- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0819,
- 2 5 February 2018.]
- 3 MJ [Col RUBIN]: The commission is called to order. All
- 4 parties present when the commission recessed are again
- **5** present. I do note that Major Miller is not present. I was
- 6 informed a moment ago that she will be running late this
- 7 morning. Is that correct, Commander Cooper?
- **8** DC [CDR COOPER]: Yes, sir, that is correct. Major Miller
- **9** had a logistical issue this morning but will be in shortly.
- 10 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Very well. We'll proceed in her absence.
- 11 I do note that the remainder of the accused's defense team is
- 12 present. Major Miller has the commission's permission to
- 13 arrive late.
- 14 The accused is present this morning.
- 15 Yesterday at the conclusion of our session, counsel
- 16 and I had a Rule for Military Commission 802 conference in my
- 17 chambers. That conference was held outside the presence of
- 18 the accused. We discussed the timing of a potential Military
- 19 Commission Rule of Evidence 505(h) hearing. Trial counsel
- 20 stated that the government may be ready to proceed by the
- 21 afternoon of 5 February 2018. We discussed the status of
- 22 certain motions related to M.C.R.E. 505(g). The government
- 23 inquired about the way ahead on AE 101. Defense counsel

- 1 requested an opportunity to present argument on the testimony
- 2 of the neurosurgeon that testified yesterday. Finally, we
- 3 briefly discussed certain accommodations for the accused.
- 4 Counsel and I had another brief R.M.C. 802 conference
- 5 in chambers. That conference was held at 0750 this morning.
- 6 It was conducted outside the presence of the accused. We
- 7 briefly discussed some of the mechanics for hearing testimony
- 8 by pseudonym. We also agreed on a later start time this
- 9 morning to allow defense counsel additional time to meet with
- 10 the accused.
- 11 Counsel, do you concur with my summation of our 802
- 12 conferences? Please feel free to add or correct anything I
- 13 may have misstated.
- 14 TC [CDR SHORT]: The government is fine with it,
- 15 Your Honor.
- 16 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: We agree with your summary, Judge.
- 17 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Thank you.
- 18 Counsel, for planning purposes, the commission will
- 19 now issue oral rulings on the record.
- With respect to AE 090J, the defense request for the
- 21 assistance of Dr. Leo in preparation for the cross-examination
- 22 of Ahmed al Darbi, that motion is denied.
- With respect to AE 096, the defense motion for

- 1 production of Ahmed al Darbi's mental health and/or
- 2 psychotherapy records, or, in the alternative, for the
- 3 military judge to conduct an in camera review, that motion is
- 4 denied.
- 5 The commission's essential findings and conclusions
- 6 of law will be captured in later written rulings.
- 7 On 31 January 2018, I ordered the record of oral
- 8 argument on AE 096 to be sealed in light of the language of
- 9 Military Commission Rule of Evidence 513(e)(5), which states:
- 10 "The motion, related papers, and record of the hearing shall
- 11 be sealed." However, the rule goes on to state, "unless the
- 12 military judge or an appellate court orders otherwise."
- 13 There was no request to close the hearing from either
- 14 party and no objection to an open hearing from counsel for
- 15 Mr. al Darbi. Additionally, there was no privileged
- 16 information discussed during the course of the open session.
- 17 I therefore rescind my earlier order that the record of the
- 18 open session remain under seal; however, all motions and
- 19 related papers will remain under seal as filed until later
- 20 order of the commission or court of competent jurisdiction.
- 21 Defense counsel indicated yesterday that they wished
- 22 to be heard on the testimony of the neurosurgeon. Much of
- 23 this argument is related to the defense motion to continue the

- 1 deposition in AE 107A. I'm going to give counsel the
- 2 opportunity to hear argument on these issues simultaneously.
- In AE 107A, the defense requests that the commission
- 4 continue the cross-examination of Ahmed al Darbi from this,
- 5 the January-February 2018 session to the scheduled 9 April
- **6** 2018 session and to prohibit the transfer of Ahmed al Darbi
- 7 outside the jurisdiction until cross-examination is completed.
- 8 The government has not yet had the opportunity to respond to
- **9** this motion.
- Does the defense wish to be heard on these issues?
- 11 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Yes, Judge, although I confess, I
- 12 have been wrong-footed on AE 107A. That was a motion that you
- 13 had indicated you anticipated hearing at the conclusion of the
- 14 remainder -- all of the other motions, I think, in our initial
- 15 802. And so while I was prepared to go forward with the other
- 16 motions that were ripe, based on responses and pending
- 17 AE 101 -- M.C.R.E. 505(h) finalizations, I was prepared -- I
- 18 am prepared -- I was not prepared to proceed to discuss the
- **19** motion to continue in particular.
- I can do that. I request the opportunity to
- 21 supplement in writing and/or orally if I go back and find I
- 22 missed something, but I can do that. And I do very much wish
- 23 to address the neurosurgeon's testimony from yesterday, which

