- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1042, 17 May
- 2 2016.1
- 3 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Commission will come to order. Let the
- 4 record reflect that all parties who were present when the
- 5 commission recessed are once again present.
- **6** All right. Mr. Rushforth? Okay, Mr. Rushforth, my
- 7 first question whenever I hear a motion is who has the burden
- 8 and what is the burden?
- **9** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Your Honor, we have the burden of
- 10 demonstrating that we meet the elements for a continuance. I
- 11 can be mercifully brief I believe here, Your Honor, because we
- 12 discussed this, to some extent, last evening in the conference
- 13 with Your Honor.
- 14 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I don't want you to omit anything that
- 15 was discussed in that conference for expediency sake. I want
- 16 it all on the record.
- DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: I don't want to omit anything for the
- 18 expediency sake, Your Honor. I intend to omit some things
- 19 because we have heard and absorbed your admonitions and we
- 20 agree with them, and your admonitions including that we meet
- 21 with counsel for the other side to set a schedule for pretrial
- 22 business, that it is premature to set a trial date.
- We also heard and agree -- or at least have absorbed

- 1 your admonitions regarding the issue of unlawful influence and
- 2 the issue of the health risks. We are going to reserve -- I'm
- 3 not going to argue those issues today. I'm going to -- we are
- 4 likely to file separate motions on both of those issues. But
- 5 I'm not going to argue those issues today with respect to
- 6 their support or nonsupport for our motion for a continuance.
- 7 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Thank you. I really appreciate that.
- **8** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: So that's what I mean by I think I
- **9** can be mercifully brief.
- **10** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: That's wonderful.
- 11 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Our motion for a continuance really
- 12 rests on three primary bases. One is we don't have our
- 13 counsel team together. And I find it a little rich that the
- 14 other side says, well, you only need the team that you've got.
- 15 I have a couple of comments to that.
- One, in all the years I've been litigating cases in
- 17 federal court, the other side has never been able to tell me
- 18 what my team is, and I don't think that's -- I'm not
- 19 comfortable with that happening today. But they control a key
- 20 aspect of our putting together our team. "They," being the
- 21 United States Government, controls our access to top secret
- 22 information by slow-rolling or otherwise not getting to our
- 23 clearances for some members of our team.

- 1 And the only way to remedy that, Judge, is to put the 2 onus on the United States to at least get these -- I know the 3 United States nor the judge can -- I'm not asking for an order 4 that certain people be cleared. That's not your prerogative, 5 it's certainly not in my purview to ask that a certain person 6 be cleared. But we can certainly get them interviewed, or we 7 can get them in the process. 8 And what's happening in this case is that certain 9 members of this team -- it's just come to a complete halt. 10 There are no interviews going on; there is nothing with 11 respect to the clearance process going on. And so we are not 12 getting people cleared that have been assigned to this case. 13 And they are critical people. Two of them are my partners and 14 they litigated several habeas cases with me. 15 extremely familiar with some of the issues in this case. 16
- 17 This team needs them.
- 18 And it's a little rich to be told that we don't need 19 them by a team that has multiple people on their team, many 20 more people than we do. And if you multiply the number of 21 people on their team by the number of years that they have 22 been involved in this case, then it's not a close fight. 23 are multiple years, man-years, woman-years ahead of us in that

They're extremely familiar with Guantanamo, and I need them.

- 1 regard.
- 2 And so the first thing that has to happen, in my
- 3 view, Judge, is the government has to be told we're not going
- 4 to move until these people at least get in the pipeline and
- 5 get moved through the pipeline. And if the answer is no,
- 6 you're not entitled to a top secret clearance, so be it. But
- 7 it's not happening. And it's extremely frustrating because --
- 8 and to be told you don't need these people is just wrong. We
- **9** do need these people.
- 10 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. I want to ask you a question. In
- 11 the 802 last night, I believe that you identified particular
- 12 subject matter areas that one or more of these people were
- 13 associated with in terms of your, I guess, work, you know,
- 14 areas of responsibility -- I don't know what you want to call
- 15 it -- areas of expertise. Is that so or are all these
- **16** people ----
- 17 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: That is so. They're not all
- 18 generalists. Professor Moore is a specialist in international
- **19** law.
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay.
- 21 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: And her expertise is absolutely
- 22 essential to us with respect to -- for example, not solely
- 23 but, for example, to the motion regarding personal

- **1** jurisdiction.
- 2 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. I want to ask the government a
- 3 question on that, then. On the issue of personal
- 4 jurisdiction, is the government going to be using classified
- **5** evidence?
- **6** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: No, Your Honor.
- 7 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. Does that make a difference?
- **8** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, it may well be, Your Honor,
- 9 that we use classified evidence in making our motion. And the
- 10 notion that she can come in and do her job without having
- 11 access to classified evidence, I frankly think that is going
- 12 to limit her very much to enable her to do her job. And I
- 13 think the notion that they're not going to use classified
- 14 evidence doesn't answer the question. We may want her to look
- 15 at a lot of classified evidence in making the judgment -- or
- 16 in rendering the contribution to our team that she will
- 17 render.
- **18** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay.
- **19** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Have I answered your question, Judge?
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I think so.
- 21 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: The second element that -- and,
- 22 Judge, these things are going to come up over and over again.
- 23 When we meet with counsel to talk about, well, we can hear

