, you know, and it seems to me it's the party that has to provide said notice responsibility to provide a clean, clear, detailed description according to the rule, if the rule applies -- I know you say it doesn't -- and not force the OGC to hunt and peck through six other exhibits, at least, to see what it is. Because again, they may pick the wrong stuff.

This way -- two advantages of this way: One is it's
in one place; and two is they know what you say it is. As
Mr. Ryan pointed out, you know, he says he thinks your notice

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

could have other details that it doesn't have. I mean, for
 example, this most recent document, now, would that be
 included in your <u>Touhy</u> notice and say, okay, now we've got a
 seventh document that the OGC has got to consider?

5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The seventh document is from a defense6 investigator, not ----

7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I'm just saying is -- I have not
8 read it yet, but I'm just saying ----

9 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The CIA doesn't have any equity in10 that document.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So you say it doesn't apply --- LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I think it does apply. I'm saying the
 CIA doesn't have any equities in it.

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But what I'm saying is, is that 15 you -- if a <u>Touhy</u> notice is required, it will go to the OGC, 16 and he will make certain determinations under the relevant 17 regulations, okay? But I think it's only fair for him to know 18 exactly what your Touhy notice entails and not that he -- he 19 may be on notice of it, may be on notice of a lot of things, I 20 suspect, okay? But if this procedure applies, it seems to be 21 a specific regulatory procedure that will require you to 22 provide, with relative specificity, a reasonably detailed 23 description.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

We can go back and forth on this. I think you knowwhere I'm going on this.

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I do know where you're going, but let
me just say one place where my vision parts company with the
military commission, because I'm all in favor of clear
pleadings and good communication and complete discovery and
all those other virtues.

8 The place that -- the thing that I think the military 9 commission is leaving out of this is the time dimension, that 10 -- how much information gets dribbled out to us, and that we 11 do our very best within the construct of 505 and now <u>Touhy</u>, 12 and the regulations which govern our handling of classified 13 information, to provide notice to everybody who needs it.

And so if what the military commission is saying now, six months after the event, we should take everything we have and put it in one place, that's fine. But to impose that as an ongoing burden on us on, say, February 12th of 2015, as opposed to October 28th of 2015 -- or 29th, is unreasonable. The ----

MJ [COL POHL]: Well, let's be clear here, okay,
Mr. Connell, is to my knowledge -- and I've been here at every
session ----

23 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, you have, sir.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 9029

MJ [COL POHL]: This is the first time the <u>Touhy</u> issue
came up.

3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL POHL]: When you say the commission is imposing
some type of rule, understand this: If you wanted to say
that, you certainly can, okay? I'm simply saying if I rule a
certain way that these regulations, the <u>Touhy</u> regulations,
apply, then they're going to apply. And if a <u>Touhy</u> issue
comes up again, absent some different facts, then guess what?
They'll probably apply again.

If you get additional information that you want to supplement your <u>Touhy</u> notice, you can. But that's -- I mean, I don't understand your point that because we get it in dribs and drabs, therefore we can drib and drab, bury it in pleadings to the OGC, and that constitutes sufficient <u>Touhy</u> notice.

17 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The -- what I'm saying is there's
18 not -- I mean, there are two alternatives: One is to give
19 notice of information as we receive it, all right, that's
20 dribs and drabs. Number two is to wait at some point when it
21 feels ripe and put it all in one place and send it off.

22 And the ----

23 MJ [COL POHL]: But let's back up, though, because you're

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	requesting a witness to be produced, either live or for
2	deposition for testimony, okay? So you've got a point in time
3	where you filed that request.
4	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes.
5	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Like any witness production
6	issue and I know I don't need to hear it again, the defense
7	version, view of why this process is unfair about the
8	government comes in, I understand it.
9	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I won't repeat it.
10	MJ [COL POHL]: I understand everybody's view on that.
11	I've got it. I'm not going to revisit that view.
12	But be that as it may, is that at a point in time you
13	say, as you do frequently, we want this witness.
14	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure.
15	MJ [COL POHL]: Once you request that witness, that's the
16	point in time you've got to provide whatever required
17	supporting documentation is required. So why is this any
18	different?
19	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: It is not different at all.
20	MJ [COL POHL]: Good.
21	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's exactly my point, Your Honor.
22	Because each time we file some piece of classified
23	information, we file a 505(g) notice about it, and so it

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 becomes dribs and drabs. And what you are -- what I hear the
2 court describing is different from that process.