- 1 is apart from the question of continuing the deposition, which
- 2 is a separate matter, is applicable to the kind of
- 3 accommodations and the framework that the commission should
- 4 follow in thinking about those going forward.
- 5 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Mr. Thurschwell, I would like to hear
- 6 both. I think there is tremendous interplay between the two.
- 7 If you would like a recess to just collect some additional
- 8 thoughts, I will give you that opportunity, but the commission
- 9 does intend to litigate 107A at this session of the
- 10 commission.
- 11 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, I can do that. If I have
- 12 ten minutes, I can be prepared.
- 13 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Very well. I am going to give you 15
- **14** minutes, Mr. Thurschwell, all right?
- **15** ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Thank you.
- 16 MJ [Col RUBIN]: It's 8:25. The commission is in recess
- **17** until 8:40.
- 18 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0825, 05 February 2018.]
- 19 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0826,
- 20 05 February 2018.]
- 21 MJ [Col RUBIN]: The commission is called to order. All
- 22 parties present when the commission recessed are again
- 23 present.

1 Lieutenant Commander Lincoln, did you want to briefly 2 address the matter we discussed in the 802 conference this 3 morning, the testimony via pseudonym? 4 ATC [LCDR LINCOLN]: Yes, Your Honor. 5 MJ [Col RUBIN]: You may. 6 ATC [LCDR LINCOLN]: Thank you, Your Honor, for the 7 opportunity. I know the witnesses, you know, they testified 8 on the expectation of their identity being protected and 9 they're understandably a little concerned based on some of the 10 discussions yesterday, so I thank you for the opportunity to 11 clear this up promptly. 12 Just to clear up, sir, under AE 014A, which is 13 Protective Order Number 3, the government needs to request a 14 protective order from the commission for a witness, and we ask 15 that you take the oral or -- we ask that you take the oral 16 request that we made prior to the assistant SJA and the 17 neurosurgeon testifying this week as a request to protect 18 their identities pursuant to AE 014A. 19 Specifically, you requested a declaration 20 explaining -- specifically toward the neurosurgeon. The 21 prosecution respectfully directs your attention to AE 014A --22 excuse me, AE 014, Attachment B in its entirety, but 23 specifically page 27. That is filed ex parte and under seal.

- 1 We have a copy should the commission not have one available
- 2 that we can bring over. It is classified, but we can get that
- 3 to you unless you already have a copy. We ask that Your Honor
- 4 rely on that in issuing a protective order regarding the
- 5 neurosurgeon and the assistant SJA.
- **6** And we also call your attention to the order that
- 7 this commission filed, AE 021T, in which it previously
- 8 protected the identity of potential government witnesses,
- 9 because, if publicly released, the information could
- 10 reasonably be expected to threaten the safety of individuals.
- 11 The government also calls your attention to the fact
- 12 that the names of these individuals are considered sensitive,
- 13 but unclassified information.
- 14 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Thank you, Trial Counsel. I will review
- 15 those items.
- 16 Mr. Thurschwell, do you want to be heard?
- 17 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Very briefly, Judge.
- 18 ATC [LCDR LINCOLN]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 19 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, so the record is clear, we
- 20 continue to object to the anonymous testimony of the witness
- 21 for the reasons I stated earlier; our ability to actually do
- 22 the background research, especially with respect to an expert
- 23 witness, so I reiterate that objection.

1 We object to the commission's use of ex parte under 2 seal information that we do not have access to to decide that 3 issue, which we think is an ongoing one and critical to our 4 ability to present the defense generally, and specifically 5 with respect to these issues. We do not object to you -- your 6 hearing the government's application in an oral form and we 7 take no position on the form of order that you issue with 8 regard to the specific question of the anonymous treatment of 9 the witness. 10 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Thank you, Mr. Thurschwell. 11 Counsel, the commission is in recess until 0845. 12 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0830, 5 February 2018.] 13 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0933, 14 5 February 2018.] 15 MJ [Col RUBIN]: The commission is called to order. A11 16 parties present when the commission recessed are again 17 present. I will note that Major Miller is present. She was 18 present prior to the recess as well. 19 Counsel and I had a brief R.M.C. 802 conference in 20 chambers at approximately 0845 this morning. The accused was 21 not present. Defense counsel requested an additional 45 22 minutes to prepare for argument. I granted that request. 23