- 1 this motion on this date, we're going to say no, we can't,
- 2 because we can't prepare it, because our team isn't
- 3 constituted the way it must be constituted.
- 4 And secondly, we don't have full discovery. Now,
- 5 there are discovery orders that have been issued in this case
- 6 before I ever became involved that have been blown right
- 7 through by the government. We heard last night that the order
- 8 which was supposed to be complied with a year and a half ago,
- 9 September of 2014, still has not been fully complied with.
- 10 Still has not been fully complied with. We can't do our job
- 11 until it is.
- 12 And last month, we filed another 200 discovery
- 13 requests. We expect the government to respond to those. And
- 14 when they do -- and if need be, we'll bring motions to compel.
- 15 We can't do our job until we have that discovery.
- So while we're perfectly -- we're not only happy,
- 17 we're bound to follow Your Honor's advice or order to meet
- 18 with counsel and to come up with a pretrial plan. We will do
- 19 our very best to do that. But we will be handcuffed unless we
- 20 have our team put together and unless we have full
- 21 discovery -- access to full discovery. That's where we are,
- **22** Judge.
- Now, there's a third point which I'll mention. And

- 1 Your Honor is very aware of the case pending in front of the
- 2 D.C. Circuit, the en banc panel, <u>Bahlul</u>. And that case
- 3 addresses an issue that goes to the very heart of this case,
- 4 namely whether conspiracy can be tried before the military
- 5 commissions. If it can be, then this case will move forward
- 6 in its full glory. If the D.C. Circuit says that it cannot
- 7 be, then this case will change radically -- radically. And
- 8 there is really no use whatsoever, in my view, to going
- 9 forward in motion practice and in pretrial practice until that
- 10 issue is resolved.
- 11 Thank you, Your Honor.
- 12 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. Go ahead -- wait.
- 13 The reason -- you know, there are several outstanding
- 14 motions that relate to conspiracy. And the reason that the
- 15 commission -- that this commission has not ruled on those is
- 16 because there is no urgency to resolve those motions until
- 17 either Bahlul is decided or we have a trial. Okay? Whichever
- 18 one of those happens first is going to dictate the timing of
- 19 any decisions on any motion related to conspiracy.
- **20** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Understood.
- 21 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: But in the pleadings that you filed even
- 22 to continue this hearing, you raised a lot of issues. Now,
- 23 you know, you said at the beginning of your argument that

- 1 you're going to probably refile those issues as, I assume,
- 2 motions for appropriate relief, or whatever other proper style
- 3 they should be filed under. Those types of issues have
- 4 nothing to do with how many people you have on your team or
- 5 how much discovery the government hasn't provided yet. Those
- 6 are legal, what have been called earlier in this commission,
- 7 law motions.
- 8 And the commission finds no reason why these two --
- 9 that is, the provision of discovery and evidentiary-related
- 10 motions and progress toward those things -- cannot occur in
- 11 parallel to the litigation of law motions. Okay?
- 12 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Your Honor ----
- 13 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: So I hear everything you're saying, but
- 14 asking for a bald "we need 18 months before we do anything,"
- 15 the commission does not find that reasonable, because there's
- 16 a lot of business we can take care of that has nothing to
- 17 do -- and I'm as frustrated as you are about the provision of
- 18 discovery, okay? As I said last night in the 802 conference,
- 19 that is the long pole in the tent. Regardless of whatever
- 20 else has happened in this case, we wouldn't be anywhere
- 21 different, to my knowledge, on the road to completing
- 22 discovery regardless of what's happened up until now
- 23 collaterally.

- 1 So I hear what you're saying, but I don't -- I don't
- 2 accept the proposition that everything has to come to a dead
- 3 stop for a year and a half while we wait for those things that
- 4 you're talking about to happen.
- **5** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Let me -- if I may respond, Judge,
- 6 let me say a couple things: We're not asking for 18 months
- 7 dead stop until X, Y, and Z happens. But the way to get it
- 8 done is to say to the government, the clock will start on
- 9 getting this matter ready for trial when these guys get their
- 10 team together and when discovery is completed. That's when it
- **11** should start.
- Now, I hear Your Honor saying there's some law
- 13 motions that could be done. Absolutely, we agree with that in
- 14 principle. But, you know, when the government says, well, the
- 15 Fifth Amendment motion is just law, well, no, it's not. It
- 16 involves all kinds of facts. So there will be a back and
- 17 forth about what's purely law and what involves facts that
- **18** demand discovery.
- **19** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Sure.
- DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: But if someone can say -- if Your
- 21 Honor tells us this is a purely legal motion -- for example,
- 22 what about the health risks of being in this courtroom?
- 23 Should that delay things until the Navy tells us whether it's

- 1 risky or not? Well, that involves some discovery, too,
- 2 apparently. We've already consulted an expert on the issue.
- I'm not arguing it today. All I'm saying is that
- 4 things that sometimes look like they're purely legal can
- 5 involve factual issues. And if something is purely legal,
- 6 then I agree with Your Honor. I agree that we can go forward
- 7 with those things and get those things out of the way. But
- 8 many -- there are many things that just aren't going to move
- 9 forward until discovery is complete and until our team gets
- 10 constituted.
- 11 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Thank you, Mr. Rushforth.
- 12 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Thank you.
- **13** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Lieutenant Commander Spencer?
- **14** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 15 Your Honor, the defense appears to be retracting the
- 16 primary basis for their motion under 015K, which was specific
- 17 to Rushforth -- Mr. Rushforth. It did mention the civilian
- 18 counsel to be employed at DoD expense, who I believe is no
- 19 longer detailed to the case and they're no longer a factor.
- 20 Essentially, the 015K motion was -- in the absence of
- 21 the detailed civilian counsel under the Convening Authority's
- 22 discretionary authority, remains only Mr. Rushforth, only the
- 23 pro bono civilian counsel. Mr. Rushforth, as we've now