3 What I hear the court saying is there has to be a 4 single document, composed of however many subparts that it may 5 happen to contain; that at some point, which I guess is in my 6 discretion -- or if it's not in my discretion, at least taken 7 at my own risk -- at some point I need to draw a line under 8 the dribs and drabs and say, okay, now I think it's 9 completely -- you know, it's sufficiently fruitful for me to 10 send off a letter to the Office of General Counsel.

MJ [COL POHL]: When you want me to produce a witness,
okay, you tell me why it's material to the preparation of the
defense ----

14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Of course.

15 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- or material or relevant, and then you16 give me some facts.

17 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure.

18 MJ [COL POHL]: Why is this any different?

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: It is not different. It will be in
dribs and drabs to the OGC in the same way it is in dribs and
drabs to the court or military commission. When we get
information, we provide it.

23 MJ [COL POHL]: If <u>Touhy</u> applies, at some point in time

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

you've got to give a <u>Touhy</u> notice. Now, if you want to wait
 on it and say I've not got complete information, or wait on
 dribs and drabs, as you keep saying, fine. Don't give the
 notice. Don't give the notice.

5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No, Your Honor has misinterpreted ---6 MJ [COL POHL]: If you say I want to give the notice and I
7 want to supplement it later, that's fine, too.

8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Here is where we part ways. I have 9 given notice. That's what 350A is, that's what 350Y is. The 10 only real point we're debating is whether it is legitimate to 11 ask the lawyers at the Office of General Counsel to do things 12 that the rest of the lawyers do, which is look at the record 13 and figure out what the record says, as opposed to a single 14 sheet of paper. That's really the only thing we're debating, 15 as far as I can tell.

And my objection to the single piece of paper
17 construction of this regulation is that it ignores the way we
18 receive information.

19 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

20 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Now, I have one more thing I want to
21 say about this ----

22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

23 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: ---- which is the question that I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 raised about whether the individual applies ----

2 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm listening.

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Okay. Whether the individual falls
under the technical definition of former employee, as
necessitated by nondisclosure agreements under 1903 -- no,
excuse me, 1905.3, is a factual question. We don't actually
know the answer to that because we've never seen the
nondisclosure agreements.

9 And it is a perfect example of the difficulty of
10 providing a unitary <u>Touhy</u> notice as opposed to simply
11 providing the government with the information we have, because
12 we can only provide information that we have.

13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you very much.

15 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Ryan?

16 TC [MR. RYAN]: Your Honor, absent any questions from the17 commission, I will make no further argument.

MJ [COL POHL]: My preference was to try to resolve the
<u>Touhy</u> issue at this session, because I think that -- that
would assist us in resolving this issue. But to do that, let
me ask you this, Trial Counsel.

You've gotten a 505(g) notice from Mr. Connell on
this issue? True? Are you requesting a 505(h) hearing?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So it seems to me, before I can
resolve this, I need to give him at least the opportunity -without knowing what it is, I don't know whether it requires a
closed session or not under 806. But obviously I consider
these motions to be made in good faith, so we need to conduct
a 505(h) hearing, which would obviously alter our potential
schedule.

9 My suggestion would be is that we could do the 505(h)
10 hearing -- have you filed a 505(h) hearing request?

11 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL POHL]: Here's the issue, and this is simply a
scheduling issue. To do the 505(h) hearing, obviously it has
got to be closed. And we do a follow-on 806 hearing, that
again is obviously closed. That creates, obviously,
logistical challenges. We were discussing, other than 008,
trying to get some of the 254 litigation begun, and this may
infringe on that.