Counsel and I briefly discussed the way ahead today

- $\mathbf{1}$ as well as the feasibility of having an M.C.R.E. 505(h)
- 2 hearing this afternoon. Counsel agreed on a potential 1500
- 3 start time for a closed session.
- 4 Counsel, did I capture all of our 802 conversation?
- 5 TC [CDR SHORT]: Yes, Your Honor.
- **6** MJ [Col RUBIN]: Commander?
- 7 DC [CDR COOPER]: Yes, Your Honor.
- 8 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Thank you.
- 9 Mr. Thurschwell, are you prepared to present oral
- 10 argument on AE 107A as well as the testimony of the
- **11** neurosurgeon?
- **12** ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: I am, Your Honor.
- And, Your Honor, I am going to address the
- 14 neurosurgeon's testimony initially on its own, so to speak,
- 15 because it provides very significant input to the -- to the
- 16 request for a continuance in certain respects and it is also
- 17 relevant to numerous other issues, including the
- 18 accommodations that you have been providing so far and our
- 19 proposed way ahead in terms of scheduling and accommodations.
- 20 MJ [Col RUBIN]: As you deem appropriate, sir.
- 21 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Thank you, Judge.
- 22 So the -- I will call him the neurosurgeon testified
- 23 primarily -- well, not primarily, but with respect to the

- 1 issue of surgery and the need for further surgery.
- 2 Unfortunately, the transcript is not yet available and so I am
- **3** going to go from notes and memory, but the commission will
- 4 correct me or remember differently if you do.
- 5 Essentially his testimony was he wasn't sure if
- 6 further surgery would be needed at this point or not. There
- 7 are indications that it might be, and that is why he has
- 8 ordered the EMG tests, which he anticipates being performed
- 9 within the next week or two, I think was his testimony. So
- 10 it's not clear now whether the additional surgery will be --
- 11 will be necessary. So that's -- I would say that's the
- 12 initial thing.
- What -- there are certain -- other than that, certain
- 14 points are very clear, and I would like to run down what they
- 15 are. And the first is that he very candidly recognized, and I
- 16 think appropriately recognized, that he could not opine and
- 17 could contribute nothing from an expert perspective on
- 18 Mr. Al-Tamir's ability to participate meaningfully in his
- 19 defense for purposes -- and he didn't say this, but I would
- 20 say add, by necessarily implication -- for purposes of the
- 21 rulings that the court is required to make with respect to
- 22 AE 099 and related -- related issues about accommodations to
- 23 the extent that the accommodations are aimed at not just his

- 1 physical condition and alleviating his physical condition, but
- 2 his ability meaningfully to participate in his defense.
- 3 He was very clear on that. He said that is not --
- 4 those were not -- his qualifications did not qualify him for
- 5 that; he has not even been a criminal defendant, much less a
- 6 criminal defense lawyer. And so his testimony was limited to
- 7 his opinion of the effect of his current medical status, as he
- 8 could determine it, and the -- the likelihood of physical
- 9 impact -- medical physical impact on Mr. Al-Tamir's health of
- 10 proceeding with these proceedings in various ways.
- 11 And while -- I'm going to come back to the issue of
- 12 pain, but he testified that he did not initially -- that he
- 13 did not believe that proceeding with these proceedings sitting
- 14 in the chair would -- would impact -- would impact, and being
- 15 transported back and forth in an appropriate manner would
- 16 adversely affect the condition of Mr. Al-Tamir's nerves and
- 17 spine. But he qualified that when, I believe, the commission
- 18 pressed him about how long he could sit without that -- having
- 19 a physical impact. He qualified that by saying, well, it
- 20 depends on how long, and this is where I don't remember
- 21 exactly, but he made it clear that he was not in a position to
- 22 claim that sitting here for any particular length of time,
- 23 certainly past the kinds of half days we've talked about,

1 would not actually -- might have a physical impact, and it --2 for reasons that I will come back to, it is going to have 3 indirectly a physical impact in terms of his -- Mr. Nashwan --4 Mr. Al-Tamir's progress in terms of healing. Let me come back 5 to that. So that his testimony was, "I can't talk about how 6 7 this is going to affect his ability to actually participate --8 listen to the proceedings, pay attention to his lawyers, or be 9 able to sit and read while he is alone in his cell trying to 10 prepare." He couldn't -- he couldn't testify to the impact of 11 the medical condition, but he could say, and this is my 12 second -- I mean, let me back up. He was -- he also -- very 13 importantly, I will come back to this when we talk about some 14 of the other motions. He clarified the meaning of the 15 repeated language in the recent SMO declarations that have 16 been filed in the AE 099I series filed by the government that 17 state that he is -- that Mr. Al-Tamir is medically cleared for 18 transport to attorney-client meetings. 19 He was very clear that that, consistent with his own 20 testimony about his own qualifications and the qualifications 21 of any other medical expert, like the SMO, that -- that

that -- that statement was a statement not about if you -- if

you would like, his -- his clearance or ability to actually

22

23

- 1 conduct an attorney-client meeting in a meaningful way, by
- 2 constitutional or any other standards, but simply that the
- 3 transport, with appropriate safeguards, wearing the CTO and so
- 4 on, would not adversely affect his actual physical condition
- **5** of his spine and nerves.
- **6** And so that is the only significance to date of those
- 7 prior declarations. They do not say and cannot say that he
- 8 was -- on December 5th, you know, when they cleared him, that
- **9** he was actually competent to participate in his defense.
- 10 Okay. He can -- I mean, he's a back surgeon; he
- 11 deals with patients in a post-surgical setting. He -- it
- 12 falls within his expertise to talk about pain that is
- 13 subsequent to operations, and he talked about Mr. Al-Tamir's
- 14 pain. Generally speaking, he said -- he agreed that pain does
- 15 interfere with daily acti- -- can interfere, let me qualify
- 16 that, with daily activities of various kinds; that -- and
- 17 specifically, pain can interfere with intellectual activity,
- 18 because it's -- it's distracting and it makes it hard to
- 19 focus.
- It can -- similarly, it can interfere with trying to
- 21 read material, because that also requires a kind of
- 22 intellectual focus, and it can interfere with the ability to
- 23 attend to conversations. If you're in extreme pain and, you