- 1 learned, has been read on. He possesses all the necessary
- 2 clearances. Therefore, the basis for the defense's motion in
- **3** 015K no longer exists.
- 4 Now, the new basis that the defense has articulated
- 5 today and the new testimony, if you will, from Mr. Rushforth,
- 6 regarding these new counsel, the new counsel that the accused
- 7 apparently elected as well, all of that information was never
- 8 previously provided to the prosecution. None of the
- 9 prosecution team had ever heard any of those names until last
- 10 night at the R.M.C. 802 conference.
- I submit to the commission that this new information
- 12 could have and should have been part of an amendment or a
- 13 supplement to 015K if that's what the defense wished to form
- 14 the basis of this new continuance request.
- 15 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: So you literally never heard of these
- 16 people until the 802 last night and you were not aware of them
- 17 having done any paperwork to initiate their security
- 18 clearances?
- **19** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. Mr. Rushforth, I'm going to ask
- 21 you -- I mean, you're talking about the government not moving
- 22 forward on obtaining clearances for these other attorneys.
- 23 And the prosecution themselves are saying they've never even

- 1 heard of these people.
- 2 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, I don't know whether that's
- 3 accurate or not, but the security clearance applications have
- 4 long been submitted, and these people have been detailed to --
- 5 two of them, at least, have been detailed to the defense.
- 6 They've been admitted to the pro bono pool. So it's a little
- 7 incredulous to me that they didn't know we were trying to get
- 8 these people onto this team.
- 9 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: How would they know if you didn't tell
- **10** them?
- 11 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, we submitted all of these
- 12 applications to WHS.
- 13 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: The prosecutors have no way of knowing
- 14 which pro bono counsel that are applying to get in the pool
- 15 are going to be assigned to which cases.
- 16 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Your Honor, it's a little hard for me
- 17 to see why that's such a -- they're not surprised as of today.
- 18 I'm telling them today. And what exactly are the consequences
- **19** for them not knowing until today?
- The government has these applications and they should
- 21 move the applications. And the fact is if we sit down with
- 22 them and we start talking about work on the personal
- 23 jurisdiction motion, we're going to be saying, "We need our

- 1 team fully constituted." So let's assume that they are
- 2 completely surprised as of today. So what?
- **3** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. I'm not endorsing the
- 4 government's processing of classified -- you know, of security
- 5 clearances as a model of efficiency, okay? But if you're not
- 6 aware, your clearance and your read-ons, by recent standards
- 7 in the federal government, were accomplished in record time,
- 8 okay?
- **9** People are talking about -- you know, when you were
- 10 first brought onto the case, people were telling me this is
- 11 going to take two years. Well, it took less than six months.
- So the answer to your question is if they had known
- 13 sooner, possibly the same thing could have been done for these
- 14 other attorneys. That's the answer to your question.
- 15 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, let's get them started today,
- 16 then. You know, Judge, when I came in 1978 in the Carter
- 17 Administration, I was the deputy general counsel to the
- 18 Secretary of Defense. I had to have every clearance known to
- 19 mankind. And I came in without any clearances, nor had I ever
- 20 had a clearance. Those clearances were done in about two
- 21 weeks because the Secretary of Defense needed me -- or wanted
- 22 me, at least. Whether he needed me or not, I'll let him say
- **23** that.

- 1 But this can be done. And, in fact, when you tell me
- 2 how fast mine was done, well, I submitted an application in
- 3 September and then I was told in December they weren't even
- 4 processing it.
- 5 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I told you I wasn't endorsing the
- 6 process as a model of efficiency.
- 7 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: So let's get them done now. Let's
- 8 get the thing started today. I mean, I've got -- one of my
- 9 partners who's been with me for ten years working habeas cases
- 10 and is extremely knowledgeable and, quite frankly, a very
- 11 gifted trial attorney, Bob Palmer, that I want in this case,
- 12 he hasn't even been interviewed. It's been three and a half
- 13 months. He has not had a single interview.
- Now, that's just outrageous from my point of view.
- 15 And it certainly doesn't lead to the -- I'm going to continue
- 16 to argue with these folks that we need our full team. And
- 17 when we meet with them, as Your Honor has ordered, I'm going
- 18 to tell them we don't have our full team. And I'm going to
- 19 continue to make that point.
- And the only way to get this to happen, in my view,
- 21 is to tell the prosecution, the government of the
- 22 United States, we need this to happen. And until it happens,
- 23 this case is not moving forward.

- **1** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: All right.
- **2** Commander Spencer, I won't interrupt you again, I
- 3 don't think.
- 4 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **5** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: But go ahead.
- **6** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, the government would like
- 7 to clear a couple of things up. As is evident from the record
- 8 and multiple pleadings, Mr. Rushforth filed security clearance
- 9 application to the Department of Justice in September, not to
- 10 the Department of Defense. It was prior to our knowledge of
- 11 any of his involvement on the case. There were a number of
- 12 issues with the way that the Office of Chief Defense Counsel
- 13 proceeded and is evident from our response, Appellate
- 14 Exhibit 055F, there was even some delay requested by the
- 15 Office of Chief Defense Counsel for Mr. Rushforth.
- 16 So the constant accusation of slow-rolling, I believe
- 17 is the phrase that was used, is inaccurate, not based on fact,
- 18 and also does not reflect the feet dragging by the defense in
- 19 this case with respect to Mr. Rushforth's clearance.
- I don't know whether the same thing has happened with
- 21 these four new people or not. Again, this is all new evidence
- 22 or testimony or proffers from the defense that were not part
- 23 of the motion, not part of the briefings, and so to form the