So for scheduling purposes -- well, let me ask the government. Given all those competing equities, because a lot -- we can go different ways on this. What would be your suggested way ahead, when to do the 505(h)? When to do the 806 if necessary, the closed 806? And in light of that, what

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 do we do with the other motions, given the transportation, 2 logistical challenges involved? 3 And defense, I'm going to give you an opportunity on 4 this, too. It's simply a scheduling issue. 5 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: One second, sir. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure. 7 [Conference with court personnel.] 8 MJ [COL POHL]: General Martins? 9 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, on scheduling matters, so 10 you're seeking our input? 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah. What I am just saying is, is that 12 given that we have today and tomorrow, okay, and given the 13 logistical challenges of a 505(h) hearing/a closed 806 14 hearing, there may be difficulty doing that and also taking 15 the witnesses on 254, assuming we get to there. I just kind 16 of want to get your input as to the way ahead. 17 You can tell me now or we can go -- we're only going 18 to go for about another 20 more minutes and discuss it over 19 the break, and tell me after the break. We're going to 008 20 next, so we've got time on this. 21 CP [BG MARTINS]: That's what we understood. If it helps 22 to get our -- sort of how we see it structurally because of 23 the logistics ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL POHL]: You understand, once we go to a closed
 session, that creates logistical challenges, and pick-up the
 same day is difficult.

4 CP [BG MARTINS]: Putting that together for us, Your
5 Honor, this would be the government's request: Come back, do
6 831, visit those, 505(h) hearing after that, and then tomorrow
7 -- so that we can start arranging for the testimony and the
8 witnesses in 254, start that tomorrow.

9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Do the 505(h) hearing today and
10 then, if necessary, follow it right away with the closed 806
11 hearing today, okay? And then tomorrow -- okay.

12 CP [BG MARTINS]: Wherever we are in the 350 process,
13 right, because we're ----

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Right.

15 CP [BG MARTINS]: Wherever we are, tomorrow let's go the16 witnesses on 254, would be our suggestion.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Here's what we're going to do. I
understand that may be kind of the best efficient use of time.
What we're going to do between now and when we break
is, I want to talk about -- I want to touch on 254. Because
once we break out of it, I want to be able to tell the guards
what to do so we can get ahead. So let me go -- I now want to
touch on 254, and then we will see where we're at as far as a

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 505(h) on 350, okay?

Mr. Connell.

2

3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Doing the 505(h) this afternoon makes 4 sense to me. My question is I just will need some advance 5 notice of what is the scope of the 505(h) hearing. I can 6 imagine three different scopes: One is just the piece that I 7 want to argue relative to Touhy; one is all the different 8 classified facts in 350; and one is, you know, the vast list 9 of classified information that's covered in 376 from the 10 defense and 376A from the prosecution. So small, medium or 11 large, and I'm just trying to figure out what it is.

12 MJ [COL POHL]: Small.

13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Small, got it. Thank you.

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Let's start 254. And, again, we're15 just talking scheduling here.

16 Last time we met in February -- I think it was 17 February -- I put on the record that I was aware that my order 18 of, I believe, January, basically freezing in place what was 19 proffered to me the current policy with regards to male 20 guards, was subject to some EO complaint, Equal Opportunity 21 complaint from the -- I'm assuming, the female guard force. I 22 told you that -- I gave you written notice of that as soon as 23 I found out about it. I put it on the record as soon as I --

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 at our next session.

Since that time, I have heard zero about the E0
complaint. I have no idea where it is. I have no idea its
resolution or lack thereof, and I have no idea and, quite
frankly, have no interest in any of that. If anyone wants to
voir dire me on the E0 complaint, as I told you before, I
would give you that opportunity, and that opportunity is
today.

9 Does any defense counsel wish to be heard on it? I
10 know there are other motions for other options, too, and if
11 you wish to be heard on that, you certainly can.

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, as you know, I filed 254WW, and in that motion we asked that -- for two forms of relief. The first was that you recuse yourself from hearing this issue, obviously, as you were the target of an investigation. The second one was that you put this decision on hold until a determination is made that the investigation is over.

Since that time, there have been some additional facts and additional public statements made by high-ranking officials that we believe are necessary to supplement that pleading. You heard about them this morning from Major Poteet. We have the same issue that arose at the same time on the 27th of October, and it was based on the same comments by

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the Secretary of Defense and other high-ranking officers
2 including senate -- a senator.

3 What we're going to ask the court to do on this, at 4 least our position, is that we should be allowed to supplement 5 that before the judge and the court makes any type of ruling 6 on this decision. I'm also told, and I have to track down the 7 e-mail that indicates that at least to a public affairs 8 officer, there has been a public disclosure that the EEO 9 complaint remains open until at which time the judge issues 10 his ruling.