- 1 know, you're in a conversation, you're going to miss some of
- 2 the stuff that people say. And that is both common sense and
- 3 was his testimony as a -- as a medical expert who treats
- 4 individuals who are in a post-surgical setting.
- 5 With respect to Mr. Al-Tamir, he -- what he reported
- 6 Mr. Al-Tamir saying -- and this is not entirely clear, so I'm
- 7 going to -- I'm going to try to say what he said and then say,
- 8 "I think the reasonable inference is from that" and address
- 9 some of the government's cross on him -- or redirect on him
- 10 about that.
- 11 What he said when he met with Mr. Al-Tamir most
- 12 recently, on Friday night, was that he reported that he was
- 13 in -- that he was experiencing pain up to a level of 8 out of
- 14 10. I want to put that in context because it is -- this was
- 15 not clarified, but I think it's a reasonable inference. What
- 16 he also testified was that Mr. Al-Tamir was reporting mostly
- 17 about the previous ten days and the -- the significant
- 18 increase in his pain and other symptoms, and it is not clear
- 19 to me that he was saying, "I am in pain today at 8," or that
- 20 "my pain level has been up to 8 during that time."
- 21 Either way -- and the one reason I -- and I tried
- 22 to -- I asked him if he was aware that Mr. Al-Tamir, when he
- 23 had met with him, had not been in court or attorney-client

- 1 meetings for, I believe at that point, two days, so he was
- 2 able to rest in his cell, whether he was aware of that; he
- 3 said no. And so he had testified that he didn't -- apparently
- 4 he didn't seem like he was in a level-of-8 pain. That's a
- 5 subjective sense. Maybe he didn't look that way. Maybe he
- 6 wasn't in a level-of-8 pain at that time, that is conceivable,
- 7 and that that reference was to the earlier period.
- 8 In any event, his report to the neurosurgeon of his
- 9 pain is consistent with what he's been telling us, the exact
- 10 levels. We have been monitoring, numerically, his pain. He
- 11 has -- in here, he has reported, by the end of the day, levels
- 12 of 6 to 8. It varies. At the very end of the day, especially
- 13 when we've gone over, he's indicated 8. I don't think he's
- **14** ever said 9.
- 15 So fully consistent with that, and most critically, I
- 16 asked the neurosurgeon whether he had any reason to doubt the
- 17 truthfulness of Mr. Al-Tamir's reports of his own subjective
- 18 experience of the pain; he said no, he had no basis for that.
- 19 And later, he offered himself that Mr. Al-Tamir has always
- 20 been very, and I think the word he used was "straightforward,"
- **21** with me.
- 22 And so, you know, I think there is no basis -- to the
- 23 extent that the government has been trying to insinuate that

- 1 there has been some manipulation of the process by
- 2 Mr. Al-Tamir, or counsel, hopefully, that that can be put to
- 3 rest. And, you know, we are -- we are trying, Judge, and
- 4 that's what we have been doing since we got here for this
- 5 session, and he is trying. So that's -- but so against that
- 6 back -- now, and let me -- against that background, let me
- 7 pick up again with his testimony.
- **8** With regard to the pain, he testified very clearly
- 9 that the assessment of pain by the neurosurgeon, who -- you
- 10 know, when they're evaluating it in a post-surgical context,
- 11 is this subjective report of the -- of the patient, and that
- 12 is inevitable if -- anyone who has undergone an operation,
- 13 certainly a back operation, will recognize that. They want to
- 14 know how you're feeling.
- And what he testified as well -- and this goes to the
- 16 question of accommodations. You know, I asked him, you know,
- 17 if a patient is doing an activity in -- a patient with
- 18 Mr. Al-Tamir's medical profile, I specified -- is doing an
- 19 activity and reports to you that doing it for an extended --
- 20 for a period of time, the level of pain increases up to --
- 21 significantly, wouldn't your advice be, yes, stop doing the
- 22 activity when it hurts that much? And he said, yes, it would.
- 23 And I then asked him if -- if the same patient was