- $\mathbf{1}$ basis of a decision on 015K, based on this new information, I
- 2 think, suggests respectfully that the commission should not
- 3 consider that information.
- 4 That's really all a threshold matter. Because the
- 5 primary issue that the defense is ignoring or is apparently
- 6 uninformed of is there is a distinction between what the
- 7 defense would like to have and what the accused has a right to
- 8 have proceeding forward. The accused -- the rule is very
- 9 clear. The accused has a right to civilian counsel. The
- 10 government has been consistently reasonable with respect to
- 11 that right, attempted to afford him that opportunity when
- 12 possible, and even concurred with delay so that Mr. Rushforth
- 13 could be read on and could be ready to proceed forward with
- 14 the case.
- 15 The accused does not have the right to multiple
- 16 civilian defense counsel at no expense to the United States or
- 17 at expense to the United States. In fact, the commission
- 18 itself in the September hearing specifically instructed that
- 19 with respect to the GS-15 DoD civilian defense counsel that
- 20 the Chief Defense Counsel was appointing to assist that the
- 21 court would not wait for her to be read on prior to
- 22 proceeding. Why? Because he has no right to her. That's a
- 23 discretionary decision by the Chief Defense Counsel to assign

- 1 her. Ultimately he, using his discretion, unassigned her or
- 2 moved her to a different case.
- These four new counsel, whether they're detailed or
- 4 not from what Mr. Rushforth just said, two are detailed, he
- 5 thinks, we've previously had the issue of using the term
- 6 "detailing" inartfully. Detailing, as you know, is a term of
- 7 art where they're assigned to the case. It's been recently
- 8 the Chief Defense Counsel's position that counsel are
- 9 initially assigned to the case internally for the purposes of
- 10 obtaining a security clearance. Based on the representation
- 11 of Mr. Rushforth just a moment ago, it's not even clear that
- 12 all four have been internally assigned because Mr. Rushforth
- 13 said only two had been detailed that he knows of.
- 14 So there are a number of facts or allegations, or
- 15 however you'd like to characterize them, that the defense is
- 16 claiming are relevant to this motion but they've given you no
- **17** evidence, Judge.
- 18 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Well, doesn't -- I mean, doesn't the
- 19 prosecution do the same thing in terms of assigning counsel
- 20 internally to particular cases? I think this is what I heard
- 21 last night in the 802. And subsequently, at some point
- 22 potentially, as Major Milton, I think, was this week, actually
- 23 detailed to the case?

- 1 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, Major Milton has been
- 2 detailed for some time, Your Honor. We don't have -- we have
- 3 internal assignment as well, but we don't -- as a rule or
- 4 general practice, don't have attorneys who are not detailed
- 5 counsel assigned to the case signing pleadings.
- **6** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: So Major Milton has been signing
- 7 pleadings?
- **8** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: It's my recollection that she has,
- 9 Your Honor, post her detailing.
- **10** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Post her detailing?
- 11 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Yes.
- 12 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: How long has she been detailed to the
- **13** case?
- 14 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: I don't have that information, Your
- 15 Honor.
- 16 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. Honestly, I'm not hearing much
- 17 difference between the way the defense assigns people and
- 18 ultimately details people to cases than what the government
- **19** does.
- 20 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Yes, Your Honor. Understood.
- 21 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: So you're not really ringing any alarm
- 22 bells for me. I agree that I don't want to see pleadings
- 23 signed by people who I don't know are detailed to the case. I

- 1 don't want that. Okay? 2 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, my point is ----3 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Right now I don't see a whole lot of 4 difference between the way the government is doing business 5 and the way the defense is doing business. 6 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: With regards to assigning internal 7 counsel, yes, that's accurate, Your Honor. However, my point 8 is based on purely representations. We have no detailing 9 memos, we have no information, no internal assignment 10 information. What we have is limited and incomplete 11 information from the defense that -- last night we learned 12 that the four counsel were internally assigned. Today 13 Mr. Rushforth said he believes at least two of them are. 14
- So in terms of -- they're asking the commission to

 15 full stop until these four people, two of whom the defense has

 16 no right, regardless of whether they would like him or not -
 17 or like these people or not, the defense wants to wait until

 18 those people are ready to go. And that's not a reasonable

 19 request, Your Honor.
- Specifically in their motion, the defense cites a couple of cases. The first case that they cite that I would like to invite the court's attention to is the <u>Avery</u> case.
- 23 The Avery case dealt with a capital murder case for which two

- 1 court-appointed attorneys were assigned five days before a
- 2 capital murder trial. The Supreme Court said that he was
- 3 accurate -- that the accused was accurately represented in
- 4 that instance and there was no prejudice to the accused.
- 5 It's ironic that they would cite that case as well as
- **6** the <u>Unger</u> case, which had a four-and-a-half-day period between
- 7 new counsel being assigned and them being ready to go
- 8 according to the Supreme Court to prepare. And that was for
- 9 trial in the capital murder case, and then in the <u>Unger</u> case,
- 10 a contempt hearing.
- 11 As we discussed last night, Your Honor, the
- 12 government is not suggesting that the defense should be ready
- 13 to go to trial five days from now or four and a half days from
- 14 now. But what the defense is asking the commission is to deny
- 15 the motion for continuance, keep the currently two scheduled
- 16 sessions of court, which are July and September, and proceed
- 17 with other matters that even the defense apparently concedes
- 18 we could proceed with.
- 19 They also cite the Miller case, Your Honor, which is
- 20 interesting. Miller points to Thomas for its authority. And
- 21 I'd like to read a quote from Thomas. "The exercise of the
- 22 right to civilian counsel 'cannot operate to unreasonably
- 23 delay the progress of the trial.' Only an unreasoning and