11 So it seems to me that it is time, and premised
12 on ----

13 MJ [COL POHL]: Well, you're telling me things I don't14 know.

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Okay. I'm telling you information that I
need to put into our supplement, and why we will need to
supplement our ----

18 MJ [COL POHL]: Just understand this, that if you tell me19 something I don't know ----

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I don't know what you don't know, Judge.
MJ [COL POHL]: Yes, you do. I told you what I know about
the EO complaint. Now, if you tell me something I don't know,
which you just did, and that somehow that influences,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

therefore, raises an issue, you know, you're telling me
 something that, "Oh, by the way, Judge, you ought to recuse
 yourself because now you have this additional fact which, by
 the way, you didn't know until I told you." So be careful
 what you tell me.

6 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Sure. And we're going to ask for
7 different relief. We're no longer going to ask for you to
8 recuse yourself.

9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

10 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: But that's part of our supplement.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. That's really what I want toaddress right now.

13 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I understand.

MJ [COL POHL]: But that -- okay. Let me make it easier,
because, again, I'm focusing simply on that issue.

16 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Sure.

MJ [COL POHL]: Voir dire/recusal, and at this point ---LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I'm not asking you to recuse yourself any
longer. We believe that remedy no longer would cure the
unlawful influence because of the statements that have now
been made publicly. If you recused yourself and replaced them
with another military judge who could be aware of the same
statements and the same pressure, we don't think it would

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 leave us -- or purge the unlawful influence, which is, of2 course, the concern here.

3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

4 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I'm not -- I don't have a -- I'm not
5 going to move for you to recuse yourself.

6 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

7 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: But I also don't think that voir dire8 would resolve the issue.

9 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm not saying it would resolve the issue,10 I'm simply giving you the opportunity to do it.

11 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Cure it.

12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: What we would like to do is we would like
to have the opportunity in the normal course of business to
file our supplement before you rule on this issue. That's
what we are requesting, before you rule -- and I think that's
where you're heading anyhow.

18 MJ [COL POHL]: The big issue.

19 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Big issue, right.

20 MJ [COL POHL]: Quite frankly ----

21 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: The order itself.

MJ [COL POHL]: The initial order itself, I don't want toprioritize what's big and what's small. And there's an

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

unlawful influence issue which someone may characterize as a
 big issue, also, and they're conflated together. I've got it.
 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Yes.

4 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, Your Honor. And we request the
opportunity to do some discovery before we're put in the
position of voir diring the military judge. And voir dire
can't be meaningful unless we know what information is out
there.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And as -- you may not remember
this, but I do, is that all the way back at the arraignment,
after the voir dire, everybody said I want to reserve if ---LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Everyone said what?

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Everybody wanted to reserve whether or not15 they wanted to challenge me, as I recall, okay?

16 This case is not different than any other case. If 17 something comes up that requires an initial -- again, it's got 18 to be new. But if something comes up you didn't know about 19 you want to ask me about, you will always have that 20 opportunity from now until I'm no longer on the case or the 21 case is over. That's -- but I think that's just black-letter 22 law.

23

So if that's your request, it's always granted.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Well, thank you, Your Honor. And I 2 assumed that would be the case. But now we're talking about 3 specifically this issue of voir diring you on 254 before we go 4 forward to litigate it further, and I can't meaningfully do 5 that. And I appreciate that the military commission would 6 make that opportunity available to me at any reasonable time, 7 but I'm just saying I think this is not a reasonable time to 8 do that.

9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: The statements of the Secretary of 11 Defense and the statements that Mr. Ruiz mentioned suggest 12 that there's a tie-in to those issues depending on what the 13 military commission does in this round of hearings, and we 14 have discovery requests out on that to learn more about where 15 that comes from, where it's gone, and so on.

16 We can't -- there's not any way for us to know what 17 the military commission has seen or not seen, who has said 18 things to you at times, what you've read in newspapers. These 19 are public pronouncements that are made, and we have to assume 20 that this kind of information is finding its way to the 21 military commission. Unless we're following you around 22 24 hours a day to see what you're listening to and talking 23 about, there's not any other way for us to approach this.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL POHL]: I understand that, Mr. Nevin. But just -and I'm not -- and I understand, you're an experienced
attorney, and I've been a judge for a while. I believe every
judge -- this judge -- if he's aware of any matter that might
cause question, he has a responsibility to disclose it, and I
will disclose it to you and to everybody. I disclosed to you
everything I know about the E0 complaint.

