- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0903,
- 2 8 January 2018.]
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: The commission is called to order. Trial
- 4 Counsel, who is here on behalf of the United States?
- **5** CP [BG MARTINS]: Good morning, Your Honor. Present for
- 6 the United States are Brigadier General Mark Martins,
- 7 Mr. Robert Swann, Mr. Edward Ryan, Mr. Clay Trivett,
- 8 Ms. Nicole Tate, and Major Christopher Dykstra. Also present
- 9 at counsel table are paralegals Mr. Dale Cox, Mr. Rudolph
- 10 Gibbs, and Staff Sergeant Jeffery Furr. And also present in
- 11 the courtroom are Ghailan Stepho and Donald Fuhr of the
- 12 Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- 13 These proceedings are being transmitted by closed
- 14 circuit signal to locations in the continental United States
- 15 pursuant to the commission's order.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Commission will note that each
- 17 of the accused are present. Mr. Nevin, who is here on behalf
- **18** of Mr. Mohammad?
- 19 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Right, Your Honor. David Nevin for
- 20 Mr. Mohammad. I'm -- I'm physically present, but there's some
- 21 restrictions on my ability to practice law here that I want to
- 22 bring to the military commission's attention at an appropriate
- 23 time.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 2 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And also, Lieutenant Colonel Poteet,
- 3 Ms. LeBoeuf, Mr. Sowards, Ms. Medina-Celestin. And you noted
- 4 that Mr. Mohammad is present. Thanks.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Ms. Bormann?
- 6 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge, present for Mr. Bin'Attash are
- 7 myself, Mr. Edwin Perry, Captain Brian Brady, and Major
- 8 Matthew Seeger.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Mr. Harrington?
- 10 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, in addition to myself on
- 11 behalf of Mr. Binalshibh, Ms. Alaina Wichner, and Major
- 12 Christopher Lanks.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Mr. Connell.
- 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Good morning, Your Honor.
- **15** MJ [COL POHL]: Good morning.
- 16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: On behalf of Mr. al Baluchi are
- 17 myself, James Connell; Lieutenant Colonel Sterling Thomas of
- 18 the United States Air Force; Major Jason Wareham of the
- 19 United States Marine Corps. Ms. Alka Pradhan was excused by
- 20 the military commission.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Mr. Ruiz.
- 22 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, myself, Ms. Suzanne Lachelier,
- 23 Major Joseph Wilkinson, Mr. Sean Gleason are here present on

- **1** behalf of Mr. al Hawsawi.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Mr. Nevin, before we address
- 3 your issue, I need to talk to each of the accused about their
- 4 rights to be present and to waive that right.
- 5 So this is directed to each of the five accused.
- 6 You've heard this before, you're going to hear it again. You
- 7 have the right to be present during all sessions of the
- 8 commission. If you request to absent yourself from any
- 9 session, such absence must be voluntary and of your own free
- **10** will.
- 11 Your voluntary absence from any session of the
- 12 commission is an unequivocal waiver of the right to be present
- 13 during that session. Your absence from any session may
- 14 negatively affect the presentation of the defense in your
- 15 case. Your failure to meet with and cooperate with your
- 16 defense counsel may also negatively affect the presentation of
- 17 your case.
- 18 Under certain circumstances, your attendance at a
- 19 session can be compelled, regardless of your personal desire
- 20 not to be present. Regardless of your voluntary waiver to
- 21 attend a particular session of the commission, you have the
- 22 right at any time to decide to attend any subsequent session.
- 23 If you decide not to attend the morning session but wish to

- 1 attend the afternoon session, you must notify the guard force
- 2 of your desires. Assuming there is enough time to arrange
- 3 transportation, you will then be allowed to attend the
- 4 afternoon session.
- 5 You will be informed of the time and date of each
- 6 commission session prior to the session to afford you the
- 7 opportunity to decide whether you wish to attend that session.
- 8 Mr. Mohammad, do you understand what I just explained
- 9 to you?
- 10 ACC [MR. MOHAMMAD]: Before I say yes, I would like for
- 11 Mr. Nevin to tell you something.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: No, it doesn't work that way. Just -- do
- 13 you understand what I'm saying? I'm going to give Mr. Nevin a
- 14 chance to talk, but I want to get this out of the way now. Do
- 15 you understand what I just told you about your right to be
- 16 present.
- 17 ACC [MR. MOHAMMAD]: [Speaking in English] Yes, I
- 18 understood. But we be under sexual harassment today for
- 19 search and coming here.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And we'll talk about that.
- 21 Mr. Bin'Attash, do you understand what I just told you?
- ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: Yes, I do. And I join my brother,
- 23 Khalid Shaikh.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Mr. Binalshibh?
- 2 ACC [MR. BINALSHIBH]: [Microphone button not pushed; no
- 3 audio.]
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. You need to push the button.
- **5** ACC [MR. BINALSHIBH]: I fully understand. And I am
- 6 joining my brothers for the -- what was going on today morning
- 7 at the Camp VII ----
- **8** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- **9** ACC [MR. BINALSHIBH]: ---- sexual harassment search.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Mr. Ali, do you understand what I
- 11 just told you?
- 12 ACC [MR. AZIZ ALI]: Yes. And I do join in regards to the
- 13 issue that was mentioned.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And, Mr. al Hawsawi, do you
- 15 understand what I just explained to you about your right to be
- **16** present?
- 17 ACC [MR. AL HAWSAWI]: Yes. And I do join with the
- 18 brothers. And I also would like to leave now.
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Mr. Hawsawi, are you choosing to
- 20 voluntarily leave now?
- 21 [Pause.]
- **22** ACC [MR. AL HAWSAWI]: Yes, voluntarily.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Then Mr. Hawsawi may be escorted

- **1** back to the holding cells and then transported back to the
- 2 camp at -- when available.
- 3 [Pause.]
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Ruiz, does your client want to leave
- **5** now?
- 6 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Yes, Judge.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Go ahead and escort him out,
- 8 please.
- 9 [Judge Pohl conferred with courtroom personnel.]
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Forget this. How long will it take to get
- 11 him to be moved? 15 minutes? Okay. We're going to make this
- **12** easy.
- 13 The commission is in recess until Mr. Hawsawi is out
- 14 of the courtroom, then we'll pick up with Mr. Nevin's issue.
- 15 Commission is in recess.
- 16 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0911, 8 January 2018.]
- 17 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0916,
- 18 8 January 2018.]
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: The commission is called to order. All
- 20 parties are again present with the exception of Mr. Hawsawi,
- **21** who has voluntarily chosen to absent himself.
- Mr. Nevin, you had an issue you wanted me to address.
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: That's right, Your Honor. Thank you.

1 The problem that Mr. Mohammad referred to was that, 2 for the first time today, he and I believe other defendants as 3 well were subjected to a groin search before traveling to the 4 ELC this morning, which is invasive, violative of religious 5 principles, objectionable on a number of grounds. And he 6 nonetheless came to court this morning. But this is a problem 7 for his ability to come to court on a regular basis going 8 forward. He understands your rules, but this puts unnecessary 9 pressure on the right of access to the court and the right to 10 be present and the right to present a defense. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Is this a change of procedure? 12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: It is -- it is a change in procedure. 13 And ----14 MJ [COL POHL]: The reason why I ask that, Mr. Nevin, and 15 of course I don't have the case sitting in front of me, but as 16 I recall, this type of issue came up before Judge Lamberth in 17 the district court, did it not? And he had one ruling that 18 subsequently the -- I believe the D.C. Circuit modified. I 19 mean, isn't -- I believe they were talking about groin 20 searches. Again, I don't have the case in front of me because 21 I had no idea this issue was coming up. 22 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah. And ----

MJ [COL POHL]: So that's why I kind of ask, is this a new

23

1 procedure? Because apparently there was some litigation in 2 the D.C. Circuit. 3 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I don't know the source of this. I 4 can't say authoritatively what the source of this is, but it 5 is part of a bigger pattern that has -- that presents itself, 6 recedes, presents itself again, and this has been going on for 7 a number of years. 8 But there have been a number of things recently. The 9 guard force has announced that there will be -- they're 10 expecting that there will be restrictions on communal prayer. 11 Mr. Mohammad was restricted from having access to his physical 12 legal materials. This is separate from the issue regarding 13 the seizure of the computer. But we're talking the physical 14 legal materials; he was not permitted to have access to those 15 for -- or only on very limited basis for some period of time. 16 This -- I will say we have some personal experience 17 with this. Some of it is reflected in 541, the meetings that 18 we had scheduled that were cancelled. There's been a 19 change -- and there have been a number of changes in the rules 20 that relate to our visiting as well. And also, I'm just 21 giving you a tip of the iceberg here with respect to what

Mr. Mohammad and, I think, the other defendants have been

22

23

experiencing.

- 1 So whether this rule is coming from the JDG or the
- 2 OIC or the ops people or the SMO, I mean, there are
- 3 different -- there are different rules that present themselves
- 4 from day to day. And it's extremely dis -- there are two
- 5 things about it. First is, it's extremely disruptive to
- 6 Mr. Mohammad's ability to participate in these legal
- 7 proceedings. And I submit to you that it is an ongoing
- 8 pattern.
- **9** An early GTMO commander referred to it as controlled
- 10 chaos, that it was being done for the purpose of disrupting
- 11 the ability to participate in these proceedings. And that is
- 12 what's happening again. In fact, we have referred to it by an
- 13 acronym, CCR, constantly changing rules. And it presents a
- 14 gigantic problem in our ability to defend Mr. Mohammad and in
- 15 his ability to participate in the defense.
- So this arises this morning also for me and some of
- 17 the other members of my team specifically, because the guard
- 18 force this morning wanted to search my bag. I carry things in
- 19 a backpack. And they said we want to search your bag. And I
- 20 said, well, I can't let you search my bag. It's ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Was that what you were referencing about
- 22 your ability to practice law?
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, sir.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 2 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And so I said all right, I'll take it up
- 3 with the judge and I'll leave my stuff in the car. So I did.
- 4 So I -- this is what I have this morning.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. That's -- that I can solve.
- **6** Back to my first question though, is that is this the
- 7 first groin search your client has ever been exposed to?
- **8** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: You mean in the history of his time in
- 9 custody?
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: No. Since he's been here after September
- **11** of 2006.
- 12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: That's my understanding.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 14 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And I will say, Your Honor, if you -- if
- 15 you'll afford me a little time to discuss it in more detail.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure.
- 17 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: This was something that was just brought
- 18 to my attention this morning, and I haven't had the
- **19** opportunity ----
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, I understand that.
- 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- for extended discussion.
- MJ [COL POHL]: And, of course, the government is in the
- 23 same position, as they had now idea this was going to come up,

- 1 neither did I. Let's do this, Mr. Nevin. At least while
- 2 we're all here, we can address the issue and hopefully resolve
- 3 it on the groin search part of it.
- 4 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel, can you have somebody look
- 6 into what the procedure is, whether it was changed, why it was
- 7 done, hopefully have a witness with competent authority to
- 8 explain why -- why it was done? I'm making no judgment on it.
- **9** I'm just saying is it standard practice? Is it something
- 10 unique?
- 11 And I understand one thing Mr. Nevin talks about, and
- 12 we've all experienced this here, is that we rotate guard
- 13 forces in and out, and they all have -- may have the best
- 14 intentions in the world, but that doesn't mean they all do
- 15 things the same way. So there is a certain amount of constant
- **16** change down here.
- 17 But my question -- or my point to you, Mr. Swann, is
- 18 simply let's get to the bottom of why allegedly a procedure is
- 19 instituted today that's not been used in the past.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: Right, Your Honor. But the guard force
- 21 has been here for about four and a half months.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: A different procedure was used this

- 1 morning. They've gone back to the SOP rather than these
- 2 temporary standing orders that allowed certain -- to speed up
- 3 processes.
- 4 The case you're looking for, I think, is <u>United</u>
- 5 States v. Ghailani. The judge was Judge Kaplan in that case.
- 6 Mr. Ghailani refused to come to court because he refused
- 7 a cavity search and other such invasive searches. Judge
- 8 Kaplan said that's not stopping me from telling you to come to
- 9 court.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: That wasn't the case I was thinking of,
- **11** but ----
- TC [MR. SWANN]: Well, the other case is a habeas case,
- 13 and that is Judge Lamberth. I think the case might be Odeh,
- 14 off the top of my head.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: That was the one I was thinking of. Yeah.
- **16** Okay. Okay. But just -- what you're saying is they did
- 17 change procedures today.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: They went to the SOP instead of -- the
- **19** SOP does allow for a groin search.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Does it allow or require?
- TC [MR. SWANN]: It doesn't require anything. I mean,
- 22 obviously, the JDG commander can pretty much say we'll not
- 23 have it today. There were some changes. But this morning

- 1 they were subjected to a modified groin search along the sides
- 2 of their legs and stuff, I believe, is what I'm told.
- **3** But I will have somebody ----
- **4** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- **5** TC [MR. SWANN]: ---- more knowledgeable about it this
- 6 morning and tell me exactly what occurred, and we'll let the
- 7 court know.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And then on the second issue as far
- 9 as defense counsel's private papers?
- TC [MR. SWANN]: Well, I -- listen, they looked at my
- 11 papers this morning, too.
- **12** MJ [COL POHL]: I didn't ask ----
- TC [MR. SWANN]: I don't know, sir.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: You work for the United States Government,
- 15 Mr. Swann. I don't really care about your papers.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: I understand. I take no position that --
- 17 I don't know if that's been a past procedure. I do know
- 18 there's a heightened security, for a variety of reasons. I'll
- 19 look into that as well to see whether or not somebody ----
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Well, Mr. Nevin can't bring his backpack
- 21 with his papers in. What we're going to do now is -- and if
- 22 you wish to articulate and present evidence of why this more
- 23 intrusive search on the defense counsel needs to be done, I