- 1 arbitrary 'insistence upon expeditiousness in the face of a
- 2 justifiable request for delay' violates the right to the
- 3 assistance of counsel."
- 4 This is clearly not an unreasoning and arbitrary
- 5 request for expeditiousness on the commission's part nor on
- 6 the government's part. Again, the government has been
- 7 reasonable in allowing sufficient time for Mr. Rushforth and
- 8 attempting as quickly as possible to get him the required
- 9 read-ons.
- Both of those quotes, the first one is from
- 11 United States v. Thomas quoting United States v. Montoya 13 MJ 268,
- 12 and Morris v. Slappy, 461 U.S. 1. Both of those talk about
- 13 the right to counsel.
- As we've discussed, 506 says that he has the right to
- 15 civilian counsel, he has the right to military counsel,
- 16 detailed military counsel, or right to individual military
- 17 counsel, which has been previously briefed. The government is
- 18 not suggesting that they shouldn't proceed with the current
- 19 team in place but that he's adequately represented by counsel.
- 20 He is adequately represented by civilian counsel, with more
- 21 experience than I've been alive apparently, and dating back to
- 22 the Carter administration, perfectly capable of proceeding in
- 23 the current proceedings and three military counsel with

- 1 probably 30 years of military justice between them. The
- 2 accused is adequately represented.
- 3 Even if we had detailed counsel who were cleared or
- 4 ready to go, 805 would still allow us -- the discussion under
- 5 805C would still allow us to proceed in their absence. So the
- **6** defense is asking you to ignore 805C and to ignore 506 and
- 7 wait until four people to whom the accused does not have a
- 8 right are read on before they proceed; and that's just not a
- **9** reasonable request, Your Honor.
- 10 The other two bases besides the team composition that
- 11 the defense now raises for the first time is the issues of
- 12 discovery and the issues related to Bahlul. I'll first
- 13 address, out of order, the issues related to **Bahlul**.
- 14 Appellate Exhibit 020, 026 and 028 as the court previously
- 15 discussed are pending but I would also for the record clarify
- 16 those motions have not even been argued. They've been filed
- 17 and the court, at the government's request or -- in agreement
- 18 with the government continue the arguing of those motions
- 19 until such time as we have a decision in the Bahlul case or
- 20 until such time as trial, whichever comes first.
- 21 So those are pending issues. That's not a basis
- 22 for -- that's not good cause for continuing the July or
- 23 September hearings, Your Honor.

- 1 Lastly, with respect to discovery, it's true that the
- 2 government has provided a large amount of discovery as
- 3 previously discussed, previously provided to the clerk as well
- 4 as previously provided to the defense. The government would
- 5 like the -- invite the commission to view Appellate Exhibits I
- **6** believe it's 015N and 0150. Those are inventories of
- 7 discoveries that have been provided.
- 8 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Is this -- this is, okay, so this
- 9 includes November is unclassified and ----
- 10 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, both documents are
- **11** unclassified.
- 12 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Right. But I'm talking about what they
- 13 contain.
- 14 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.
- 15 November references the Bates numbers -- essentially the
- 16 inventory of documents that's been produced to the defense
- 17 already. November is the unclassified documents; Oscar is the
- 18 classified documents.
- **19** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Other than unclassified?
- 20 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Correct. Classified higher than
- 21 unclassified, yes, Your Honor. And those are documents that
- 22 are currently in defense possession ----
- 23 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay.

- 1 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: ---- not documents that are part of
- 2 the ongoing 505 process, Your Honor.
- **3** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Right.
- 4 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: As previously mentioned by the court,
- 5 those documents, with respect to the classified portion,
- 6 represent approximately three quarters -- it's actually
- 7 slightly higher than 80 percent of everything currently in the
- 8 government's possession. The remaining 20 percent, a portion
- 9 of those are going through the 505 process now, Your Honor, as
- 10 you're aware.
- 11 For the unclassified, that represents between 90 and
- 12 95 percent of the discovery that the government is aware of
- 13 for discoverable, unclassified material.
- 14 With respect to the unclassified material, what that
- 15 means, then, is that Mr. Rushforth, since filing a notice of
- 16 appearance with the commission on 17 December 2015, has had or
- 17 should have had access to the overwhelming majority, almost
- 18 100 percent of the unclassified discovery in the case. The
- 19 same is true for these four new counsel that the prosecution
- 20 became aware of only yesterday.
- 21 With respect to the classified evidence, obviously
- 22 Mr. Rushforth would not have had that. And contrary to what
- 23 was previously represented to the court, Mr. Rushforth did not

1 possess his secret clearance prior to -- prior to being 2 adjudicated at the top secret/SCI level. He had previously 3 had it at some point but I believe it was expired, so he was 4 unable to review secret material -- contrary to the 5 government's previous understanding, he was unable to review 6 secret material until his March 3, 2016 TS/SCI read-on. 7 With respect to -- so in terms of discovery, as the 8 court noted, it's an ongoing discovery obligation. It's been 9 an ongoing discovery obligation since the beginning. 10 that information that has been turned over and that we are 11 working through now is information that the defense -- that 12 the government did not have at the time of the court's order 13 18 months ago. It is a volume of information, the 14 overwhelming majority of which the defense has had for quite 15 some time. Even before the new military counsel have come on 16 board. 17 So Major Kincaid who was, I believe, cleared and detailed as of the end of October, and then Major Hall and 18 Lieutenant Commander Lofland who were also cleared shortly 19 20 thereafter, within a few weeks, have had, since then, almost 21 what, eight, nine months to review classified discovery. And 22 before that, they could even review unclassified discovery.