- 1 doing the -- that same activity and stopping when the pain
- 2 became too much, but found that doing that activity on a daily
- 3 basis itself, even with stopping along with the pain, itself
- 4 increased the level of pain and the intensity of pain and made
- 5 it harder and harder to go during the day, those -- then would
- 6 your advice be to stop doing that on a daily basis, and he
- 7 said yes. Again, that is very significant. It's his
- 8 medical -- that's his medical -- that is within his expertise;
- 9 that is advice that a surgeon gives to a patient in a
- 10 post-operative setting.
- 11 Just one moment, Judge. Just -- if I may have a
- 12 second to make sure I have covered what I need to say.
- 13 [Pause.]
- **14** ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: I think -- okay. So that is --
- 15 that was the essence of his -- of his testimony, I think, for
- 16 purposes of the request for accommodations and so on.
- 17 What we -- we can talk about now, if you would like,
- 18 based on that, our proposed way forward and what we -- and
- 19 this would be based on his testimony and also on our --
- 20 especially now with his testimony and our own subjective
- 21 experience of working with Mr. Al-Tamir over a period of days
- 22 in attempting and seeing what's happened in our attempt to
- 23 meet with him in attorney-client meetings, we can talk about

- 1 our proposed schedule now or we can talk about that after
- 2 we've addressed these other issues. That's -- that's your
- **3** discretion, Judge.
- 4 MJ [Col RUBIN]: I'd like to hear on the defense proposed
- **5** way forward.
- 6 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: You'd like, all right. Based on
- 7 Mr. Al-Tamir's subjective expressions of pain and his
- 8 good-faith attempts to actually do what we've asked, and our
- 9 experience meeting with him in court -- I'm sorry, meeting
- 10 with him a week and a half ago, beginning on January 26 for
- 11 three consecutive days, it was three consecutive days, and
- 12 then the experience in court last week and his subjective --
- 13 his expressions of what he was capable of and when he stopped
- 14 being able to actually attend and focus and his level of pain,
- 15 we -- we think there is a four-day cycle that is -- is --
- 16 would be needed.
- 17 And the four-day cycle would be two days -- and this
- 18 is a proposal based, you know, on what we think he can do. If
- 19 his -- we don't know what the long-term consequence -- I mean,
- 20 the long-term effect of doing this cycle will be. But for
- 21 now, it appears that two days of the four days on half-day
- 22 sessions in court, two days not in court; the last day of
- 23 the -- on one of those days, we realistically -- the two off

- 1 days, excuse me, on one of the two off days, we realistically
- 2 expect to be able to meet with him for a half-day for an
- 3 attorney-client meeting; and that would be for various
- 4 purposes, including, I will say, and anticipating the motion
- 5 to continue, trying -- subject to other considerations, being
- 6 able to start preparing him -- preparing ourselves, I should
- 7 say, and allowing him to prepare us for the all Darbi cross.
- 8 So -- and if he can meet with us more during those
- 9 two days, that would be -- we will do that. I mean, we need
- 10 to meet with him, but that's our realistic assessment of what
- 11 he is capable of.
- 12 When we met with him -- in the week before the
- 13 session started, we -- as I reported at the outset, we were
- 14 able to meet with him for about three and a half hours or so,
- 15 three hours before he became exhausted. The next day he was
- 16 able to do it for about two and a half hours or so, maybe
- 17 three, around there, and then it was -- and then it was down
- 18 to two hours before he really had enough. And then he was
- 19 incapable -- he really did not want to meet with us on Monday,
- 20 and -- and -- so that -- and then the experience in court has
- 21 been similar.
- He was -- we had a half-day on Tuesday, then he had
- 23 the extra strain of the nighttime MRI. He came on Wednesday

1 He was not -- afternoon sessions are more 2 difficult. We would ask for morning sessions, I think, is --3 so the afternoon session was already later in the day. And 4 then the -- the session was, in order to accommodate, try to 5 get in all the argument, it ended up getting extended by 6 either 30 minutes or more past what he really told us was 7 like, "I am not being able to pay attention now." 8 And the result was he was really -- he was out of 9 commission on Thursday and really unable medically -- I mean, 10 unable medically to attend. And so that -- that is the cycle 11 that we would ask for. 12 Let me say this, even that cycle is a problem, and 13 it's a medical problem for him. And as I said, we are 14 addressing here his ability to meaningfully participate in his 15 defense for constitutional and statutory purposes. But the --16 the -- the neurosurgeon stated that he was doing physical 17 therapy and he recommended physical therapy and physical 18 therapy would help. 19 On days, especially when he is in court, but even 20 when he meets with us, it is slightly less stressful -- I 21 mean, it is less stressful to meet with his attorneys. 22 still -- the physical positioning is the same, but it's less

stressful. But on days when he is in court, and especially on

23

- 1 days -- and other days as well, he -- he really -- that uses
- 2 up the energy he has got.
- 3 He is not able to do the physical therapy exercises,
- 4 or do them in a much more limited way, is our understanding,
- 5 than he would otherwise. And so proceeding on this basis is,
- **6** in fact, affecting his medical progress and his ability to
- 7 heal. And so we, with a great deal of hesitancy, are
- 8 proposing this four-day -- having our motion to abate having
- 9 been denied, we are proposing this as way forward as
- 10 accommodations, subject to, you know, the qualification that
- 11 this cannot be a -- on our side, a promise that he will not
- 12 fade and that other -- clearly other developments medically
- 13 might obstruct his ability to come to court on a particular
- 14 day or affect the accommodations needed.
- And if I might have a moment, Judge, just to make
- **16** sure I ----
- 17 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Sure.
- 18 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, that -- that is all I have
- 19 to say specifically about the neurosurgeon's testimony. And I
- 20 don't know if you want me to proceed directly into the
- 21 continuance motion or you want the government to respond to
- **22** my ----
- 23 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Please proceed right now into 107A,