- 1 will listen to you. But for today's hearing is they're
- 2 allowed to bring in anything without being searched, okay?
- 3 They'll go through -- the electronic issue is a separate
- 4 issue.
- 5 So we will take a short recess. I don't know if
- 6 Mr. Nevin is the only one affected, but whoever needs to
- 7 retrieve their materials will have an opportunity to go do
- 8 that, and then we'll pick up with 541.
- **9** TC [MR. SWANN]: All right, sir.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Commission is in recess.
- 11 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0926, 8 January 2018.]
- 12 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0950,
- 13 8 January 2018.]
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: The commission is called to order.
- 15 Mr. Harrington? I believe all parties are again present. And
- 16 if I'm wrong when I say that, please stand up and tell me.
- 17 Mr. Harrington.
- 18 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, I would just add, Lieutenant
- **19** Commander Furry has joined us.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Sowards has
- **21** just joined us, too.
- 22 Mr. Harrington.
- 23 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, I'm going to make an attempt

- 1 to stand here for a bit, I if could.
- **2** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 3 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: And I just want you to know that
- 4 the trial in Buffalo is not over yet.
- **5** Anyway, you just mentioned the issue of temperature,
- 6 Judge. And an auxiliary of 152 now is a continuous problem we
- 7 have had for Mr. Binalshibh with extreme cold temperature. He
- 8 has complained over and over again to us. We have complained
- 9 to the authorities. There has supposedly been some
- 10 investigations. No relief from it. I've talked with the
- 11 assistant SJA last hearings, I talked to him again this
- **12** morning.
- 13 Mr. Binalshibh has been given a thermometer for his
- 14 cell, and the temperature goes as low as 60 degrees
- 15 constantly. He has shown it to the assistant SJA where it was
- 16 63 degrees. We have written to the -- everybody that we can
- 17 to try and get some relief from it, and there's been a refusal
- 18 to do an investigation. And obviously he is at his wit's end.
- 19 We are at our wit's end.
- This leads to him complaining, yelling, screaming,
- 21 banging, and trying to get attention. He ends up getting a
- 22 disciplinary proceeding and getting moved to a different cell
- 23 where he says he experiences the same thing, even though the

- 1 other detainees do not experience the same thing that he does,
- 2 which obviously leads us to the conclusion that there is some
- 3 way of controlling this. And I know we've been told that it
- 4 can't be controlled, but it is very, very disruptive.
- 5 It's -- for example, yesterday we came down -- or
- 6 Saturday, and yesterday Mr. Binalshibh cancelled his attorney
- 7 visits because he is so distraught about this. And this goes
- 8 back to the times when he was in the black sites and one of
- 9 the methods that was used. And these things are horribly
- 10 disruptive to him, horribly painful to him, and it interferes
- 11 with our ability to represent him. And I bring up the ability
- 12 to represent him not because -- because that's the hook that
- 13 the court needs to do something about this.
- And so I'm requesting that the court make another
- 15 order if the court can; if not another order, to do something,
- 16 have somebody testify this week at this hearing. We can file
- 17 emergency papers this afternoon on this and have somebody
- 18 testify as to what the conditions are and why it is that this
- 19 cannot be controlled. It is extremely, extremely painful. It
- 20 is totally disruptive to everything that we are trying to do
- 21 in this case.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harrington.
- Trial Counsel, I'm assuming -- are you aware of this

1 issue? Mr. Trivett? 2 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Do you wish to respond to what 4 Harrington just said? 5 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. Good morning, Your Honor. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Good morning. 7 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: So my understanding of this issue is 8 that, in fact, there is a mechanical issue involving the air 9 conditioning unit; that Mr. Binalshibh has been offered to 10 move to another cell to attempt to rectify this issue; and 11 that he's refused. 12 So JTF-GTMO is looking into it. This is a mechanical 13 This is a legitimate issue, at least in regard to the 14 temperature. But their way of solving it was to try to move 15 him to another cell, and my understanding is that he's 16 refused. So that's where we're at with this issue. 17 MJ [COL POHL]: And I'm going to ask Mr. Harrington in a 18 second, but just so I'm understanding how this confinement 19 facility is run: The detainee gets to decide which cell he's 20 in? 21 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: They ----22 MJ [COL POHL]: Is that what you're telling me? 23

MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I ----

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Is that what you're telling me?
- 2 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Could they forcibly move him if they
- 3 wanted to? Sure. But they're not taking that position.
- 4 They're simply asking him if he'd be willing to leave and go
- 5 to another cell, and he's refusing.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I got it.
- 7 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you, sir.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Harrington, any response? I mean,
- 9 Mr. Trivett seems to be agreeing with you that there's a
- 10 problem with that particular cell's temperature, and the --
- 11 and the resolution was to give him another cell.
- 12 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, I would agree with him, and
- 13 I think that it's extreme in this particular cell, but he has
- 14 experienced the same thing when he's been put in disciplinary
- 15 proceedings. And over the past six months that has happened a
- 16 number of times, it has happened in the other cells that he
- 17 has been moved to. So it's not like this -- we -- you know,
- 18 we have empirical evidence from him that -- that it continues
- 19 no matter where he is.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: I understand. But what I'm hearing the
- 21 government say is this particular cell has got a problem with
- 22 its temperature, with this air conditioner thing. We will
- 23 move him to another cell, but he doesn't want to move.

- 1 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Well, I haven't discussed that with
- 2 him, Judge.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. It's just -- I mean, the government
- 4 is agreeing. This is one of the few times the government is
- 5 agreeing with you on this issue. ----
- **6** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Right.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- that there is a temperature problem
- 8 in that cell. And they're agreeing that's a mechanical issue
- 9 and they're saying here's our short-term fix. If he's ----
- 10 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: But the response that we've always
- 11 gotten is we can't control any cell. They're all the same.
- 12 It's all the same system. We don't have individual control of
- 13 these mechanics.
- **14** MJ [COL POHL]: Apparently that's ----
- 15 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, Ms. Wichner just spoke to
- 16 Mr. Binalshibh, and it confirms what I said before, that he
- 17 has been moved to other cells and the same thing has happened
- 18 to him. That's all. We are complaining that this is
- 19 something that is being targeted to him. There's no question
- 20 about that.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. On this particular cell he's been
- 22 given the option to move. And as I asked Mr. Trivett,
- 23 apparently that's -- they're giving him an option to move. He

- 1 chooses not to move out of this cell for -- because of the
- 2 mechanical issue. That's apparently his choice.
- 3 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I will discuss that with him,
- 4 Judge.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: The other cells we can discuss
- 6 differently, but I can't -- what I'm hearing the government
- 7 say, yes, there is a problem with this cell but he doesn't
- 8 want to move. Now, there may be problems with other cells,
- 9 but we don't know that because he's not in them.
- **10** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Okay.
- **11** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay?
- 12 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I will discuss that with him and
- 13 report to the court.
- **14** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 15 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Thank you.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: We'll hopefully resolve that this week,
- **17** Mr. Harrington. Okay.
- We're going to ----
- 19 ACC [MR. BINALSHIBH]: [Speaking in English] Judge, can I
- 20 add something, just make things clear? Because it's not about
- 21 moving from cell to cell. If they're going to move me from
- 22 this cell to other cell, they going to continue the same
- 23 things.

1 The policy of the camp is to disturb me in every 2 place that I am in. And then they said okay, we're going to 3 move you to another cell. They move me to another cell. Thev 4 started again. And then after six months or year or so, 5 they're going to come and say okay, let's move you to other 6 cell. They move me from alpha to bravo, from one cell to the 7 other cell. Same problems. Now, just last three days, I was 8 in three different cells. They were okay with all brothers 9 except for me. And those cells where they are saying we can 10 move you into it, so same problem. It's not going to fix it. 11 My cell has no problem. If I go now, it is -- the 12 temperature is okay. But when I go to sleep, in the morning, 13 9:00, they're going to turn it very cold. When I go to sleep 14 at night, at nighttime, they're going to turn it very cold. 15 If I call the WC and ask him to turn it down, adjust it, he's 16 going to make it the opposite. He's going to make it very 17 cold. And they come say, oh, I don't have any control. 18 Who is controlling the whole things? If you don't 19 have the control, who is doing this whole things? It's not 20 just my cell. Every place I go to, they're going to do it. 21 It's not about them moving me -- over to me. That's not 22 the solution. That's only the policy -- their policy is not 23 going to stop. Harassment, vibration, banging, noises, all

- 1 places they're going to do it. And they're going to tell me,
- 2 okay, we're going to move you to other cell.
- 3 Keep moving me from cell to cell, I cannot
- 4 concentrate on my issues, on my case. I cannot work on any of
- 5 my legal stuff. It's going to just disturb me. That's not
- 6 right. I'm not going to move to any other cell because I know
- 7 what's going to happen there. And I already moved to two
- 8 cells that are available now in my tier that they can move me
- 9 to it, and it's cold. They turn it cold only when I am in.
- 10 Bravo 9, Bravo 14. The other one is -- they are so -- or they
- 11 are not working.
- 12 Where are they going to take me now? That's only two
- 13 cells that they have. And if you remember other brother, they
- 14 went in the same cell, they have no problem with it. This
- 15 unit and the unit before, the guard -- the one who started
- 16 these things, the coldness that started was just something
- 17 very, very rare. Now it's become everyday issues, every day.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I understand, Mr. Binalshibh.
- 19 Mr. Harrington, I don't really want to get into the
- 20 mechanics of how air conditioning works in a confinement
- 21 facility, but I do understand your concern. You asked for an
- 22 additional order for it. I'm not sure exactly what you want.
- 23 So if you draft a proposed order, give it to the government,

- 1 and we will see if that can work out to at least address this
- 2 issue, okay?
- 3 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Thank you.
- **4** MJ [COL POHL]: That brings us to 541.
- 5 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, Your Honor. And the issues around
- **6** 541 are laid out in the moving papers, and the military
- 7 commission ruled that we would be given time before these
- 8 hearings commenced to meet with our client in view of the
- 9 problems we had with the cancelled meetings, and we
- 10 respectfully request that we be given that time and that there
- 11 not be substantive proceedings.
- 12 And I guess by substantive, I mean proceedings that
- 13 go to motions other than the kinds of things we've discussed
- 14 so far this morning about immediate condition issues; that
- 15 there not be discussions about matters until we've had a
- 16 chance to have those meetings with Mr. Mohammad.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin, I'm reading the government's
- 18 pleading on this issue, and just so -- you filed a motion
- 19 basically complaining about last-minute cancellation of
- 20 meetings.
- 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, sir.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: And apparently the government -- I'm
- 23 reading the government response here, is some of those

- 1 cancellations were done by the government, by the JTF, because
- 2 of the need on MRI exams for certain accused. But also in
- 3 there, it indicates that there are meetings that were
- 4 scheduled, approved, that your client refused to meet with
- **5** you.
- **6** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Not during -- not during that period of
- 7 time.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Well, yeah, but I'm just -- what I'm
- 9 saying here is that -- which period of time are you talking
- 10 about?
- 11 What I'm looking at is -- is during the week of 11 to
- 12 15 December, Mr. Mohammad refused the afternoon meeting -- and
- 13 again, I'm just reading from their papers, so understand if
- 14 it's not true, it's not true. I got it. But I'm just telling
- 15 you what they're saying -- and refused the morning meeting the
- 16 next day and only part of the afternoon meeting.
- 17 So if Mr. Mohammad is refusing to meet with you and
- 18 then later on the confinement facility has to adjust their
- **19** schedule, isn't part of this on Mr. Mohammad?
- 20 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: The ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Not all of it, understand what I'm saying,
- 22 but part of it.
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah, well -- and, Your Honor, counsel

- 1 advises me that the reason that Mr. Mohammad was unable to
- 2 attend those meetings was because he was experiencing back
- 3 pain that was severe and that made him unable to -- unable to
- 4 report to the visit, so it was -- it was a matter that was
- 5 outside his control.
- **6** But I guess the point is we -- we schedule visits
- 7 and, you know, if the facility tells us, no, you can't have a
- 8 visit, that's one thing -- we're -- we can't accommodate that
- 9 now. But we plan our own visit and hearing preparation
- 10 schedule based on what they tell us they can accommodate. And
- 11 they told us they could accommodate these meetings and then
- 12 cancelled, and then cancelled those without explanation.
- 13 So that leaves us ----
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: They didn't tell you there was an issue
- 15 with the MRI exams that diminished the number of guards
- **16** available?
- 17 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I hear that.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, did they tell you that at the
- **19** time?
- 20 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I wasn't present, but I'm told that they
- 21 did not.
- **22** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: They just simply said your visits are

1 cancelled. 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. 3 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I mean, I can speak to the MRI issue if 4 the military commission would like. I mean ----5 MJ [COL POHL]: Well, what I'm simply saying is is -- and 6 again, I'm taking it from the government pleadings, so I'm not 7 saying this is -- I have no independent knowledge of this, let 8 me put it that way -- that they had to adjust the meetings 9 because they had an operational shortfall to support the 10 meetings and the MRI, and therefore, they chose to do the MRI. 11 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Right. And my understanding is that the 12 MRIs are taking place at night. In fact, we -- one of the 13 things that, in our dealing with the MRI situation, we've 14 asked that ours not take place at night ----15 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah. 16 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- but -- for a variety of reasons. 17 But I think that's the kind of thing that would need to be 18 resolved by testimony, because I don't -- I don't think that 19 that is -- I don't see how that presents an issue, number one. 20 But number two, it's a point that we have made on a 21 number of occasions, and I think the military commission has 22 made on a number of occasions. I don't doubt that it's 23 difficult to accommodate MRIs and accommodate a detainee about

- 1 whom we know who has had special medical problems and to do
- 2 that and to accommodate visits.
- 3 But it is true, on the other hand, that facilities
- 4 all across the United States do this every day without any
- 5 problem. And it is, as we've said many times, the
- 6 government's decision to do this here in this difficult
- 7 environment. And if they're going to do it here, they should
- 8 be obligated to do it in a way that is efficient.
- **9** And if it's a question of staffing, this was -- this
- 10 came up during the December hearings, and there was an
- 11 indication that the staffing levels were going to be stepped
- 12 up. And I don't know where we stand on that now, but I think
- 13 the point of that remark or of that concession or of that
- 14 direction by the military commission was, you're running a
- 15 capital prosecution here in a pretrial detention facility in a
- 16 law of war environment. Staff it up. It was your idea to
- 17 come here and do this here as opposed to somewhere else, so
- 18 prepare for it and get it right.
- So -- but I'm not asking -- I'm not even asking you
- 20 to condemn anything. I'm just saying could we please have our
- 21 day of meetings before we get into the meat of 502 so that we
- 22 can sufficiently consult with Mr. Mohammad in order to decide
- 23 what steps to take next.