They've had ample time. The accused has a fully

23

1 constituted defense team, to which he has a right. Waiting 2 for countless other people, potentially, is not a reasonable 3 By the defense's rationale, the defense -- if 4 Mr. Rushforth had previously worked with 30 or 40 attorneys or 5 every other attorney at his law firm with whom he has a relationship, by that rationale we should wait for literally 6 7 countless number of attorneys to come on because the defense 8 says they need them. That's not the standard, Judge. 9 standard is to what is the accused entitled? He has more than 10 what he is entitled to under law. And the government is of 11 the position the defense should be ready to proceed. 12 Now, the government does agree with the defense with 13 one point that Mr. Rushforth made repeatedly, which is that 14 it's clear from Mr. Rushforth position that the defense will 15 not agree to any dates, with any sit-down with the government, 16 until their team is fully constituted. So I respectfully 17 submit, Judge, that any sit-down would be less than productive 18 because it's their position that he has -- he should have the 19 right, even though the rules don't say that, that he should 20 have the right to all these other counsel. 21 And that without those counsel, if the defense is 22 unwilling to proceed, attempting to have the parties mutually

agree to dates would probably be an unproductive exercise.

23

1 The defense -- the government suggests that rather 2 than do that, last time -- previously in this case, both the 3 defense and the government submitted proposed dates. 4 was some coordination on that, but there was not an agreement. 5 It was Appellate Exhibit 011A and 012A. Those were proposed dates by the government and the defense. The government would 6 7 ask following the requested denial of 015K that the court 8 order the parties to provide similar proposed milestones and 9 upon those proposals, Your Honor, the commission could then 10 make a ruling as to what was going to be litigated in July --11 or in the July hearing or the September hearing. 12 Specifically, as previously stated, the government 13 suggests respectfully that the O45A -- I'm sorry, Appellate 14 Exhibit 045 is a purely law motion. Whether Miranda applies 15 or not in a military commission, contrary to what 16 Mr. Rushforth just said, does not require any discovery, 17 doesn't require any evidence. It's a strictly does Miranda 18 apply in a military commission? That could easily be argued 19 in July. 20 The new -- newly raised issue by the defense of them 21 needing their entire defense team before they can go forward 22 could also be a motion for appropriate relief as to what

equals due process and what equals appropriate representation.

23

- **1** That could also be litigated in July.
- 2 The multiple references to the government's supposed
- 3 delay in the clearance procedure and the discovery procedure,
- 4 the defense repeatedly in its motion, in its 015K motion,
- 5 discusses excludable delay. As the government points out in
- 6 its response, that's misplaced. The judge has already ruled
- 7 on that delay. But should the defense relitigate that issue
- 8 in the form of a speedy trial motion, for example, that's also
- **9** something that could be litigated in July.
- There are multiple issues that we could proceed
- 11 forward with, Your Honor. The defense has had ample time to
- 12 prepare. He's had three fully qualified defense counsel for
- 13 the better part of nine months. And Mr. Rushforth is clearly
- 14 capable of proceeding forward in preliminary matters in this
- 15 case, Your Honor. The government is not suggesting that he
- 16 should be ready for trial in five days, even there's Supreme
- 17 Court precedent that says in certain circumstances that's
- 18 authorized.
- 19 Thank you, Your Honor.
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Thank you.
- 21 All right, Mr. Rushforth, since you have the burden,
- 22 I will give you the last word.
- DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Thank you, Judge. I can be brief. I

- 1 heard the government say they haven't performed their
- 2 discovery obligations. They didn't say that they blew through
- 3 the September 2014, over 18 months ago discovery was supposed
- 4 to be complete. It not only wasn't complete, it isn't
- 5 complete today. And until it's complete, we can't do our
- 6 jobs.
- 7 And then there was -- counsel said, well, we're
- 8 springing these four people on you and we've never heard about
- 9 them and it's not evidence anyway because Mr. Rushforth is
- 10 just telling you.
- 11 Well, I represent to the court, it's a representation
- 12 from me to the court that these four people are essential to
- 13 my team. And they have already, as I'm reminded by my
- 14 co-counsel, been assigned to the pro bono pool, all four of
- 15 them. And they are now awaiting their clearances and, you
- 16 know, they're waiting and waiting and waiting. And we need
- 17 them on the team to be fully prepared.
- And, you know, I'm making that representation to the
- 19 court today. And the only way we're going to get it moving,
- 20 Judge, in my opinion, is to say to the United States, and in
- 21 this case it's the prosecution, to say to the United States,
- 22 We're going to move forward, but we're going to move forward
- 23 when you're at least beginning to process the security

- 1 clearances for members of this team.
- 2 It is very rich, indeed, for a team that has multiple
- 3 years of experience on their team to say, well, we're okay,
- 4 we're fully constituted. We're not. We need these people and
- 5 we can't really move forward until we have them.
- 6 Thank you, Judge.
- 7 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. I want clarification on this.
- 8 You're saying that the defense is ready to move forward once
- 9 the processing of the security clearances for these four
- **10** lawyers commences?
- 11 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: If we -- Judge ----
- 12 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I mean, I'm just telling you what I
- 13 think I just heard.
- 14 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: If we can get -- if we can get them
- 15 started down the process with an assurance of some kind that
- 16 it would be complete within a number of months, that would be
- 17 wonderful.
- I'm not saying we can't move forward an inch until
- 19 these guys are all cleared and come on. But right now they're
- 20 sitting in complete and total limbo. As you said, Judge,
- 21 you've been told this is going to take two years. Well,
- 22 that's just not acceptable to our team. This case will be
- 23 over in two years -- or should be over in two years. And