- **1** please.
- 2 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: All right. Let me first say with
- 3 respect to the continuance motion, I -- I appreciate -- the
- 4 commission, upon our request, granted an additional amount of
- 5 time for me to prepare. At an earlier 802, after we had
- 6 requested to address the continuance first, the commission had
- 7 said no, let's listen -- see what else happens and then
- 8 address that last, and I was not prepared to go forward today.
- **9** And I appreciate that extra opportunity.
- 10 Let me say that having -- appreciating that -- that
- 11 indulgence, I trust that that will not affect or be subtracted
- 12 from the period of time that Mr. Al-Tamir has to sit here in
- 13 court. I mean, it's not going to affect his -- it doesn't add
- **14** 45 minutes to his day.
- 15 Thank you, Judge.
- 16 Okay. So the -- the basis of this -- of the
- 17 continuance motion -- and to be clear, the relief we are
- 18 requesting is a continuance until the next-scheduled session,
- 19 which begins, I believe, on April 9th, another two-week
- 20 session. The basis of the motion is predicated, first, on
- 21 Mr. Al-Tamir's constitutional and statutory rights to make a
- 22 defense, to meaningfully -- to conduct a -- to confront the
- 23 witnesses against him, his right to counsel, and his general

- **1** due process rights to a fair proceeding.
- 2 And the -- the factual basis of the motion, there are
- 3 three elements to it, all of which combine to make it
- 4 literally impossible for us to effectively -- constitutionally
- 5 effectively prepare for this deposition if it is going to be
- 6 held in the next -- during this week or next week or for
- 7 the -- if it isn't put off to a time frame that's comparable,
- 8 at a minimum, to the amount of time we would have if we just
- 9 did it during the next-scheduled session.
- And the first basis is that we have been effectively
- 11 prevented from meeting with Mr. Al-Tamir to talk about
- 12 anything face to face for -- effectively until this past
- 13 mid-January, and the -- I'm going to recount the history
- 14 briefly for that so that it's clear.
- 15 Second, we are -- even had we been allowed to meet
- 16 with him, what we were able -- what we were ethically able to
- 17 talk to him about under present circumstances, for reasons
- 18 that are laid out in AE 101, do not include litigation
- 19 strategy. And we had -- we intended to only talk to him about
- 20 the medical issue, which was front and center. We had no --
- 21 to remind the commission, we've had, you know, no medical
- 22 expertise of our -- regarding his current condition or to
- 23 advise us, we have had no medical records that are more than

- 1 40 -- that are more recent than 45 days old, and we haven't
- 2 been able to talk to him directly to get a direct, subjective
- 3 gauge of his symptoms.
- 4 He has done as good a job as he could, and it's been
- 5 pretty effective, but it doesn't compare -- in his letters, it
- 6 doesn't compare to his personal -- the right to meet with your
- 7 attorney personally. So that, that -- that is all we were
- 8 capable -- I'm sorry, all we would have been capable of
- 9 meeting with him about would be the medical issues, which were
- 10 front and center. And in fact, that is all we have talked
- 11 about. That's mostly what we have been talking about in the
- 12 hearings to date.
- When we speak to him in the -- when we spoke to him
- 14 in our sessions, all we talked to him about were sort of
- 15 procedural, what's going to happen, and medical questions, and
- 16 getting information from him, to the extent we could, about
- 17 his medical condition to present to the commission and to use
- 18 for the medical-related litigation.
- 19 And A -- and the reasons are set out in AE 101.
- 20 We -- I hope we get a chance to argue that in some form. We
- 21 have not. But for purposes of the motion to continue, and I
- 22 will -- I may elaborate on this a little bit later, but just
- 23 briefly to lay out the form of the argument, even if the

1 commission were to deny AE 101 today, as soon as I stop 2 talking, on its face, we -- that would not have -- would not 3 have given us and would not retroactively have authorized us 4 ethically to have met with Mr. Al-Tamir during the limited 5 period anyway that we could have met with him at all about the 6 issues we need to talk to him about to do the cross. 7 And the AE 101 -- and I will just say, whatever else 8 it is, it is a good faith effort to comply with our own -- our 9 own ethical requirements as -- as amplified and -- by the 10 Chief Defense Counsel in an unclassified memorandum, which we 11 will talk about, I hope, at the AE 101 hearing. So we have 12 not had a ruling on that. And because of that, we cannot just 13 assume that we're allowed to do -- well, it will probably get 14 denied, so we might as well talk to him about the stuff that 15 we think we're ethically unable to talk to him about. 16 So at -- even if it was denied, even if the motion to 17 abate has been denied, whatever the accommodations are that 18 are worked out now -- and I will come back to this again in 19 terms of the realistic timing -- we have not been able to talk 20 to him ethically and legally, as far as we're concerned, and 21 in good faith and reasonably, about anything related to the 22 al Darbi deposition, substantive, and there is a great deal to 23

talk about.