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. Any other defense --2 this appears to be a Mr. Mohammad-specific issue on these 3 specific meetings. Any other defense counsel think somehow 4 they want to be heard on this? I know, Ms. Bormann, you've 5 had a similar issue on other occasions. 6 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge, we have, and it necessitated 7 the calling of a member of the JDG staff, who indicated that 8 they were indeed going to staff up. So we would join this 9 because it's a recurring issue. 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel, do you wish to be heard? 11 TC [MR. SWANN]: Just a couple of things, Your Honor. 12 You indicated Mr. Nevin was unsure about when he was 13 notified. I've got the e-mail to him that's dated 13 December 14 2000 [sic]. It's a Wednesday, about a week or so before these 15 meetings, that because of operational reasons, they needed to 16 deny his request for the meetings on -- on the 20th and the 17 morning meeting on the 21st.
- that. And I've spent too much of my time dealing with this issue. If you recall back in the 254 series, that was the other half of the female guards issue. And I provided the court with pie charts for a number of years across the board, just exactly what happens during those meetings. When they

18

You know, I understand they want meetings. I've got

- 1 make a request, does the request get approved.
- 2 By and large, I would say this: Mr. Mohammad attends
- 3 more of his meetings than any of the five accused; and he
- 4 rarely, if ever, gets a meeting that's disapproved. In this
- 5 instance, it was.
- **6** The court indicated that you looked at our brief.
- 7 I'll take you back to the first week of October. I think we
- 8 were down here for the hearings, and that's when a witness
- 9 testified that -- we addressed the issue of could they have
- 10 meetings here in the courtroom. Could we also do it over in
- **11** the ELC.
- 12 That week the camp was able to accommodate. So if
- 13 the accused decided he didn't want to be in the room here and
- 14 his lawyer had a meeting over at the Echo II, they would --
- 15 they'd make those arrangements. By and large, that entire
- 16 week, if they had that meeting over there, many of them
- 17 refused those meetings over here. They weren't in this room.
- 18 They just decided to stay back at the camp.
- 19 The week of -- when we left here, I believe, on
- 20 the Saturday, the 9th or the 10th, Mr. Mohammad's team, some
- 21 members of his team stayed around. So they had meetings
- 22 during the week of 11 to 15. He asked for four meetings -- he
- 23 asked for eight meetings, a morning meeting, an afternoon

- 1 meeting is counted as two. He asked for eight meetings,
- 2 Monday through Thursday. All of those meetings were approved.
- 3 He chose not to go to two of the meetings, and then chose to
- 4 leave early, much -- very early on one of those meetings. So
- 5 those were three meetings.
- **6** Apparently, there was nobody on island from the 15th,
- 7 that Friday, Saturday, or Sunday, but then they chose to fly
- 8 down here on the rotator the following Tuesday. It's common
- 9 practice. They fly in on the rotator, they turn around and
- 10 fly out on the rotator on Friday. That's fine.
- 11 They were able to accommodate the meeting on the
- 12 21st. There have been no meetings, that I'm aware of, between
- 13 21 December and yesterday. And I don't know if Mr. Mohammad
- 14 had meetings yesterday. If he did, because of the rule,
- 15 weekends before and weekends after, he would have been
- 16 accommodated on that meeting.
- Now, on further look, you see where the camp has
- 18 approved -- and I think the number is going through March now,
- 19 yeah -- he's asked for 78 meetings between now and the first
- 20 week in March. The camp has approved 74 of those 78 meetings.
- 21 They have plenty of opportunity to meet with their client.
- The camp is not -- I work -- I work hard with the
- 23 camp, and the camp has been able to accommodate. Back in

- 1 November, I think Ms. Bormann wanted meetings for a particular
- **2** week. She didn't have an attorney on island. Normally they
- 3 require an attorney to be on island. In this case, they
- 4 originally denied the meetings and then turned around and
- 5 approved all of the meetings that she wanted.
- 6 So the camp goes out of its way to provide meetings
- 7 to these particular individuals. They either refuse them,
- 8 they accept them. Very rarely, if ever, if ever, except on
- 9 this one instance here in the last couple, three months, have
- 10 they ever disapproved a meeting for -- certainly for
- 11 Mr. Mohammad.
- 12 So with that said, sir, I know -- again, I didn't
- 13 make an inquiry as to whether he met with his lawyers
- 14 yesterday or not. If he did, then I certainly don't think
- 15 that we need to stop and give them another Tuesday to meet
- 16 with their attorneys. And even so, I think we need to proceed
- 17 and get the court's business done this week.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- 19 Mr. Nevin?
- 20 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Well, Your Honor, yes, we did meet with
- 21 Mr. Mohammad yesterday, and we'd like to meet with him -- we'd
- 22 like to take the court up on its suggestion, at least that it
- 23 would provide us with additional time to meet with him

- **1** beforehand.
- 2 I can lay out and would be glad to lay out in a
- 3 closed session or in an exparte session exactly what was to
- 4 occur at the meetings that were cancelled and which lawyer
- 5 from our team was to have participated in those meetings.
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin, that's not necessary. I don't
- 7 want to get into your business.
- 8 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah, I didn't ----
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: That's ----
- 10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I don't -- I'm not really proposing that
- 11 that would be a great idea either.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Good. Then we agree it's a bad idea.
- 13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah, okay. It's a bad idea. But in
- 14 some ways I can't really respond to all ----
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I understand.
- 16 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- of Mr. Swann's remarks.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm making an assumption that people
- 18 always act in good faith until proven otherwise. You have --
- 19 in my view, you've presented a good faith reason why you need
- 20 these meetings, and that's -- that's enough for this purpose.
- 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: All right. That's what I needed to say.
- **22** Thank you.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. What we're going to do is this:

- 1 Although it appears that we have ample time in the next seven
- 2 days, seven court days, perhaps eight court days to get our
- 3 business done, experience has shown that sometimes we don't go
- 4 as fast as we think we're going to.
- 5 So that being said, what we're going to do today is
- 6 we're going to go up till the lunch recess, and then this
- 7 afternoon we will not meet, and you can meet with your client
- 8 in the courtroom, all of you can, until 1630. And tomorrow
- 9 we'll go as scheduled with the 505(h) hearings, and there's
- 10 another issue with that that's just come up. And then we'll
- 11 pick up to wherever we are in the open session on Wednesday.
- 12 Back to what I just stated is that, Mr. Connell, I
- 13 understand that you have a 505(g) notice on the groin issue --
- 14 I'm going to reframe that -- the search issue, just for going
- 15 forward. Go ahead. True?
- 16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, yes. We have some relevant
- 17 classified material that seems to inform the issues before the
- 18 military commission, so we have requested an AE number to get
- 19 that 505(g) notice so we can get that information before the
- 20 court.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: And it seems to me if we're dealing
- 22 with -- if we get to the TTPs of how the confinement facility
- 23 is being run, that's going to be classified information, too.

- 1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir, at the secret level.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel, do you think we can resolve
- 3 the search issue without discussing secret information?
- 4 TC [MR. SWANN]: I doubt it. Absolutely not. If
- 5 that's what we're going to be talking about, tactics,
- 6 techniques, and procedures, it will be at the classified
- 7 level, it needs to be in a classified proceeding.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Well, that will give everybody an
- 9 opportunity to actually to maybe even research the law in the
- 10 area. It will give me an opportunity to, anyway. You guys
- 11 may already know what you're talking about. Okay.
- 12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, the Ghailani case that Mr. Swann
- 13 referred to is found at 751 F. Supp 2d 508, and the
- 14 D.C. Circuit opinion regarding groin searches that the
- 15 military commission referred to is found at 760 F.3d 54.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. Okay.
- 17 So that's going to bring us to the 530. I'm not sure
- 18 if this is a government motion or a defense motion.
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, if I could, there are aspects of
- 20 this that have 505 notices. I had listed those for a 505.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah.
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: But there are two aspects of it, G and
- 23 D, that do not have any 505 notices. So my suggestion at the

- 1 802 was that if counsel involved in those cases wish to take
- 2 them up without -- prior to the 505, the government asked part
- $\mathbf{3}$ of this motion, the motion for search, does require a 505
- 4 hearing; but the question of whether the military commission
- 5 can go forward while the defendants don't have access to their
- **6** legal materials does not implicate a classified aspect.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Trial Counsel, I've got a question
- **8** for you, is -- Mr. Ryan, this is yours?
- 9 TC [MR. RYAN]: Good morning, Your Honor. Edward Ryan on
- 10 behalf of the United States.
- In part, Judge, last session if you'll recall, you
- 12 approved this one being broken up because it's two very
- 13 distinct matters within one. 530 as it pertains to laptops is
- 14 mine, 530G as it pertains to legal materials in the specific
- 15 case of Mr. Mohammad is being handled by Mr. Swann. I can
- 16 answer any question you have.
- 17 Your Honor, as to the way forward right now, at the
- 18 802, Your Honor, I believe, accepted and without our objection
- 19 the proposed order of march presented ----
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Uh-huh.
- 21 TC [MR. RYAN]: ---- which would indicate that 530G was to
- 22 go forward today. 530D, I believe, is actually withdrawn by
- 23 the defense. The 530G, by the way, pertains to the legal

- 1 materials in the case of Mr. Mohammad, particularly papers.
- 2 As far as the laptops are concerned, that portion of
- 3 530, 505 notices have been filed which were to be taken up at
- 4 the closed session to be followed in the next open session
- 5 with the handling of the laptops motion.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Let me ask you a question, Mr. Ryan.
- 7 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: And if -- and I don't want a classified
- **9** answer, obviously.
- 10 TC [MR. RYAN]: You won't get one, sir.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. It's unclear to me, and perhaps
- 12 it's because I'm not very digitally proficient, of exactly
- 13 what was done to the computers that caused the problem and
- 14 what's the risk of what was done to the computers? Are you
- 15 with me? And the question is: Can you answer those questions
- 16 in an open session?
- 17 TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, I can, sir.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. What was done to the computers that
- 19 caused them to be seized?
- TC [MR. RYAN]: Your Honor, this pertains to the full
- 21 argument as to 530, that portion of it that deals with the
- 22 laptops. I prefer, and as we have already discussed, that the
- 23 505 aspect of it go first before the open court session

- 1 because one might impact on the other.
- 2 As far as what was done to the laptops at this point,
- 3 alterations were done that, however specified in government
- 4 pleadings as far as the full extent of what was altered within
- 5 them and the events that took place within them as described
- 6 in the document that was seized, that has been presented as an
- 7 attachment. Those are documented for Your Honor.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I have that. My question is is that:
- 9 What is the risk here? I mean, I understand there's an order
- 10 for them not to modify the computers. I got that. You know,
- 11 so that part I got.
- 12 But my question is: What is the risk here? Is it --
- 13 by that, I mean can they alter the computers in such a way to
- 14 give them capability that presents a risk to the United States
- 15 or the confinement facilities?
- TC [MR. RYAN]: Yes, sir.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Can you tell me what that is if -- in an
- 18 open session?
- **19** TC [MR. RYAN]: I believe I can, sir.
- The computers were being modified in such a way
- 21 that -- and, you know, part of this argument, Judge, is sort
- 22 of circular with our request for the ----
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah.