- 1 there's no acceptable reason why these -- the process for
- 2 these folks can't begin now. But it's not going to unless the
- 3 government suffers some consequence for just sitting there
- **4** doing nothing.
- 5 I'll tell you two quick stories. Premal Dharia, who
- 6 was assigned to this case, still doesn't have her read-ons.
- 7 If she were sitting here at counsel table -- she's been moved
- 8 to another case -- if she were sitting here, she still
- 9 wouldn't be cleared because she hasn't been read on.
- 10 Secondly, one of my partners, Jimmy Szymanski -- I'm
- 11 testifying, Judge, I know, but I'm representing to you, he
- 12 found out that his clearance had been assigned to a woman on
- 13 maternity leave. And he jumped on it and called the primary
- 14 person and said, "This person's on maternity leave," and so it
- 15 got reassigned to somebody who wasn't on maternity leave.
- Now, that just isn't acceptable. It shouldn't be
- 17 acceptable, and yet it goes on and on.
- And until the government suffers some consequence for
- 19 just blowing through these discovery deadlines, then they'll
- 20 continue to do it. That's what always happens.
- 21 And so I'm asking you, Judge -- I'm not asking for
- 22 18 months. I'm asking you to order that the clearance process
- 23 begin on these four people and that they complete their

- 1 discovery. And, you know, it can be three or four months.
- 2 You know, I don't see why it should take 18 months, but we're
- 3 just not going to be able to argue motions and get into
- 4 pretrial preparation without these things being done.
- **5** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. All right. I'm not making an
- 6 order or a ruling right now, Trial Counsel. But I'm telling
- 7 you that these people are apparently in the pro bono pool,
- 8 okay?
- **9** I'm taking Mr. Rushforth at his word that they have
- 10 applied for clearances. And I'm not ruling that the accused
- 11 is entitled to these people or that the defense team is not
- 12 going to be complete until they are in place with clearances.
- 13 I'm just telling you that once their applications have been
- 14 filed, then obviously in due course they are supposed to be
- 15 processed. Whatever you did in Mr. Rushforth's case, whatever
- 16 you had to do with it or whatever any government entity had to
- 17 do with the, at least by federal government standards, quick
- 18 processing of his clearance, I recommend that you get that
- 19 started with these other counsel. Okay?
- I mean, it's supposed to happen anyway. Right?
- 21 They're there, they've applied, it's supposed to happen. This
- 22 isn't -- you know, it's not a ruling, it's not an order. I'm
- 23 just telling you, it's probably in your best interest to make

- 1 that happen, to influence that process as best you can. And
- 2 I'm not -- again, I'm not saying that it's an entitlement,
- 3 that the commission is not going to move forward until they
- 4 have their clearances. And apparently Mr. Rushforth is at
- 5 least making the concession that the defense's position is not
- 6 that they have to have security clearances in place before the
- 7 defense is willing to move forward.
- 8 So take that for whatever it's worth. Okay?
- 9 I want to ask you, Mr. Rushforth, the government has
- 10 proposed a few specific items for hearing at the next
- 11 scheduled session of this commission. The Miranda motion,
- **12** what Appellate Exhibit number is that?
- **13** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: 045, Your Honor.
- 14 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: AE045, this issue of not being able to
- 15 move -- or not moving forward until the process of clearing
- 16 these four counsel has been initiated, briefing that and
- 17 hearing a motion on that at a July hearing.
- And the last one is this -- what the defense has
- 19 characterized as "attributable delay"? Is there any reason
- 20 that -- do you have any qualms with those three issues being
- 21 briefed and -- I mean, some of them have already been -- one
- 22 of them has already been briefed but you can file a
- 23 supplemental brief on that. Do you have any qualms with

- 1 hearing those three motions related to those three subject
- 2 matter at a July hearing?
- 3 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Your Honor, would you clarify for me?
- 4 I only heard two, and I'm sure I missed the third.
- 5 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: The AE045, that's the one that's
- **6** actually been briefed.
- 7 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: And what is the 045?
- **8** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: It's the applicability of ----
- **9** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Miranda?
- **10** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: ---- Miranda to commissions.
- **11** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: And the second?
- 12 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: To, I guess, unlawful enemy
- **13** belligerents.
- 14 The second one was the counsel issue, the issue of
- 15 the defense saying that you're not ready to move forward until
- 16 these four other counsel have been -- the process of their
- 17 clearances being initiated.
- DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: And you're asking me whether that
- 19 could be argued and heard ----
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Briefed and heard.
- **21** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: ---- in July?
- 22 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Yeah.
- 23 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Okay. And then the third?

- 1 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Because the fact is the government -- or
- 2 these prosecutors heard about it for the first time last
- 3 night.
- **4** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: I understand. I understand.
- 5 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. I mean, I understand the
- 6 difference between these prosecutors and the United States.
- 7 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, I don't understand that
- 8 difference but I'm sure you do, Judge.
- 9 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Well, I mean, I'm just looking at
- 10 reality. They're telling me they didn't know about it. Okay?
- 11 So they haven't had a chance in this commission to respond to
- **12** that thoroughly.
- **13** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: I understand that.
- 14 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: They made an oral argument.
- **15** DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: I understand that point, Judge.
- 16 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: And the last one is -- the third one is
- 17 the issue of excludable delay versus attributable delay.
- 18 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Judge, if I could have just a few
- 19 minutes to confer with my ----
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Sure.
- 21 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: ---- with my counsel here who are
- 22 smarter than I on all of these issues?
- 23 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Sure.