8 I disclosed to you everything I've read about, which
9 is, quite frankly, your motion on this. I heard noise that
10 something happened, but I didn't know any details until I got
11 your motion. That's the sum and substance of what I know.

Now, if you want to -- and I will continue to keep you informed if I hear additional things on these kind of issues, because it is all going to -- but I see that just as a responsibility of any trial judge, or any appellate judge, for that matter, to disclose that.

Now, that doesn't mean to say that there are other
issues that you may need to investigate, okay? I've got that.
And that does not mean to say the unlawful influence issue is
just brand new. I've got that, too, okay?

So I understand what you're saying. I'm not sure,
when you say I have to investigate because I can't follow you
24/7, what that necessarily means. But I will tell you this,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 is that I will always disclose what I know, when I know it, as
2 I did with the EO complaint. And that's all I can do.

And if you find something else you think I didn't
disclose that I should have, bring it to my attention and I
will tell you whether I did it. But, again, I see that's my
job as a judge, to tell you that.

7 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Right. And, Your Honor, let me put it
8 this way: I don't plan to get up every morning before we
9 start court and every time we come back from a break and ask,
10 "Did you hear anything since we last met that causes you any
11 problem?" I know that the military commission will come
12 forward with that.

But the military commission just said that you heard something about this, practically speaking, was my point. There is not any way for us to have contemporaneous, ongoing perfect awareness of what the military commission has been made aware of. And there's -- undoubtedly there's no way for the military commission to know going forward what you're going to be made aware of.

20 MJ [COL POHL]: That's true.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Right. So all I'm saying is this: One,
we have what on its face seems to be a pure instance of either
unlawful influence or the appearance of unlawful influence.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

The point of what Major Poteet said this morning is
 that it's not right to litigate this motion, 254 -- I think
 we're talking about 254Y, really, and the subsequent
 pleadings -- it isn't right to litigate that when there is now
 this cloud over this situation.

6 We become obligated as lawyers to get to the bottom 7 of this as best we can, and we have filed discovery requests 8 vesterday evening, and we intend to follow up on those. То 9 now go ahead and litigate this and say, well, we're going to 10 submit evidence to you and make arguments to you to some 11 degree, we're going to hear testimony from witnesses, ask you 12 to rule on objections or not, these kinds of things, until we 13 get to the bottom of a colorable issue of unlawful influence, 14 I think it's inappropriate to have further litigation on this 15 motion.

And there are a hundred other things we can -- well,
there are many, many other things that we can do between now
and tomorrow at 1700, or whenever we finish ----

19 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

20 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- as opposed to that. So that's my
21 request.

22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it.

23 Anything else from either -- any of the other defense

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 counsel? Apparently not.

2 Trial Counsel, do you want to be heard on this? 3 CP [BG MARTINS]: Nothing further, Your Honor. We've 4 given you our requested approach to the -- you mean on 254? 5 MJ [COL POHL]: No, on -- what I'm hearing the defense 6 requesting is, in essence, is that we don't even take witnesses on 254 tomorrow. Is that we basically punt 254 7 8 until the December hearings. That's what I -- and we pick up other things like, for example, 018. I mean, there's other 9 10 stuff to do, but I just ----

CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, on the witnesses, I mean
these are witnesses that have long been set up for the issues
that were already presented in 254 and your order in January.

14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. We're talking about the two15 witnesses referenced earlier?

16 CP [BG MARTINS]: Yeah, and we also have some VTC -- well,
17 these are defense witnesses, so we're making them available to
18 them.

19 MJ [COL POHL]: We're talking -- how many witnesses are we20 talking about?

21 CP [BG MARTINS]: A total of five, Your Honor.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And they're all theoreticallyscheduled to appear tomorrow?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 CP [BG MARTINS]: Yes.

2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I got it. Thank you.

3 Mr. Nevin?

4 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, I'm sorry, I've been
5 corrected. Four.

6 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin.