1 TC [MR. RYAN]: ---- forensic analysis. 2 MJ [COL POHL]: I understand. All I want to do is get 3 kind of a framework here, and then we're going to go into the 4 substantive arguments. I don't want to get into the whole 5 issue now because we're going to do it after the 505 hearing. 6 I just want to kind of get the lay -- that's the part that was 7 unclear to me in the proceeding -- in the pleadings of the 8 risk -- what I'm calling the risks to the -- to the 9 United States or the -- and/or the confinement facility. 10 TC [MR. RYAN]: One of the significant risks -- risks that 11 we're presenting that Your Honor -- that we're presenting to 12 Your Honor that has to be dealt with and part of the reason 13 for the forensic search is that, based on the very limited 14 analysis thus far, based on the reading of the documents, 15 based on those with extensive knowledge as to the workings of 16 computers, there are a couple of different risks involved. 17 One is creating an entire operating system within the 18 computers that is separate and apart from that which was 19 already part of that installed and that could be monitored and 20 that had been approved, et cetera; that this new operating 21 system, this separate operating system, could not be easily 22 detected, monitored, et cetera. 23

And secondly, that the alterations to the laptops

- 1 could involve -- along with other changes to the base as a
- **2** whole -- could involve the ability to access the internet.
- **3** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 4 TC [MR. RYAN]: That is -- I think I'm saying it fairly,
- 5 Judge, to say that's sort of the biggest concern of all.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. Okay.
- 7 And again ----
- 8 TC [MR. RYAN]: And, Your Honor, in answering your
- 9 question, I do, of course, reserve the right to make further
- 10 argument at the appropriate time.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I just wanted to kind of get the lay
- 12 of the land because that was kind of my issue.
- 13 Mr. Ruiz?
- 14 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Just briefly, Judge. Judge, I know you
- 15 don't want to get into the meat and bones of this issue, but
- 16 what I want to make very clear here is that Mr. Ryan spoke in
- 17 very broad, general terms about what was done to these
- 18 computers as though these alleged modifications were made to
- **19** every computer.
- The question that I would suggest you ask, Judge, is:
- 21 What was done to, for instance, Mr. al Hawsawi's computer, if
- 22 anything? The answer to that is absolutely nothing. The
- 23 answer, as I've said all along, is there is absolutely not one

- 1 scintilla of evidence that the government possesses that
- 2 indicates that there is any risk whatsoever or any evidence
- 3 whatsoever that Mr. al Hawsawi's computer was compromised or
- 4 modified in any way, shape, or form.
- 5 There were multiple searches that were conducted of
- 6 each of these accused's cells. Some things were found. None
- 7 in Mr. al Hawsawi's cell. And these were fairly comprehensive
- 8 searches.
- **9** And so when Mr. Ryan gets up here and talks in these
- 10 general terms and says the computers were modified and that
- 11 these systems were compromised, it's inaccurate. There's
- 12 absolutely nothing that has been done to Mr. al Hawsawi's
- 13 computer. There's absolutely no evidence that anything has
- 14 been done to Mr. al Hawsawi's computer or that it presents any
- 15 kind of risk whatsoever. That's undisputed. There's been no
- 16 evidence whatsoever presented to you, classified or otherwise,
- 17 that contradicts that, Your Honor.
- 18 Under those circumstances, we have a very strong
- 19 interest in proceeding with getting Mr. al Hawsawi's laptop
- 20 back to him because it is his primary method of reviewing
- 21 discovery, of getting discovery, and of participating in this
- 22 case in a way that is meaningful and a way that allows him to
- 23 continue to participate.

1 All of those things and some of the things you've 2 heard today are things that go to the quality of the 3 representation and the ability of counsel to interact with the 4 accused, the people we are asked to represent. These things 5 matter and have collateral and ripple effects. And they've 6 had that effect in our case. That's why, when the issue first 7 came up, I tried very hard -- we had another week of hearings, 8 and I tried very hard to see if we could try to resolve that 9 at that time. 10 Here we are, as I expected, two, three months down 11 the line. Mr. al Hawsawi still does not have his computer. 12 It's impacting the ability to get discovery to him, to review 13 that discovery, to have meaningful conversations about the 14 issues. 15 And I ask, Judge, that you put the government to the 16 test to show you exactly what you've asked. What is the risk 17 specifically in Mr. al Hawsawi's case and why should we 18 continue to withhold his computer from him? 19 Thank you. 20 MJ [COL POHL]: You're welcome. 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Your Honor, could I speak to the

MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, okay. Because I see 530G is your

22

23

scheduling question, please?

- **1** motion.
- 2 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Right. And this has to do with the
- 3 seizure of legal -- Mr. Mohammad's legal materials.
- **4** And I did file a 505 notice and a motion for a 505(g)
- 5 notice and a motion for a 505(h) hearing, so I think it's not
- **6** ready to be argued at this point.
- 7 I've also had conversations with counsel. I filed a
- 8 witness request, which I -- well, I'll let counsel speak to
- 9 that. But that -- but the time for responding to that hasn't
- 10 run yet, so the time -- I'm not in a position to file a motion
- 11 to compel yet. And it may be that those motions won't be
- 12 necessary in any event, depending on how the discussions go.
- So I submit that 530G -- I believe it's -- there's a
- 14 response and a reply as well, three separate pleadings. I
- 15 believe those are not ready to be argued.
- **16** MJ [COL POHL]: Until after the 505(h) hearing.
- 17 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Until after the 505. I really --
- 18 honestly, I think it should be -- it should be moved until
- 19 later on the calendar to allow counsel and I to have
- 20 additional discussions about it.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I mean -- okay. Just, you know,
- 22 I hear what you're saying there, Mr. Nevin, but the only thing
- 23 is is that I hear you saying it may take longer than Mr. Ruiz

1 saying we need to decide today. What's the ----2 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Oh, I think ----3 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- intention here? 4 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I think Mr. Ruiz is talking about 5 something different. 6 There is a -- how this works is that while -- there 7 were a number of cell searches that occurred in the course of 8 the seizure of the computers and immediately after. And 9 during the course of that cell search, a lot of Mr. Mohammad's 10 legal materials became implicated. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. 12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And that led to the filing of a motion. 13 And because it related to the computer seizure issue, it got 14 filed in the 530 series. 15 MJ [COL POHL]: So your issue is the legal materials, not 16 the -- you have a computer issue, too? 17 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, sir. 18 MJ [COL POHL]: But you're talking about your -- okay. 19 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Correct.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

on the docket, I thought you just wanted to confirm that ----

And, Mr. Connell, 530D was withdrawn, correct?

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's right, sir. Since it appeared

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

20

21

22

23

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah.
- 2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: ---- we seek no further relief on
- 3 530D. Your order taking custody of the laptops and all
- 4 associated materials resolved our concerns.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. 133RR.
- **6** DDC [Maj WAREHAM]: Good morning, Your Honor. Major
- 7 Wareham for Mr. al Baluchi.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Good morning, Major Wareham.
- **9** DDC [Maj WAREHAM]: Good morning. This is a status
- 10 update. We still have a pending request for the TSCM expert.
- 11 But in addition, we supplemented on 30 November with the
- 12 convening authority's findings concerning a different case,
- 13 but one that acknowledged the issues contained in AE 133RR,
- 14 stating that he is working with the command structure here to
- 15 develop a clean facility. And we wanted to note that for the
- 16 court. And as far as anything else, we're still awaiting
- 17 assignment of the expert to resolve these issues.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So 133RR, except for what you just
- 19 told me, is not ripe for these sessions?
- **20** DDC [Maj WAREHAM]: Correct, Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
- Just while we're on that topic, Trial Counsel, is
- 23 there any, to your knowledge -- and I know this is maybe not

- 1 even your bailiwick -- of some type of construction or of a
- 2 new defense counsel meeting area?
- 3 TC [MR. RYAN]: I do not have information, Judge. But in
- 4 light of counsel's reporting, I'll make it my business to look
- 5 into it.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Again, I know you guys don't -- you're not
- 7 Home Depot. But I just would be curious as to, if there
- 8 really is going to be something done or it's just a -- because
- 9 it came from the convening authority, of course, it didn't
- 10 have authority over the JTF. So just a status on it.
- 11 TC [MR. RYAN]: Understood, sir. I'll be able to report.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. 350C.
- 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, with respect to 350C and 3500,
- 14 they both are regarding the former CIA interpreter utilized by
- 15 Mr. Binalshibh's team.
- The government has represented that it is -- it will
- 17 produce discovery regarding that material, that matter. It
- 18 says that it will do so by the end of January. So this -- the
- **19** 350 series is not ripe for decision.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Trial Counsel, is that your ----
- 21 TC [MR. RYAN]: It's accurate, sir.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- accurate? Thank you, Mr. Connell.
- 23 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, one issue on the 350 series with

- 1 respect to our filings, 350R.
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Uh-huh.
- 3 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I still do not believe that I have
- 4 received language from the prosecution on exactly how I can
- 5 refer to our issue in open court. And I think I've been
- 6 awaiting that, and I just want to flag that so that we can try
- 7 to get that.
- **8** MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Ryan?
- 9 TC [MR. RYAN]: I have stated -- I'm sorry, Judge. I'll
- 10 make it clear. We'll take care of it.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. We talked about 478. We're
- 12 going to do that later in the week. One moment, please.
- 13 [Pause.]
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: I think the witness issue on 502 may take
- 15 a while, so I'm going to -- I want to come back to that.
- 16 What I do want on the 502 series is 502JJJ. And
- 17 there is a couple of issues there, one of which is
- 18 Mr. Hawsawi's objection to even considering the government
- 19 pleading; and secondly is the pleading itself, which Mr. Ali
- 20 takes issue just strictly with the legal basis.
- 21 So, Mr. Ruiz, it seems to me you would be heard first
- 22 on this, on the procedural aspect. And if you want to,
- 23 obviously, you can go to the other -- rephrase this. Only

- 1 talk about the procedural aspect, because it's really a
- **2** government motion.
- 3 So you object to me considering it at all on a
- 4 procedural basis?
- **5** DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: That's correct, sir.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Go ahead. Tell me why.
- 7 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Well, the rules are clear. If you
- 8 want to supplement your arguments, you ask for permission.
- **9** And then with the supplement, you better have something new,
- 10 new facts or newly decided case law. The government did
- 11 neither of those things. They didn't ask permission, they
- 12 simply filed it. They titled it as motion to adopt a standard
- 13 instead of as a supplement, but it's supplemental argument on
- 14 something that was in front of you in the December hearings.
- And the result of that is now it's also, I mean,
- 16 delayed your ruling on our part of 502 itself. Because once
- 17 you put it on the docket, then we knew there would be no
- 18 decision between then and now. That isn't right. It isn't
- 19 fair. You should strike it.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: And then what do I do with the issue?
- 21 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: I mean, if -- well, firstly, you
- 22 have, for Mr. Hawsawi's part of 502, a complete record now.
- 23 Either rule on it, or if you decide ----

1 MJ [COL POHL]: No, but I'm saying on this particular 2 issue of ----3 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Yes, sir. 4 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- what does "part of al Qaeda" 5 mean ----6 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Yes, sir. 7 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- as I recall, I asked you that in open 8 court, and you gave me some ----9 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: And we argued it in open court. 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, and you argued. I don't recall any 11 legal standard you gave me. Did you? So what I'm saying is 12 is, do I just ignore any legal authority that -- on one way or 13 the other because it was improperly filed? 14 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Well, what you should do is, if you 15 decide that you need supplemental briefing on the subject, if 16 you don't feel the record in front of you is enough to rule on 17 that issue, then you do what you've done in the past. You 18 say, parties, I want supplemental briefing; here's the issue I 19 want the briefing on; here's the date by which you do it. And 20 then everybody will have a proper opportunity to brief it as 21 fully as it needs to be briefed. 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Do you think you guys did not have an 23 opportunity to fully brief it?

- 1 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Well, when the government filed ----2 MJ [COL POHL]: I agree it was irregular, I'm not going to 3 dispute you on that. I agree that the rules don't neatly 4 address this issue. 5 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Right. I mean the choice ----6 MJ [COL POHL]: In fact, doesn't address it at all. So 7 I've got that. I got that. But I'm just saying is, 8 procedurally going forward is, this is clearly -- and, you 9 know, I ----10 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Uh-huh. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- work on a lot of motions at one time, 12 so it's -- so understand, okay? And I can't say I would have 13 said -- required supplemental briefing on it or I wouldn't 14 have, but clearly I was concerned on what "part of al Qaeda" 15 meant. 16 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Right. 17 MJ [COL POHL]: So -- and again, it wasn't a regular 18 filing, I concede that. But I'm not sure -- but it is a
- **20** DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Yes, sir, it is.

19

- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: So I'm asking you is, have you had a
- 22 sufficient opportunity to respond? Because I know your

significant issue in the underlying 502 issue.

23 pleading objected to the procedure and then talked about the

- 1 substance. But I -- again, I don't want to penalize you if
- 2 you think you were -- hadn't had sufficient time to respond to
- 3 the government's substantive argument about that.
- 4 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Right. As I think you saw, the
- 5 substantive argument we made is basically cut and pasted out
- **6** of 502E, where we took the position that, with what they
- 7 wanted you to do, it was really something we'd responded to
- 8 already.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 10 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: But we made the procedural choice
- 11 ourselves when we saw the irregular filing. We didn't want to
- 12 acquiesce in the irregular filing by doing a full brief on
- 13 what that should mean, and so what we gave you was not a full
- 14 brief on that issue.
- 15 If you want to consider, you know, either that or to
- 16 just to start it over again and say everybody give me your
- 17 best brief on what this means by this date, then we would give
- 18 you something fuller than what we did give you in both 502KKK
- **19** and 540A.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. Trial Counsel.
- 21 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Your Honor, the way in which
- 22 Mr. Hawsawi decided to challenge personal jurisdiction in its
- 23 entirety was irregular, and I wanted to point the court's

- 1 attention back to what the original challenge was when the
- 2 filings papers were drafted. And on 17 April when we
- 3 responded, the only challenge that Mr. Hawsawi had offered in
- 4 regard to his personal jurisdiction was on the issue of
- **5** hostilities, period.
- **6** I've stood up in this court a couple of times and
- 7 said I'm still confused with what exactly they're challenging
- 8 because it sounds like, although they wrote it's just
- 9 hostilities, it sounds like there may be other aspects of the
- 10 AUEB standard that they're challenging.
- 11 Not until, I believe it was 19 October, after the
- 12 April filings, after a July response where they only wanted
- 13 one witness, and their only one witness was Professor Watts.
- 14 He was specific only to the hostilities issue. Not until you
- 15 actually pinned down Major Wilkinson on 19 October did he
- 16 indicate that all aspects of the AUEB standard were going to
- 17 be challenged. So this was subsequent to any of our filings.
- 18 We did not have an opportunity to file on it.
- 19 It's a fairly straightforward issue. But then when
- 20 there was no standard that we had an opportunity to even file
- 21 for you, Major Wilkinson started making up his own, right?
- 22 And he started discussing that "part of" was really synonymous
- 23 with being a member of al Qaeda. He said that there was no