- 1 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: You know, if you want to take a brief
- 2 recess, I could use a half hour to confer with them and
- 3 perhaps answer your question.
- 4 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I think that's time probably well spent
- 5 for everyone. And the next prayer time is not until almost
- 6 1300, so I think that would still give us an hour before that.
- 7 And I don't think it should take that long.
- 8 But before we do, I want to ask the government if you
- 9 have any other proposals for matters to be heard at the July
- 10 hearing.
- 11 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, may I approach the
- 12 lectern?
- 13 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Yes.
- **14** ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, additionally potentially
- 15 the alleged unlawful influence, the defense did indicate a
- **16** desire to reraise that issue at some point.
- 17 Also, Mr. Rushforth also indicated a desire to
- 18 litigate the medical or the health issue, understanding that
- 19 that might require some discovery. Mr. Rushforth did refer to
- 20 200 recent items requested in discovery. That's accurate. A
- 21 few weeks ago they did submit a new discovery request. The
- 22 government is in the process of responding to that. I don't
- 23 believe that encompassed, off the top of my head, encompassed

- 1 anything specific to that motion. But they're certainly free
- 2 to request ----
- **3** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Talking about the health issues?
- 4 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Yes, Your Honor, correct, request
- 5 whatever they believe would be relevant to those motions.
- 6 Those are two additional motions that we could potentially
- 7 litigate in July. The government would respectfully ask that
- 8 should the judge order that specific deadlines be set for
- 9 motions, a scheduling order specific to that hearing on those
- 10 motions be set so it's clear to the parties, deadlines for
- 11 filing those motions including any request for discovery
- 12 needed in support of those motions.
- 13 Also, Your Honor, if I may address the clearing
- 14 issues, as I have become aware of it, with respect to the four
- 15 newly requested people. It's not clear to the government when
- 16 they were made a member of the civilian pool. And my
- 17 understanding from the security clearance folks is that they
- 18 would have no way of knowing that those people were intended
- 19 for a specific case.
- 20 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Right. I said that.
- 21 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: In addition, with respect to
- 22 Mr. Rushforth, the prosecution had little to no ability to
- 23 affect that process. Largely that was a result of the fact

- 1 that Mr. Rushforth applied with the Department of Justice.
- 2 Department of Justice actually adjudicated his clearance and
- 3 then transferred that over to the Department of Defense. So
- 4 the process ----
- 5 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Why do we need to keep talking about
- **6** this? He's sitting here now and he has a clearance. Why do
- 7 we need to keep talking about this?
- 8 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Because Your Honor suggested we do
- **9** what we did in Mr. Rushforth's case and make it happen.
- 10 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I understand what you are saying.
- 11 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: I'm trying to inform the commission,
- 12 we as the prosecution has very little ability to move things
- 13 along. If we could, I would be happy to assist in whatever
- 14 way possible.
- 15 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I don't know who influenced it. All I
- 16 know is at least according to people who know, who have talked
- 17 to me, it happened in record time. So -- I mean I'm -- I have
- 18 to agree with Mr. Rushforth on this. You are the
- **19** United States, okay?
- 20 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: So I understand you have a hard job and
- 22 you're dealing with a monolithic bureaucracy, interagency
- 23 tangled webs. I mean, I understand. I understand what you're

- **1** up against. But ----
- 2 ATC [LCDR SPENCER]: Your Honor, we have the same
- 3 challenges. We're losing personnel. We have new personnel
- 4 coming in. We've had one individual who's been internally
- 5 assigned to the team for a very long time still awaiting
- 6 clearance. It's an ongoing ----
- 7 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: I mean, that doesn't make it any better.
- 8 That's just -- you know, it's bad all around if that's the
- 9 case. And this isn't -- you know, it really isn't a who's got
- 10 it worse. It's we need to get it done so that we can move
- 11 forward in this case.
- 12 All right. So the only question I really had for you
- 13 is: What other business do you think we can take care of?
- 14 And you've said the -- you know, parsing out the unlawful
- 15 influence motion that we had talked about briefly today that I
- 16 said was misplaced, and the continuance motion, and the
- 17 health-related issue of working here in Guantanamo.
- So, Mr. Rushforth, if you could add those to your
- 19 list of prospective possible things to hear at the July
- 20 hearing and ----
- 21 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Well, Your Honor, I can comment on
- 22 those right now. They will not be ready to be heard in July.
- Your Honor commented this morning unlawful influence

- 1 is an ongoing matter anyway. And the legislation that we
- 2 were -- that we've been talking about may or may not be passed
- 3 by then. And it may be a really good argument that there
- 4 isn't unlawful influence until it's passed. I don't know, I
- 5 haven't thought that through.
- **6** But we're not going to get it ready and get it ready
- 7 to be heard in July unless, of course, the court orders, but I
- 8 would respectfully request that the court not so order.
- **9** MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay.
- 10 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: And with respect to the health
- 11 issues, we're already seeking to retain an expert. The Navy
- 12 report, as Your Honor knows, I'm sure Your Honor has read it,
- 13 basically raises all kinds of questions and answers none of
- 14 them. And so we're going out to get our own expert to try to
- 15 help us answer those. And we're not going to be prepared to
- **16** do that by July.
- 17 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. You'll talk about the other three
- 18 that we talked about originally and get back to me when we
- 19 come back on the record?
- 20 DC [MR. RUSHFORTH]: Yes, sir. Yes, Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [CAPT WAITS]: Okay. We'll take a recess until, we'll
- 22 say 1205. We'll come back and address those three prospective
- 23 motions. Okay?

1		Со	urt's	in 1	the com	missi	on is	in rece	ess until	1205.
2	[The	R.M.C.	803 s	ession	recess	ed at	1143,	17 May	2016.]	
3					[END	OF PA	GE]			
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										