1 Now, the third problem that might have, to a certain 2 extent maybe, alleviated some of this, it could have, is if we 3 had been able to send Mr. Al-Tamir the basic written documents 4 that he would need to review and discuss with us, when we 5 finally did get a chance to talk to him, if we could have sent 6 them to him in advance. We have not. The only thing we are 7 allowed, by regulation, by -- by DoD regulation, by the 8 interpretation we have been provided by the -- the head of 9 security for the OMC, are documents if they are -- that are 10 marked DISPLAYABLE TO THE -- or, I'm sorry, RELEASABLE TO THE 11 DETAINEE. 12 We have been asking for months and pointing out to 13 the government for months that the all Darbi transcript of his 14 direct is marked U//FOUO, and that we're not able to send --15 being unable to, you know, meet with the client to talk to him 16 about it, we can't even send it to him to ask him to read it 17 in advance. And we've been pointing it out for months. The 18 commission noted that fact, that he was unable to do it, 19 itself in AE 099Y. That was on the 5 th of December. 20 To this day, we do not have either, just to begin 21 with -- and there are other documents as well -- the Darbi 22 direct testimony transcript or the Nashiri direct testimony 23 transcript marked in a way that we could have -- we could

- 1 leave it in his cell with him, once we got to meet with him,
- 2 or have sent it to him months ago and to the extent he was
- 3 able to read it in advance, without our presence to talk to
- 4 him about it, it would have at least given us that. That has
- 5 not been available.
- **6** So in every way, we have been hamstrung by the -- by,
- 7 and I'm going to emphasize this, the government's own policies
- 8 and decisions. It was the government's decision not to
- 9 accommodate our requests for -- to meet with the client. We
- 10 began requesting in-person meetings with the client in
- 11 September. He was operated on in early September. Our
- 12 requests began within days of his surgery, saying, "Can we
- 13 meet with him?" So -- and the -- we were repeatedly rebuffed.
- 14 They -- on one hand, they would not -- at that point, he was
- 15 not cleared to meet with us for transport to an
- 16 attorney-client meeting, and we now know what that means.
- 17 Not -- but he was not even cleared for that medically, for
- 18 transport. We requested to meet with him in the hospital, or
- 19 wherever he was being held so that we'd be -- we could find
- 20 out about him and start working on whatever we could work with
- **21** him on. That was repeatedly rebuffed.
- And we moved in AE 102 in -- on the 5th of October,
- 23 we filed a motion to compel access to counsel where he was

- 1 located. That was denied eventually by this commission, but
- 2 the commission itself noted that the -- that the inability of
- 3 the government to accommodate, in the face of these
- 4 unfortunate circumstances -- that is, the illness -- in-person
- 5 or even telephonic attorney-client communications will be
- 6 weighed in consideration of future requests for continuances
- 7 or appropriate relief. Those are the commission's words,
- 8 AE 102D at paragraph 4. So the commission recognized that
- 9 this was a problem in terms of our ability to move forward,
- 10 this lack of access.
- 11 On 31 October, for JTF -- and I don't have this in
- 12 front of me -- but JTF approved visits if the client was
- 13 wearing his CTO for November 8th and 9th. That was the first
- 14 statement that he was cleared for transport that we received.
- 15 And we immediately thereafter received an SMO declaration the
- 16 next day that actually confirmed his ability to do that under
- 17 that medical standard.
- And subsequently we actually -- they moved up -- I
- 19 think they approved visits, maybe spontaneously, for
- 20 November 2nd. But in any event, as soon as we were able,
- 21 after receiving that, we arranged to fly down to Guantanamo to
- 22 meet with him, having gotten that word.
- 23 By the way, this is all documented, Judge. It's