- 1 oath that was taken or bay at pledge, so therefore, he
- 2 couldn't be a member of al Qaeda or a part of al Qaeda.
- **3** Upon a question that you gave whether a DoD
- 4 contractor would be considered part of DoD, he said no;
- 5 whether training in an al Qaeda camp would make someone part
- **6** of al Qaeda, he said no. And most remarkably, he even said
- 7 that you can conduct an operation on behalf of al Qaeda and
- 8 not be part of al Qaeda.
- **9** Those arguments were first raised by him during the
- 10 argument phase of the jurisdictional hearing. And I was
- 11 sitting there saying, you know, there's at least nine years of
- 12 case law directly contrary to everything he was saying that
- 13 was being handled at the D.C. Circuit Court. It was dealing
- 14 with this very issue under the law of war: Who can we detain
- 15 under the authorization to use military force in regard to who
- **16** is part of al Qaeda?
- 17 And we would have been negligent to not at that point
- 18 seek that that be the standard, that that functional standard
- 19 be adopted by the judge who can look at the D.C. Circuit,
- 20 understand that there's been a wealth of habeas petitions on
- 21 this, and that ultimately a functional test was adopted.
- That's why we did what we did. I don't dispute that
- 23 it was irregular, but I think it was irregular in reacting to

- 1 what was a very irregular way in which they challenged
- 2 personal jurisdiction. Had they challenged it up front back
- 3 in July and said we don't believe he was a part of al Qaeda,
- 4 we would have briefed it at that time. But when you're
- 5 dealing with jurisdictional challenges, you're just going to
- 6 deal with the jurisdictional challenge that's in front of you.
- 7 We're not going to make up other things, we're not going to
- 8 brief other things. He challenged the existence of
- 9 hostilities, and that's what we answered.
- 10 So we would ask that you consider the standard. I'm
- 11 ready to argue whenever on the substance of it with
- 12 Mr. Connell. I can do that now, or I can wait. I'll defer to
- 13 you on that, sir.
- **14** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- 15 Mr. Connell, do you want to be heard on the
- **16** procedural aspect of this issue?
- 17 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: We take no position on the procedural
- **18** aspect, sir.
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Trivett.
- 20 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you, sir.
- 21 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Well, firstly, sir, when you told us
- 22 on the 31st of May that you were going to have an evidentiary
- 23 hearing, you put everyone on notice that the entire issue of

- 1 personal jurisdiction was at issue. On jurisdictional issues,
- 2 the government always has the burden of proof; the proponent
- **3** of jurisdiction always does.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Wait a minute. Because I said we're going
- 5 to do an evidentiary hearing, that somehow defines the scope
- **6** of the motion you filed?
- 7 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: No, sir, but ----
- **8** MJ [COL POHL]: Why would you say that?
- 9 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Because the scope ----
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, if the scope of your motion was
- 11 hostilities alone, why would I -- how does my ordering an
- 12 evidentiary hearing somehow expand that scope?
- DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Because when you said they were going
- 14 to have to prove personal jurisdiction, they have to prove
- 15 personal jurisdiction.
- **16** MJ [COL POHL]: Beyond what's being challenged?
- 17 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: That was my understanding of the
- 18 orders that you issued. And it certainly came out in hearings
- 19 that we weren't waiving any piece of it. You said they have
- **20** to ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: It went back and forth, quite frankly, and
- 22 then eventually you said yes, we're not waiving anything.
- DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: That's right.

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: But your original motion was just
- 2 hostilities, correct?
- 3 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: That's true, sir.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: So when I ordered the evidentiary hearing,
- 5 I ordered the evidentiary hearing to support the motion that
- 6 you filed, not one you could have filed. Then later on, it
- 7 devolved that you wanted -- you were challenging all aspects
- 8 of the jurisdictional issue, true?
- 9 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: I mean, that we weren't going to
- 10 waive them because -- so that, for example, there was no way
- 11 for them to avoid hostilities, which we don't think is a
- 12 possibility anyway, with any other aspect of it. If they
- 13 would like to take other aspects off the table and say it's on
- 14 hostilities alone, we're fine with that. But that's not how
- 15 they wish to do it and that's not how they described it in
- 16 their own motions.
- 17 When it comes to the things that came out in
- 18 December, I argued off the evidence and I argued off the
- 19 English language, which is not making up anything at all. The
- 20 evidence that I mainly used from the 302s, they had only given
- 21 us a few weeks before that hearing. So I argued off the
- 22 evidence that was there.
- But, I mean, there's nothing especially irregular

- 1 about challenging what we want to challenge. And if you say,
- 2 Government, you've got to prove personal jurisdiction one way
- 3 or the other, that's what they have to do. And as long as the
- 4 burden is on them, they're not absolved from proving it any
- 5 way that they can prove it.
- **6** And in any case, there was plenty of time before the
- 7 hearing, even between October and the hearing, to say if they
- 8 want to introduce argument, if they want to supplement, they
- 9 could do the regular procedure, ask for it. And if you
- 10 granted permission for it, then, you know, we would do a full
- 11 response at that time. That's all.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- I would note for the record that the issue about
- 14 being part of al Qaeda was in 502E, which was a reply brief
- 15 and therefore not necessary to have a response to.
- I agree with the defense to a certain amount that
- 17 this is somewhat irregular, that I don't know whether we would
- 18 have gotten to it or not; but obviously this was an issue
- 19 that would have had to have been addressed in the eventual
- 20 ruling anyway. Whether I would have asked for a supplemental
- 21 pleading or just researched it myself, I don't know. I don't
- 22 know what I would have done since we're not at that point.
- Be that as it may, since it is an issue, I'm going to

- 1 permit the government to litigate it. And Mr. Hawsawi is 2 saying they want to file a more robust pleading, and I will 3 give them that option. You have two weeks to file the 4 pleading. And that's the last pleading on this issue from 5 everybody, okay? 6 DC [MAJ WILKINSON]: Understood, sir. 7 MJ [COL POHL]: And then we'll ----8 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Your Honor, excuse me. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Yes. 10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: It's the last briefing on this 11 issue ----12 MJ [COL POHL]: As far as they're concerned. 13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: On ----14 MJ [COL POHL]: 502, part of al Qaeda ----15 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Part of al Qaeda. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- of Mr. Hawsawi and Mr. Ali's motion. 17 It's not the last word on 502 from others.
- **18** Mr. Connell?
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Out of fairness, our 502000 was a
- 20 response. The government would already have the ability to
- 21 file the reply if they chose. I mean, it's up to them. It's
- 22 their horse, but ----
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Now, this has got to end. Understand,

- 1 they've styled it as a motion, and it really wasn't a motion,
- 2 at least under the rules. And you filed a response to what
- 3 really wasn't a motion. I understand your argument is
- 4 completely different than theirs. I've got it. They can
- 5 argue the distinction when we get to that point, but I'm --
- **6** I'm just going to stop the ----
- 7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Understood, sir. Thank you.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But I appreciate that, Mr. Connell.
- **9** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I have something else to say
- **10** about 502 when you're ready.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. One moment, please. Mr. Connell.
- 12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I just wanted to mention on 502
- 13 that, while the witness list issue does require a 505(h),
- 14 there is one other carve-out from the 502 series, which is
- 15 502MM, which is the <u>Jencks</u> R.M.C. 914 issue. And we're
- 16 prepared to argue it if the military commission wishes.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Well, since we're on 502, why don't
- **18** you go ahead, Mr. Connell.
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir. Thank you.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Refresh my memory. Didn't the government
- 21 say they were going to give this to you?
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: They said that sir, yes. But I -- I'm
- 23 going to address that issue.

1	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
2	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: There's real disagreement over what
3	that "we're going to give it to you" means.
4	MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
5	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: May I approach the clerk, please?
6	MJ [COL POHL]: Sure. Commission will be in recess for
7	ten minutes.
8	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1049, 8 January 2018.]
9	[END OF PAGE]
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1103,
- 2 8 January 2018.]
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Commission is called to order. All
- 4 parties are again present.
- 5 Mr. Connell.
- **6** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir.
- 7 Your Honor, the issue before the military commission
- 8 at this moment is 502MM, Mr. al Baluchi's motion for advanced
- 9 production of statements under Rule for Military
- 10 Commission 914.
- 11 I have provided the parties and the court reporters
- 12 with a series of slides which are marked as AE 502PPP. Prior
- 13 to court, we complied with the fourth in a series of, shall we
- 14 say, increasingly demanding requirements for advanced
- 15 production of slides. I do not know whether to be insulted or
- 16 complimented by that, but they have been provided to the court
- 17 security officer for advanced production on disc rather than
- 18 e-mail. And I would request permission to display them to the
- **19** gallery and publish them.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 21 [Conferred with courtroom personnel.]
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: PPP.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Yes, go ahead.

1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, Your Honor. May we have 2 the feed from Table 4? 3 Sir, may we have the feed from Table 4? 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, go ahead. I'm sorry. 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir. In many ways, this is a relatively straightforward 6 7 The Rule for Military Commission 914 is a strict 8 parallel to Rule for Court-Martial 914, which is a strict 9 parallel to Jencks, 18 U.S.C. 3500, in the federal court. So 10 the actual requirements are fairly well-established. 11 that, there are significant differences among the parties on 12 what Rule 914 requires, and that's why I want this opportunity 13 to bring this before you today. 14 Rule 914 itself, the so-called <u>Jencks</u> rule, has two 15 significant sources of discussion of room for interpretation. 16 The rule itself requires that the calling party after direct 17 examination produce -- and then we come to the first issue 18 which is -- let me just highlight here, give that a shot --19 "statement of the witness" is an issue that causes some 20 disagreement. And the second area which causes disagreement 21 is "relates to the subject matter."

for the motion is that the Jencks Act was passed following

The third area, of course, which is really the basis

22

23

1 United States v. Jencks to change the timing of production of 2 the statements of the witnesses that relate to the subject 3 Rule 914, like the Jencks Act itself, requires that 4 that production only take place after a witness has been 5 called on direct. 6 Now, in this particular instance regarding Special 7 Agent Fitzgerald and Special Agent Perkins, interestingly, 8 they have already been called on direct, although I'm sure 9 that there will be additional direct with respect to 10 Mr. al Baluchi specifically. Special Agent Fitzgerald has 11 already testified about his involvement in the USS COLE 12 investigation as a basis for hostilities. Special Agent 13 Perkins has already testified about her involvement in the 14 East Africa Bombing case as a basis for hostilities. 15 So in this situation, although at the time we filed 16 the motion the witnesses had not yet testified on direct, now 17 they have. So that brings us to the question of, well, what 18 has the government produced because they said they were going 19 to produce this, and that's where we have a substantial 20 disagreement with the government. They don't brief it, so I 21 don't know if their disagreement is about "statement of the 22

witness" or if their disagreement is about "relates to the

23

subject matter."

1 But let's begin with statement of a witness, because 2 this issue is going to come up again and again between now and 3 It will apply to us with the numbers of witnesses that trial. 4 we intend to call for -- in the personal jurisdiction hearing. 5 It already applied to us. We already -- there's already a 6 production from the defense in the record with respect to 7 Ms. Maher and a number -- we've given notice of the 8 production -- we've been on a rolling basis producing 9 discovery to the government with respect to personal 10 iurisdiction. 11 So let us come to what is a statement. A statement 12 in the -- in Rule 914 has three different aspects, and really 13 the government has produced a number of statements under the 14 third definition but not under the other two. 15 Under Rule 914, a statement is, number one, a written 16 statement made by the witness that is signed or otherwise 17 adopted or approved by the witness. For most people, this is 18 the most -- the largest collection of documents that they 19 produce. 20 If someone called me to testify on this case, for

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

example, as a witness, and I were testifying about the 9/11

investigation, there would be tens of thousands of documents

that would have to be produced for me: All of the e-mails

21

22

23

1 that I sent related to the subject matter of my jurisdiction, 2 all the pleadings that I've prepared, all the times that I had 3 spoken, because those are written statements made by a witness 4 and "written" has been fairly well established in the military 5 and federal courts to include electronic as well as, you know, 6 written out by a scrivener. 7 MJ [COL POHL]: So what's the problem then? 8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Well, the problem is that the 9 government does not seem to believe that written statements go 10 beyond either handwritten notes or a statement to bridge prior 11 testimony because they -- it's my understanding from the 12 government as of Friday, as of three days ago, they had 13 produced all the material that they intend to produce for 14 Special Agent Perkins and Special Agent Fitzgerald. 15 That included essentially about eight prior 16 transcripts -- and I have a slide on this actually, but I want 17 to answer your question -- the handwritten notes of Special 18 Agent Perkins and some 302s that they had produced prior, 19 either in the December hearing with respect to Special Agent 20 Perkins and in the ordinary FBI production. But there are a 21 vast amount of writings related to the subject matter that 22 they've already testified about, much less what they intend to 23

testify about, that would fall within the scope of this rule.