7 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I just wanted to add, Your Honor -- I
8 wanted to add, and I didn't say it, that we also support the
9 idea of holding the 505 hearing, and an 806 if one gets held,
10 this afternoon ----

11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- then going forward with substantive13 matters tomorrow.

I also wanted to point out with respect to these
witnesses that their testimony, we were told later this week,
we were given notice of that, as I understand it earlier this
week, within the past several days. My recollection is that I
was advised of that at the time that I was advised of the
availability of the witnesses whom I interviewed last night,
whom Ms. Bormann was referring to.

So the idea that there is some written-in-stone
longstanding understanding that these witnesses were going to
give testimony tomorrow, I think is incorrect.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it. Okay.

Here's what we're going to do: We're going to do the
505(h) hearing this afternoon. That means -- I'm going to
give time for the courtroom to be vacated, that means it's a
closed session. It's a classified session. It will begin at
1430. And that means the courtroom needs to be vacated of all
nonessential personnel that shouldn't be at a 505(h) hearing
by that time.

9 If there's a need for an R.C.M. 806 closed session, 10 my intent, without written in stone, would be to do that 11 shortly thereafter, since it's exactly the same procedure. I 12 recognize the unlawful influence issue is 254, that may need 13 fleshing out, but it seems to me there is no need to delay 14 taking evidence at this point in time on the substantive 15 underlying issue that has been percolating since at least 16 January of 2015.

17 Therefore, tomorrow morning we will begin with the 18 testimony on 254 of the four witnesses referred to. If 19 somehow we get through all four of them, we will pick up the 20 docket where it is, which I believe the next topic would be --21 excuse me. Tomorrow morning, first thing tomorrow morning, 22 will be the final two arguments on 008. Then we will pick up 23 254 witnesses. Then if time permits, we will go into the 018

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 series of motions.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I -- could the military commission tell
me what we're talking about with four witnesses? I understood
there were going to be two. I was told earlier this week
there would be ----

6 MJ [COL POHL]: I just go with what they tell me.

7

Who are the four witnesses, Mr. Swann?

8 TC [MR. SWANN]: Your Honor, if you recall in your order 9 254XXX, I believe, the defense requested several witnesses. 10 They wish to speak with the former commander -- the former 11 commander, and then they wished to speak with Colonel Heath. 12 They wish to speak with the current camp commander, and 13 because over time the current camp commander has kind of just 14 moved a little bit, and they wanted ----

15 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Swann, you're standing between me and16 lunch. Let me ask you the question ----

17 TC [MR. SWANN]: They said five witnesses they requested.
18 It's their choice. Who do they want? Just tell us and we'll
19 get them here.

MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Who are the two live witnesses?
TC [MR. SWANN]: There are potentially three live
witnesses: Colonel Heath; the camp commander; and an NCO, a
current NCO that they requested.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Defense, you want all three of
2	them? These are your witnesses, is my understanding. Is the
3	answer yes? Give me one yes or five noes.
4	LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I don't know, Your Honor. I'm not
5	prepared to tell you at this moment.
6	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Who are the other two?
7	LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge, I have yet to interview two of
8	them. So, frankly, I'm a little bit left in the dark here.
9	MJ [COL POHL]: I got it. I got it. Okay. Who are the
10	other two?
11	TC [MR. SWANN]: The other two would be the two former
12	commanders, the one that left in August of 2015 and then the
13	commander that left that actually instituted the policy and
14	probably departed sometime around December of 2014.
15	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So those are the five?
16	TC [MR. SWANN]: Yes, sir.
17	MJ [COL POHL]: And three are live?
18	TC [MR. SWANN]: Yes, sir.
19	MJ [COL POHL]: Are the three live witnesses at 0900?
20	Again, they may not testify first because we're going to do
21	008. And then the other two, just have them standing by, and
22	if we get to them, we get to them. Given our experience with
23	witnesses, we might not get to all five.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	TC [MR. SWANN]: Yes, sir.
2	MJ [COL POHL]: That's the best I can do. You guys figure
3	out all this.
4	The commission will be in recess until 1430, when we
5	will have a closed 505 session.
6	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1240, 29 October 2015.]
7	[END OF PAGE]
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
10	
20	
20 21	
22	
23	