- 1 The -- I do believe that the government has -- to the 2 best of my knowledge, the government has complied with the 3 third element of the definition, which is their statements to 4 the grand juries, they have produced those; and as far as I 5 know with the second element as well, their testimony other 6 than the grand juries. But with respect to written statements 7 made by the witness, there are a lot of statements that 8 remain.
- And so I wanted to give you a few examples of those
 just with respect to these two witnesses that we're talking
 about, Perkins and Fitzgerald. Special Agent Perkins and
 Special Agent Fitzgerald both testified about the ordinary
 practice of producing FD-302s by the FBI. It's well known and
 well documented in their procedures and obvious examples of
 statements.
- The real issue that ordinarily comes up in 302s is
 whether 302s are a statement of the interviewee. But in this
 situation, the people who are testifying are the interviewers,
 or the people who conducted investigation into three different
 major attacks on the United States between 1998 and now, and
 there are probably an enormous number of 302s that these two
 witnesses have produced.
- I can't -- I can't prove that, but I do know that the

- 1 prosecution has produced only four percent of the 302s that
- 2 were produced -- that the FBI produced. The government culled
- 3 those out. They said that these are the relevant ones. But
- 4 there's a different standard with respect to Rule 914 than
- 5 simple helpfulness to the defense and materiality.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Four percent of what? What is the hundred
- 7 percent?
- 8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: A hundred percent is the -- is all of
- 9 the 302s that the FBI produced in the 9/11 investigation.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And you've got -- you said the
- 11 government has only produced four percent of them to you?
- 12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes. And they say that's the relevant
- 13 four percent. That's their position.
- **14** MJ [COL POHL]: Under the ----
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And what we're comparing -- what we're
- 16 comparing with is <u>Moussaoui</u>. In <u>Moussaoui</u>, they produced
- 17 a factor of 20 or more 302s to the defense than they produced
- 18 here, so that's the population and the sample that I'm
- **19** referring to.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But the production of the Moussaoui
- **21** 302, just to use that shorthand ----
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- was because of the statements of a

- 1 witness or because of discovery helpful to the defense?
- 2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That was Federal Rule of Criminal
- **3** Procedure 16 discovery, equivalent to 701.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The government has taken a more
- 6 restrictive view here of what was relevant and helpful to the
- 7 defense. But obviously -- and I don't have circles for you,
- 8 but obviously there are circles that -- that there are
- 9 materials that were produced both under -- that were produced
- 10 under ordinary Rule 16 federal discovery, and probably would
- 11 be produced under <u>Jencks</u> as well. The same is true here, that
- 12 there are some documents which are responsive to 914 have
- 13 already been produced under ordinary Rule 701 discovery.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it. Thank you.
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The government -- that's for 9/11.
- 16 Now, the two other categories that the government called these
- 17 witnesses about, the East Africa Embassy Bombing and the COLE,
- 18 are radically different. The government has produced two 302s
- 19 related to Special Agent Perkins out of the East Africa
- 20 Embassy Bombing case, and has produced no 302s related to the
- 21 COLE investigation and that Special Agent Fitzgerald testified
- **22** about.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Did they say the 302s don't exist, or what

- 1 was their response?
- **2** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Well, unfortunately, the pleading
- 3 response was we're going to produce it. But as they began
- 4 producing these materials ----
- **5** MJ [COL POHL]: So you don't know ----
- 6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I don't know the answer.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it.
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: The -- with the -- Special Agent
- 9 Perkins testified about the alternative to a 302, which is an
- 10 EC, or an electronic communication. She testified about
- 11 producing some of those, as did Special Agent Fitzgerald. The
- 12 government has produced no electronic communications to us,
- 13 other than the 10 January 2007 memorandum that they produced
- 14 in December that was introduced as 502XX.
- 15 With respect to e-mails of Special Agent Fitzgerald
- 16 and Perkins, the government has produced no e-mails. With
- 17 respect to notes, Special Agent Perkins testified about her
- 18 review of a set of hard-copy CIA reporting related to,
- 19 specifically in that situation, Mr. Hawsawi.
- It seems unlikely to me that, during the course of an
- 21 entire investigation, that Special Agent Perkins never took --
- 22 didn't take notes on that set or any other set falling within
- 23 the scope of these two enormous investigations.

- 1 On Friday, the government produced the set of
- 2 handwritten notes from the interrogation on -- at the end of
- 3 January 2007, but I imagine that there are many, many other
- 4 sets of notes.
- 5 And then finally, Special Agent Perkins testified
- 6 about the way that she sent in requests for questions to
- 7 Mr. al Hawsawi was to prepare a formal cable, and that she
- 8 would prepare those cables, send them through her chain of
- 9 command. Ultimately, they would wind up at the CIA, and then
- 10 there would be some sort of response that came back. Now, the
- **11** response ----
- MJ [COL POHL]: If it goes through the chain of command,
- 13 would the cable indicate that it was Perkins as the author of
- 14 the cable or would it be somebody else?
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: So I have never seen an FBI cable, but
- 16 by analogy to an FBI electronic communication, there is a
- **17** Drafted By line.
- **18** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And so if you look at 502XX, for
- 20 example, which is an example of an FBI electronic
- 21 communication, there is a Drafted By line, there is a To line,
- 22 and there is an Approved By line. And so it's very clear --
- 23 it's very easy to see under Rule 914 what is written by and

- 1 adopted in some way by a -- by a testimonial sponsor.
- 2 And so that brings us to the last issue, which is
- 3 what is the scope of the subject matter. Both witnesses, both
- 4 Special Agent Fitzgerald and Special Agent Perkins, testified
- 5 about the 9/11 investigation, and they both testified about
- **6** the January 2007 interrogations.
- 7 I should note that, of course, the government has
- 8 produced the letterhead memorandum that was the subject of
- 9 testimony, has already produced that to us, which didn't fall
- 10 within my five categories that I talked about there because
- 11 it's unusual and I don't expect there are any other letterhead
- 12 memoranda out there. There could be. She testified that
- 13 there were some side memoranda sometimes relating to abuse
- 14 issues, but I don't know that those exist or not.
- 15 But with respect to Special Agent Fitzgerald, his
- 16 testimony, as brought out on direct, also included the
- 17 USS COLE bombing. And with respect to Special Agent Perkins,
- 18 her testimony on direct, the scope of her subject matter also
- **19** included the East Africa Embassy Bombings.
- The reason why this issue is before the military
- 21 commission is so the military commission in some ways can tell
- 22 us its interpretation of Rule 914 so that the parties can
- 23 comply. I believe that the extreme minimalist position that

- 1 the government has taken is not supported by the text of
- 2 R.M.C. 914, and that written -- when a witness who is called
- 3 by the government to testify on direct produces written
- 4 statements related to the scope of their subject matter, the
- 5 government has an opportunity -- has a responsibility to
- **6** produce them.
- 7 That's equally true for the defense as we're going --
- 8 as we, in fact, are seeing in this personal jurisdiction
- 9 litigation, that we're producing vast amounts of statements of
- 10 our witnesses to the prosecution, even in advance of knowing
- 11 which witnesses will be called to testify.
- **12** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you, Mr. Connell.
- 15 Trial Counsel.
- 16 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Your Honor, we believe this issue is
- 17 moot as of a 5 January disclosure of Special Agent Perkins'
- 18 notes for Mr. Ali's LHM. We believe that we have completed
- 19 all of our obligations under Rule 914.
- The 914 rule obviously doesn't require disclosure
- 21 until after testimony. We don't intend to invoke that. We're
- 22 not using that strategically to try to benefit the government
- 23 in any way. Like we said to Mr. Connell initially, that we

- 1 would be happy to turn these over beforehand, and we started
- 2 turning them over right around when we said we would.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Are there any 302s of Ms. Perkins related
- 4 to the East Africa Embassy Bombings you did not turn over?
- **5** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: No, sir. The ones that she wrote,
- 6 statement of the witness, have been disclosed to ----
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Are there any 302s that Agent Fitzgerald
- 8 wrote about the COLE bombing that you did not turn over?
- 9 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: No. sir.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: I could go through each topic, but I -- I
- 11 mean, you're not restricting your response only to the 9/11
- **12** itself?
- 13 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: It would just depend on the -- we
- 14 understand, obviously, the scope of what their testimony is
- 15 going to be.
- **16** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 17 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: And we understand our obligations
- 18 under the rule.
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: So looking at Mr. Connell's circles, you
- 20 agree that that's the scope of the subject matter?
- 21 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. We take no quarrel with
- **22** that.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So there's not a scope issue.

- 1 Okay. And then you say you've given them all of the 302s.
- 2 Have you given them all the electronic communications?
- **3** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: We have ----
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: I can go down the list. I'm just telling
- 5 you. Okay.
- **6** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. We have looked in all
- 7 relevant depositories for any other statements of the
- 8 witnesses, and we have provided all of them. That would have
- **9** included a search for ECs.
- Again, part of the concern is we have no obligation
- 11 to sort of wave the flag and say this is your Jencks, this is
- 12 your 701 discovery. We've turned over the relevant portions
- 13 of the FBI investigation. Those would have things that would
- 14 certainly constitute <u>Jencks</u> for both Special Agent Fitzgerald
- 15 and for Special Agent Perkins. But they were provided earlier
- 16 as -- once we turn it over once, that's all we have to turn it
- **17** over.
- 18 So we believe we have complied with our obligations.
- 19 I don't know if I want to go down or can go down with the
- 20 voluminous discovery, that there was an EC given on this date
- 21 or there was a cable given on this date. But we understand
- 22 our obligations. I took no ----
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Just on my technical question of

- 1 the cables, was Mr. Connell's surmise accurate that a cable
- 2 would have a Drafted By, or at least some way you could
- **3** determine who -- who wrote it?
- 4 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: It would depend on the nature of the
- **5** cable ----
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 7 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: ---- sir. It would.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: So when you're doing a search for cables
- 9 for Special Agent Fitzgerald, for example, you would do the
- 10 word search, and if his name was on there, it would come up as
- 11 his statement?
- **12** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. But if his name wasn't on there,
- 14 even though he may have originated it, there would be no way
- **15** for you to know that he originated it?
- 16 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Right. I think some of this is a bit
- 17 of a red herring, because it's not like FBI agents file a lot
- 18 of cables on this issue ----
- **19** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 20 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: ---- when they're investigating the
- 21 case as law enforcement officers.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I think when she discussed that one

- 1 issue, it was sort of unique to ----
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: So just so I'm clear, Mr. Trivett, as an
- 3 officer of the court, you're telling me that you've given them
- **4** all of this information.
- **5** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: And you agree with his scope ----
- 7 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I do.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- whether it's got to do with any of
- 9 those other, East Africa or the USS COLE, so it's not a scope
- 10 issue?
- **11** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Correct.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: It's not a definition of statement issue?
- 13 It's just a misunderstanding of what you have sent and what
- 14 he's received, apparently. Okay. I hear you. Thank you.
- **15** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you, sir.
- **16** MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Connell?
- 17 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: On occasion, the competing
- 18 representations of parties can be tested by evidence. This is
- 19 one of those occasions.
- 20 Special Agent Perkins has testified and so has
- 21 Special Agent Fitzgerald, excuse me, and I will be
- 22 cross-examining them on this topic of what they actually wrote
- 23 and then we'll know the answer.

- **1** But in the short-term, I suggest to the military
- 2 commission, since there's no issue here, that the military
- 3 commission go ahead and issue an order requiring the
- 4 production at whatever time you consider reasonable, and we'll
- 5 comply with that order too, right? This is not a goose versus
- 6 gander issue. We will also comply with the order as to
- 7 advanced production of Jencks materials.
- 8 And we know, for example -- and let me just give you
- 9 this one example: Special Agent Perkins has already testified
- 10 that she drafted a cable about information that she wanted to
- 11 know related to the CIA interrogations of Mr. al Hawsawi. So
- 12 we know she -- we already know that document exists.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: But is it -- is it retrievable? By that I
- 14 mean is she no longer works for the FBI.
- **15** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay, if her name isn't on the cable as
- 17 Drafted By, even though she did draft it, okay, for example,
- **18** is that retrievable?
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sure. I mean, there's -- Mr. -- or,
- 20 excuse me, the government just represented, and I think it is
- 21 accurate, there's a relatively small number of cables from the
- 22 CIA -- from the FBI to the CIA regarding interrogation of CIA
- 23 detainees.

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: Let me, let me -- let's frame it
- **2** differently then.
- 3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Right.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Even if you can't determine that on the
- 5 cable issue, the FBI cable issue, who the exact author is,
- 6 therefore, for 914 purposes it may be difficult; but for 701
- 7 purposes, shouldn't you have it anyway?
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir. And I also agree with the
- 9 government that -- I'm not asking them to flag I'm producing
- 10 this under 701 versus Brady versus 914. If they produced it
- 11 to us once, that's all they have to do. But this is an
- 12 example of something that they didn't produce at all.
- **13** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And you know ----
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm with you.
- 16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Maybe it says Drafted By, maybe it
- 17 says POC, or maybe there were seven of these and she can look
- 18 at the seven and say, yes, that's the one I drafted and not
- 19 the other.
- But, yes, whether under 701 or 914, all of this
- 21 material should be produced. And there's an easy solution,
- 22 which is, issue an order and then we'll -- the evidence will
- 23 demonstrate whatever it demonstrates.

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure. When counsel asks me to issue
- 2 orders, I always turn around and say go ahead and draft one.
- 3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Very good, sir.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Submit it in two weeks, give it to the
- 5 government. Government, then you'll have two weeks to
- 6 respond. You don't -- when I say two weeks, if you do it
- 7 earlier than that, you can.
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir, I understand.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm talking to both sides on that. So
- 10 then we'll see if it works out.
- 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: It's basically what you're saying, it's an
- 13 order to comply with the law.
- 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir.
- **15** MJ [COL POHL]: Got it?
- **16** LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, may I be heard?
- **17** MJ [COL POHL]: Sure.
- 18 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, the one thing that I want to
- 19 highlight for the commission is that Mr. Trivett indicated
- 20 that they provided this discovery to us on January 5th. They
- 21 provided it to all of the teams, and I'm referring to the
- 22 handwritten notes of Special Agent Perkins. They seek to gain
- 23 no advantage.

- 1 Nevertheless, we were never provided with her
- 2 handwritten notes prior to our examination when she testified.
- 3 I understand that the distinction, I think, the prosecution is
- 4 drawing here is that there were handwritten notes of
- 5 Mr. al Baluchi's interview. However, our position is that we
- 6 should have reviewed -- we should have received those
- 7 handwritten notes.
- 8 Again, we're operating in a co-accused case. This is
- 9 a joint motion with Mr. al Baluchi. And where I may not have
- 10 chosen to ask her specific questions about the substantive
- 11 details in those handwritten notes, certainly as you saw from
- 12 my cross examination, there were questions about protocols,
- 13 about procedures, about how she went about conducting her
- 14 investigation, her interviews, her interrogations.
- 15 So this is a -- a theme that we continue to see from
- 16 the prosecution, which is, we have a co-accused case because
- 17 they fought very hard to make this a co-accused case and to
- 18 maintain it as a co-accused case; yet when they're parsing out
- 19 discovery, they take a very individualistic approach when they
- 20 choose to provide documents to one team or another. This is
- 21 an instance where we believe we should have received that
- 22 discovery and we did not.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Since you received it on the 5th of

- **1** January after she testified ----
- 2 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Sure.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- it wasn't available at the time of
- 4 testifying, do you wish to file a supplement and necessarily
- **5** re-call her?
- 6 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: No. I wanted to, I wanted to -- not at
- 7 this time; we're still reviewing the documents.
- **8** MJ [COL POHL]: But you understand ----
- 9 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: What I want to highlight for you is that
- 10 this is an issue.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: I got that part.
- 12 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Right.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm just trying to -- you give me issues,
- 14 I try to give you remedies.
- 15 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Sure.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Some you like, some you don't. I got it.
- 17 But in this particular example, you got something on the
- 18 5th of January, new evidence. If you wish to file a
- 19 supplement with a request to re-call the witness, that would
- 20 be your option.
- 21 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Great. That's one of the things I wanted
- 22 to alert you to is there's a possibility that I may ask to ask
- 23 additional questions because of this issue.

1 What I'm also doing and I've done a number of 2 different times when I've had the opportunity, is to highlight 3 for you an issue that will be put before the commission in 4 greater context at some time, which is, the manner in which 5 discovery is provided to some of the defense teams and not to 6 others in this co-accused case, we're going to be challenging 7 Some teams are receiving discovery, some are not, 8 because the government is making these very fine distinctions 9 as to who it's relevant to. 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Is there anything that would prevent the 11 co-accused sharing their discovery with you? 12 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I believe, yes, in some of these 13 instances it says "only releasable to." 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, right. You've got that category. 15 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Yes. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Is that the only category we're talking 17 about? When it says released to detainee by number, I know 18 that. Okay. Obviously that's ----19 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Yes, there is discovery that is not --20 cannot be shared with other teams. We have received such 21 discovery in our case that we are not to share with other 22 teams, and I'm sure other teams have as well. That creates 23 problems that I will be putting in greater context for you,

- 1 but this is yet another instance where I wanted to highlight
- 2 exactly the mentality that is being -- that is driving the
- 3 productions of discovery.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 5 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Thank you.
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you, Mr. Ruiz.
- 7 Just as a housekeeping thing, AE 543 was an ex parte
- 8 request from Mr. Mohammad's team, I believe. I just put this
- 9 on the docket to remind me to tell you you'll get a response
- 10 very quickly from me on that. Okay. But it's not -- it
- 11 wasn't to be discussed. Okay.
- 12 Mr. Connell, are you ready to argue 513? And then
- 13 just to let you know, we'll do 513, and then if we have time,
- 14 we'll do 528. But if we don't, we will stop at noon. Go
- 15 ahead.
- **16** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I understand, sir.
- 17 Your Honor, in 513, the government's response is that
- 18 it intends to produce some responsive discovery. It makes
- 19 sense to us to wait until we receive that discovery.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Did they give you a timeline?
- 21 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Not in the pleading, but they might
- 22 have one.
- 23 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, on 20 December, we moved for

- 1 substitutions and other relief related to some of this ----
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Hold on a second.
- 3 [The Military Judge conferred with courtroom personnel.]
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. You indicated you submitted it for
- **5** substitutions.
- **6** CP [BG MARTINS]: 20 December, I believe it was accepted
- **7** for ----
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I directed them to bring it down
- **9** here, and I plan to review it this week.
- 10 CP [BG MARTINS]: Great. And, Your Honor, actually we
- 11 have one other -- one other piece of -- we're not conceding
- 12 that it's discoverable as a matter of law, but we've elected
- 13 to produce it, and it is covered by his 513-related underlying
- 14 discovery request that 513 -- for which 513 is a motion to
- **15** compel.
- **16** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 17 CP [BG MARTINS]: So we have one other additional document
- 18 that we just arranged and coordinated to be able to provide to
- 19 you in that same mechanism of ----
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: The 505 review?
- **21** CP [BG MARTINS]: ---- 505.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 23 CP [BG MARTINS]: And I would -- I'm actually, in order to

1 get it to them quicker, I'm moving here for a leave to file a 2 supplement to Appellate Exhibit 542 in order to catch that 3 document up with the others that are related to his 513 4 motion. And if you would ----5 MJ [COL POHL]: 542. Okay. You just want to submit ----6 CP [BG MARTINS]: I just ----7 MJ [COL POHL]: 542 is the other one. Also, I'm doing 8 that one this week also. So the answer to supplement with the 9 additional thing, I'm assuming there's no objection? 10 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No objection, sir. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Your motion is ----12 CP [BG MARTINS]: So we'll then file a ----13 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- granted. 14 CP [BG MARTINS]: ---- supplement that catches up one 15 document with that. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah. Okay. 17 CP [BG MARTINS]: But the ----18 MJ [COL POHL]: I plan to get to all that this week. 19 CP [BG MARTINS]: Thank you. 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. That brings us to 528.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Good morning, Judge.

MJ [COL POHL]: Ms. Bormann.

21

22

23

LDC [MS. BORMANN]: As I indicated to the court at the 802

- 1 conference yesterday, 538 is a motion to compel the remaining
- 2 records we requested from the government regarding seizure of
- 3 phone records from a Taliban embassy.
- 4 We received some responsive documents. They were
- 5 illegible. We went back to the prosecution. We received the
- 6 same set of documents in a more legible copy, but they were
- 7 not the full set of documents we'd requested.
- 8 As a result of what we got, we began an
- 9 investigation. We've received new developments as part of
- 10 that investigation which continues, and we will -- we intend
- 11 to supplement, but we -- at this point, the investigation is
- 12 ongoing. I anticipate a supplement being filed in the next 30
- 13 days or so. So that's where we are with it.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Just on the government response to
- 15 the -- they've -- they have complied with your discovery
- **16** request ----
- 17 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Well, they ----
- MJ [COL POHL]: ---- as of now.
- 19 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: ---- claim that their material is
- 20 responsive. We did an investigation to determine -- once we
- 21 got legible copies, or more legible copies -- whether or not
- **22** it in fact was ----
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: It may or may not be responsive, but the

- 1 government's position is this is what we're going to give you.
- 2 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Right.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: You want to do the supplemental
- 4 investigation to see ----
- **5** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: We're doing a supplemental
- 6 investigation to determine whether -- to what extent it is not
- 7 responsive. And so we'll have a supplement filed, we
- 8 anticipate, within 30 days.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you.
- **10** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Thank you.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: While you're there, Ms. Bormann.
- 12 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yes, Judge.
- **13** MJ [COL POHL]: 538.
- **14** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: 538.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Defense Motion to Compel FBI Manual for
- **16** Terrorism Interrogation.
- 17 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: That is a situation where Mr. Connell
- 18 indicated that, at the 802, that they were doing an
- 19 investigation. This has to do, in great part, with part of
- 20 what Mr. Connell just argued in 502MM.
- 21 What we did after the testimony of Agent Perkins and
- 22 Agent Fitzgerald in the December hearings was we issued eight
- 23 separate discovery requests to the government requesting

- 1 additional materials specifically mentioned by the agents in
- 2 their testimony, all of it dealing with policies and protocols
- 3 involving FBI interrogation during the time period relevant to
- 4 this case.
- 5 They have not yet had the opportunity to respond to
- 6 any of that. We anticipate that we'll probably be asking to
- 7 combine those arguments, because it appears that they all deal
- 8 with the same issues, which are: What were the protocols for
- 9 the FBI at the time? What were the policies for the FBI at
- 10 the time? How did these agents diverge from those protocols
- 11 and policies? Why did they diverge? And what information
- 12 were they given and how that information was given as to why
- 13 they should diverge. All of which is, of course, discoverable
- 14 because it's material to the preparation of our defense and
- 15 it's -- it leads to investigation, cross-examination of the
- **16** FBI agents in Mr. Bin'Attash's case.
- 17 I hesitate to say we couldn't argue ----
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: I look at 538, and it sounds to me like
- **19** you're asking for one manual.
- 20 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: No. The ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Just the way it's titled.
- 22 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: The title of it is a misnomer, and I
- 23 apologize for that. But if you read through the motion

1 itself ----2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. 3 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: ---- it asks for every policy, 4 protocol involving FBI interrogation of detainees. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Have you gotten a response from the 6 government? 7 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yes, we got a response from the 8 government. And that's why the motion to compel got filed. 9 The only responsive material we received were the two 10 documents we received in December. I think they're marked as 11 part of 502, and I ----12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. 13 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: ---- cannot remember. 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Are you ready to proceed with argument on 15 538 then ----16 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: We ----17 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- or do you want to delay it and 18 combine it with something else? 19 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yeah. We could, but I suggest to you 20 that it is more fruitful to let the government -- we've 21 submitted eight separate discovery requests that are connected to it as a result of the agents' testimony that we heard in 22 23 December. We got those in right away. They were all in

- 1 before the end of December, and so they're now running the
- 2 course of the 30 days. I anticipate we'll get responses
- 3 probably while we're here.
- 4 And then we'll take a look at what we got, and then
- 5 we'll make a determination about whether or not and to what
- 6 extent those are responsive and then sort of combine the whole
- **7** thing. So ----
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. They'll all be folded up into 538?
- **9** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: That's what we're anticipating doing.
- 10 And so I think for judicial economy it makes sense to sort of
- 11 combine all the FBI policy documents and interrogation into
- 12 one big motion.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Got it. So basically you want to
- 14 put this, in until you get -- you were almost going to get
- 15 away there. You're going to put this -- wait for the
- 16 response, then see how much needs to be incorporated, if you
- 17 need to supplement or not?
- **18** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Exactly.
- **19** MJ [COL POHL]: All right.
- 20 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: That's what we plan to do.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Got it. Thank you.
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: May I be heard, sir?
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure.

- 1 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I don't have any objection to
- 2 Mr. Bin'Attash's position on that, but at the 802 the military
- 3 commission did mention that it saw a relationship between 538
- 4 and the discussion around witnesses in 502J.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Actually, it was more like I asked whether
- 6 there was a connection between the two.
- 7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: All right, sir.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Go ahead. I don't -- okay.
- **9** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's okay.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: And I put it in the framework of let's
- 11 talk about it. So let's talk about it.
- 12 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I think it's clear that there are a
- 13 lot of sort of iterative investigations and discovery requests
- 14 that will ultimately affect 502, the personal jurisdiction
- 15 litigation. My position has been consistently that I'm not
- **16** asking to wait. I'm -- you know, additional material will
- 17 come as additional material comes, but that I don't feel that
- 18 it is necessary to wait.
- 19 So I don't have a problem with deferring 538 to
- 20 another day. But if you had some specific connections that --
- 21 you know, I don't know if you've read 538C yet or not -- we
- 22 just filed it on Friday -- our reply in the 538 series, but it
- 23 very clearly articulates a number of FBI/CIA connections,

- 1 which is, you know, an issue in the statements basket of the
- 2 502 personal jurisdiction litigation.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: While we're talking about the statement
- 4 basket, you're prepared to go forward on the statement
- **5** basket ----
- **6** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I am, sir.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- without the 538 being fully done?
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: That's what I'm saying, sir.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: And that was just my question, was whether
- 10 or not -- you know better than me.
- 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Things come up as we go along, and we
- 12 deal with them.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- **14** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. As discussed, we'll do 478 later in
- 16 the week, the remaining 502s later in the week. Okay.
- 17 One issue going forward is the search issue we
- 18 discussed earlier today, is that obviously it is not going to
- 19 be resolved today because there's a need for the 505(h)
- 20 hearing and perhaps an 806 after that. But the issue -- and I
- 21 just raise it without making any decision, is this means that
- 22 if we reconvene in an open session later in the week, there's
- 23 the status quo, whatever that is, is in place. So just --

- 1 just I'm looking at the defense counsel here to explain.
- 2 That's just the way the process has to work, is just we
- 3 have -- you know, you've asked for certain relief, the
- 4 government has an opportunity to respond, and we're going to
- 5 put some evidence in, hopefully, on the issue. But it could
- 6 entail the clients coming back on Wednesday or Thursday. It
- 7 may or may not, because apparently it's not a requirement.
- 8 It's -- have the same issue again. So I just put that out to
- 9 you, just to talk to your clients.
- 10 That being said, tomorrow we'll discuss things in the
- 11 classified session, as we discussed. We will add
- 12 Mr. Connell's most recent notice so we can resolve this search
- 13 issue this week.
- And which the last thing we would do today, though,
- 15 is -- if we can: Is there a search of the defense counsel's
- **16** bag issue still out there?
- 17 TC [MR. SWANN]: There's a hundred percent search of
- 18 everybody coming into the ELC. That means the following: If
- 19 you bring a bag in and you've got legal papers inside the bag,
- 20 all you've got to do is take the legal papers out of the bag,
- 21 give those to the guard that's standing there. They're not
- 22 going to look at them. If you want to, put them in a manila
- 23 folder, okay? They're not going to look at them. But they're

- 1 still going to look inside the bag for a variety of reasons.
- 2 People have come into the ELC, and, you know,
- 3 innocently, I suspect, where they have something laying at the
- 4 bottom of their bag like a smart watch or something along
- 5 those lines, and apparently the smart watch is far more
- 6 capable of setting off these alarms that are around here and
- 7 doing other things that I'm not aware of. I can't afford one.
- 8 That said, if you have a bag like that, and you
- 9 should be on notice -- and it happened to me this morning. I
- 10 came in, I had a bag. I had my lunch in it. They took the
- 11 lunch, they just kind of looked inside, gave it back to me,
- 12 and told me to go on.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: But they're not reading any of the
- **14** materials?
- 15 TC [MR. SWANN]: They're not interested in any of the
- 16 materials. And, in fact, when Mr. Nevin came in this morning,
- 17 as I understand it, because I talked to the people who were
- 18 actually present, all he had to do was just open up his bag,
- 19 take his papers out, hand them to the guard, and he could have
- 20 brought his bag in.
- Now I understand when he came back in this next time
- 22 after he went and got the bag, they didn't even look at it at
- 23 all. That said, that's not going to happen tomorrow. If you

- 1 bring a bag in containing anything, knapsack or any of those
- 2 other things, like I said this morning, when people came in
- 3 with their bags -- they found a thing like a Leatherman or
- 4 something like that, other knives and stuff like that.
- 5 Soldiers have those things and they carry them all the time.
- 6 But that doesn't mean they come into this facility with those
- 7 things. Those things either get stored in the lockers out
- 8 there or they go back to your car.
- **9** But in Mr. Nevin's case, they did want to look in the
- 10 bag. He didn't want them to look in the bag. He took the bag
- 11 outside. He kept his papers in there.
- 12 Again, I say the following: Everybody is being
- 13 looked at. There are no exceptions. And while I do
- 14 acknowledge that this has changed over the last ten years, I
- 15 too have been subject to those kind of changes. I don't
- 16 dispute this. They can look at anything they want. They are
- 17 not looking at what the documents say, and if you want to
- 18 protect your documents, just put them in a sealed envelope,
- 19 and they're not going to look inside the envelope, period.
- Thank you, sir.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you, Mr. Swann.
- 22 Mr. Nevin, do you want to be heard on this?
- 23 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, Your Honor. I'm obviously in a

- 1 different position from Mr. Swann. I have materials that
- 2 relate to my confidential relationship with Mr. Mohammad.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Uh-huh.
- 4 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: The other lawyers on the team do. I
- 5 know it's true of the other lawyers on the defense side of the
- 6 room as well. And we have an obligation to protect the
- 7 confidentiality of those materials. So that's the first
- 8 point. I'm not good with anyone who wants to look at my
- **9** materials looking at them.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: He just said they're not going to look at
- 11 the materials. They just want to look at the physical ----
- 12 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: No, I'm responding to what -- to his
- 13 remark with respect to his materials.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I got that. You're in a different
- 15 position than the government.
- 16 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, sir.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm just saying is they're saying is we
- 18 just want to look for, quite frankly, physical contraband. If
- 19 you've got papers you want out, just pull the papers out, we
- 20 will look at the bag, we will put the papers back in without
- 21 reading it, and then we're done.
- 22 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah. And I guess I would say, Your
- 23 Honor, it is true, coming up on ten years in doing this, and

- 1 it's always been done in the way that I have described to you
- 2 earlier this morning: We walk through. It's the way this
- 3 worked last time.
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: But to be fair, as I recall last session,
- 5 we had a number of times when the cell phone alarm went off
- 6 and we -- so I don't know necessarily that things have not
- 7 changed a little bit. I don't know what -- understand, I had
- 8 no role at all in this, so I'm not -- I'm simply speculating
- 9 that one of the problems last time was, I think, two or three
- 10 times, including one closed session, we had the cell phone
- **11** detector went off.
- Now, whether it was a cell phone, a smart watch, a
- 13 defective detector, which is always a possibility when dealing
- **14** with the government, so ----
- 15 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Could I say that's exactly -- I mean,
- 16 that's pretty close to what I was going to say, is this: I've
- 17 gone into courtrooms all over the country as an officer of the
- 18 court and been waived through. And I get TSA ----
- MJ [COL POHL]: You're telling me when you go to federal
- 20 court they don't send your bag through an x-ray?
- 21 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Oh, yeah, through an x-ray scanner,
- 22 absolutely. And I get that because now you've scanned for
- 23 contraband in a way that can't possibly get at the content of

1 my materials. 2 MJ [COL POHL]: If you're holding your materials, how do 3 they -- I understand the best world would be to have a scanner 4 out there, okay? We don't have one. 5 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okav. veah. I'm ----6 MJ [COL POHL]: Maybe they can borrow the MRI, I don't 7 But the bottom line is they're just saying is we want 8 to do a quick visual search for physical contraband. And if 9 you're concerned about your papers, you're now on notice so 10 you can pull your papers off, look at it, and put it in. 11 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah. And what I'm -- what I'm saying 12 to you is, first of all, it's not a problem. I mean, in other 13 words, you point out that the alarm goes off from time to 14 time, but so far as I know, there has not been any -- no one 15 has been found to be communicating in some improper way or 16 smuggling some sort of a something. 17 I think this is a solution that is looking for a 18 problem. And as the military commission said, and this has 19 been my experience as well, I don't even know if it's actually 20 picking something up in here or if it's a problem with the 21 sniffer itself. But in any event, there have not been any 22 incidents of anything improper occurring, apart from the alert

from the -- from the electronic device.

23

1 So against ten years of this having worked fine, 2 against my experience in many, many places of simply being 3 waved through before there were scanners, and again, not 4 having problems arise and being in the position of being an 5 officer of the court, I object to it. 6 And it's ----7 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Nevin, if I apply your officer of the 8 court theme, does that apply to everybody in here then? 9 Anybody ----10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, if you say they're not going to 12 look at your bag, then what do we tell the guard force? 13 Here's a list of names you don't look at? I mean, practically 14 speaking ----15 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Pardon me? 16 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, practically speaking, is you want 17 them to discriminate who's walking in to determine who they 18 search or not? 19 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I just want to do what we did in 20 December and in October and in July, all the way back to 2008, 21 the exact same thing. I don't -- I can't -- I mean, I don't 22 know, frankly, what was done or whether there was a list of 23 names or whatever, but I have been waved through this process

- 1 with the question "Do you have any electronics" a thousand
- 2 times or whatever it is. Many, many, many times. And my
- 3 question is: Why do we have to -- why do we have to do it a
- 4 different way now?
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Got it. Thank you.
- **6** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thank you.
- 7 DC [MS. WICHNER]: Your Honor ----
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: May I be heard?
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure, let Ms. Wichner be heard. She
- 10 hasn't gotten to talk this time.
- 11 DC [MS. WICHNER]: Thank you, Your Honor. I just request
- 12 two clarifications from the prosecution on this issue. This
- 13 has occurred to me the past two hearings in a very alarming
- 14 way. I want to make clear for everyone that there's a lot of
- 15 discussion about attorney-client privileged information that
- 16 we're concerned about, and that includes me as well. But we
- 17 also have a number of documents that we are under a duty not
- 18 to disclose to the public at large.
- I know Mr. Swann said yes, they looked through the
- 20 documents. He's okay with it. I am not okay with that. I
- 21 have a duty. There's many motions. Unless -- we are told by
- 22 the government, unless things are released on mc.mil, we have
- 23 an obligation not -- for no one to see these documents.

- 1 Whether it's a cursory scan or not, I don't -- I don't care.
- What I went through with the 531 issue this past
- 3 hearing on an issue where myself and my colleagues were
- 4 accused of something that we knew nothing about, you know, I'm
- 5 not okay with this idea of they can just look through your
- 6 documents, they're not really looking at them. I'm not okay
- 7 with that, given what I've now learned through the 531 series,
- 8 that there's not a presumption of -- that I am operating under
- 9 good faith in these proceedings.
- 10 So I would like -- I request clarification on two
- 11 issues from Mr. Swann or the government. One, I heard him say
- 12 we can put our documents into a manila envelope. Fair enough.
- 13 And that they will not -- if we seal it, they will not request
- 14 to go through those documents.
- 15 Secondly, I want a clarification that -- I think I
- 16 heard him say we'd have to give our stack of documents, we'd
- 17 have to release control of them to the guards. But I heard
- 18 you giving the -- kind of the ongoing hypothetical to
- 19 Mr. Nevin that we would retain control of the documents and
- 20 they could certainly search the rest of the bag.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: I think I actually said it both ways. So,
- 22 Mr. Swann, defense counsel walks in, has got a stack of
- 23 documents. He or she pulls the documents out and says this is

- 1 all paper and they're holding them. Is that good enough for
- 2 the guards, for the documents, and they look in the bag?
- 3 TC [MR. SWANN]: I've got the word of authority. It is
- 4 good enough.
- Here's my point on the manila envelope, okay?
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Swann, we've already resolved the
- 7 issue.
- 8 TC [MR. SWANN]: Okay. All right. I got it.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: You can keep talking if you'd like, but
- 10 I'm not sure it's useful.
- 11 TC [MR. SWANN]: I'd much rather try the case, Judge.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. The way I understand it to
- 13 work, and if it doesn't work this way I'm sure you'll tell me,
- 14 is when you walk in, put your documents -- if you want to pull
- 15 documents out, put them separately. You will maintain control
- 16 of them. They will do a cursory examination of the -- make
- 17 sure there's no electronics or whatever in the box, in the
- 18 thing, and then hand it back to you and you can move on.
- **19** Okay.
- 20 DC [MS. WICHNER]: So we -- okay. So my understanding, we
- 21 are retaining control of the documents?
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Right.
- DC [MS. WICHNER]: They can have the bag.

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: They have the bag, you have the documents.
- **2** DC [MS. WICHNER]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **3** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Mr. Connell.
- 4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: In a military situation, such as the
- 5 one we are in here, the will of the commander controls.
- **6** The -- that will may change from day to day. On 21 December I
- 7 did have a client visit, both in the morning and the
- 8 afternoon. When I came back after using the restroom in the
- 9 afternoon, the guard told me "You have to remove that belt.
- 10 That is excess clothing."
- I said, "Listen, I don't like to argue with you all,
- 12 but it wasn't excess at 9:00, and I haven't lost any weight
- 13 since then."
- 14 And he said, "Well, that's the rule right now."
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: You can't wear a belt to your meeting?
- 16 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No, it was only that one day. It was
- 17 only the afternoon of 21 December 2017, no belts allowed.
- 18 Okay? In the morning belts were allowed. Yesterday, belts
- 19 were allowed, thank goodness. And that was the rule that day.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: I don't mean to make light of this, but
- **21** were suspenders allowed?
- 22 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I should have checked, sir. That
- 23 would have been good. But my actual point is ----

- 1 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Yeah.
- 2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: My actual point is that was the will
- 3 of the commander that day, that in the afternoon the will of
- 4 the commander was no belts were allowed. In the morning, the
- 5 will of the commander was that belts were allowed.
- 6 Today, 8 January 2018, the will of the commander, we
- 7 just heard -- in fact, the record won't reflect it, but
- 8 Mr. Swann for his voice of authority actually turned to
- 9 someone in the courtroom, pointed at them, got some kind of a
- 10 nod or a wave, and then said yes, this is the answer.
- **11** But ----
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Understand -- just to make it clear on
- 13 this issue, is if he gave an answer I didn't like, that
- **14** wouldn't be the right answer.
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I agree, sir. This is your
- 16 courthouse.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: So understand, I'm not simply deferring to
- 18 them. I'm saying okay, you give me a -- they have a security
- 19 concern, I understand. You give me a practical way to protect
- 20 your privilege thing and their security concerns, I'm good
- 21 with it. You give me an impractical way to do it, like then
- 22 I'm not good with it and we do it my way. But their way
- 23 strikes to me as a fair balance between the two competing

- 1 interests, and that's why I approve what he decided to do.
- 2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Which is why I'm asking you to give us
- 3 the procedure in writing, because if tomorrow the will of the
- 4 commander changes again ----
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: If you had asked me how do you protect
- 7 your documents, I would have said put them in a bag, if
- 8 someone had asked me this morning.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 10 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And when putting them in a bag exposed
- 11 them to scrutiny, whereas hand-carrying a piece of paper did
- **12** not ----
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: I got you. I understand that. You know
- 14 what I'm going to say next, don't you?
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir, and I'm on it.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Two weeks, give it to the government. Two
- 17 weeks to respond. Okay. You know what I'm talking about, I
- 18 know what I'm talking about, but let me make sure everybody
- 19 else knows what I'm talking about.
- You want this order to cover this? Draft the order,
- 21 give it to the government, you give it to me, I'll sign it.
- 22 As long as everybody agrees to it and it's a fair balance
- 23 between the two competing interests I just talked about, then

1	we're good.
2	LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir.
3	MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
4	The commission is in recess. Tomorrow will be a
5	classified session only beginning at 0900, and we will set
6	we anticipate an open so no detainees tomorrow. We
7	anticipate the next open session would be Monday or, excuse
8	me, Wednesday at 0900; and if that changes, we will inform
9	people as quickly as possible. The detainees may stay here
0	until 1630.
1	The commission is in recess.
2	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1157, 8 January 2018.]
3	[END OF PAGE]
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
20	
21	
22	
2	