- 1 documented in AE 107A, the motion to continue; it's documented2 extensively elsewhere, and I think in particular AE 07- --
- 3 AE 0990, which was an earlier motion to continue, and the
- 4 exhibits thereto; exhaustively documented in the record, our
- 5 exhaustive efforts to meet with him in some form as soon as
- 6 possible. We did not sleep on our rights with respect to any
- 7 of these issues. The delay that this has now occasioned is --
- 8 lies entirely at the feet of the government to proceed.
- **9** We flew down on November 7th and -- in the hope to
- 10 meet with the client on November 8 -- 8th, 9th, and 10th,
- 11 which I believe were the scheduled visits. Mr. Al-Tamir, it
- 12 turned out, was unable to meet with us on those dates. Now,
- 13 he -- he -- he felt medically unable to meet with us, despite
- 14 the clearance which said he could be physically transported
- 15 without damage to his spine. So he said, "I am not
- 16 medically -- my opinion is I'm not medically competent to meet
- **17** with my attorneys."
- 18 On the -- so on the 13th of November, the defense was
- 19 informed that he was no longer cleared. So this was a brief
- 20 window in which he was -- he was cleared. He told us he was
- 21 unable to meet with us, and he told us we are no longer
- 22 cleared. And then, lo and behold, we learn that the next
- 23 day -- this is the 14th of November, less than a week after

- 1 the meetings that he said "I don't feel well enough" to meet
- 2 with us -- they operated on him.
- 3 So to be absolutely clear, his -- he had a more
- 4 accurate read on his medical ability to meet with us than the
- 5 SMO who said, "You're cleared to be transported." He -- he
- 6 was about to receive another emergency operation before that.
- 7 So I don't -- that put to rest, again, the fact that he said
- 8 he was unable to meet with us on those days, those were not
- 9 realistic opportunities for us to meet with him. Then he was
- 10 no longer -- he was operated on, he was no longer cleared
- 11 under the medical standard, even under the medical standard
- 12 which does not address his ability to participate in his
- 13 defense.
- On -- and on the 5th of December -- and that
- 15 clearance, I should say, we -- there is an issue that I don't
- 16 have to get into here but it's one that's floated, which is
- 17 our concern that the -- and I've said it before -- that
- 18 medical decisions at some level -- and I'm not saying this
- 19 about the neurosurgeon, but at the JTF level -- are being
- 20 driven by the -- by litigation concerns, and I -- and we have
- **21** a significant concern about that.
- His clearance -- his clearance, days before he was
- 23 operated on on an emergency basis, I mean, it either -- it

- 1 suggests, by reasonable inference, that the commission's very
- 2 recent suggestion that his -- Mr. Al-Tamir's inability to meet
- 3 with the -- his counsel would be taken into account in further
- 4 continuance -- you know, requests for continuance, that is
- 5 what preceded brief -- shortly that decision to suddenly clear
- 6 him. It either suggests that that was a factor or, at the
- 7 very least, that the -- the advice and decision-making by JTF
- 8 medical personnel was unreliable, I mean, at that point in
- 9 time at least. They cleared him a week before they said he
- 10 needs an emergency operation, and he was medically unable, as
- 11 he told us, and that is why he didn't meet with us.
- So that's where things stood on the 5th of November
- 13 when we suddenly received a further notice that the client was
- 14 able to meet with us, that he was cleared again.
- On that same day, the judge -- the commission ruled,
- 16 and I am going to quote, that the problem of access, and this
- 17 is -- was a problem that lies at the feet of the government.
- 18 And let me not put words in the commission's mouth; let me
- 19 just read two quotes from AE 099Y, which was also issued on
- 20 the 5th of December.
- That -- the commission said, "There are two possible
- 22 ways to restore in-person attorney-client communications: The
- 23 accused recovers, or the government finds alternative means of

- 1 restoring such communication. And while that first option is
- 2 not within the control of either party, his recovery, the
- 3 second is fully within the control of the government, although
- 4 not the prosecution itself. The prosecution has represented
- 5 that the United States Government cannot accommodate
- 6 attorney-client meetings, and the commission will defer to
- 7 this decision. However, and I underline this language, "this
- 8 inability is still a decision rather than a factual
- 9 impossibility."
- And in the same order on 5 December, the commission
- 11 also noted that -- that some of the information related to the
- 12 Darbi deposition, including the deposition transcript, can
- 13 only be reviewed by the accused in the presence of defense
- 14 counsel. Consequently, the accused has yet to review this
- 15 information or discuss it with his counsel. That's on 5th of
- 16 December.
- And so that is a clear, I think, recognition by the
- 18 government that, as of the 5th of December, this was not --
- 19 you know, there was nothing we could be doing to get -- to
- 20 work with our client, for all of the reasons we said so far,
- 21 leaving aside the AE 101 issue, which I will come back to
- **22** momentarily.
- So we then get a 5 December -- on the same day, we

1 get a sudden clearance. That was -- because that clearance 2 was entirely inconsistent with the information we were 3 receiving from our client about the steady decline in his --4 in his subjective pain levels and symptoms, we filed, quickly thereafter, AE 099AA, which reported that discrepancy, that 5 6 attached letters, as we had elsewhere, describing his 7 subjective levels of pain and his subjective symptoms. 8 Again, according to the neurosurgeon, that is the 9 relevant standard for determining ability to conduct 10 activities. And to explain why, you know, we had deep 11 concerns about our ability to meet with him and so on. 12 That took us into the holidays. We -- and I don't 13 have the date of the request to meet with him, but we filed a 14 request pursuant to the two-week requirement, sometime during 15 the holiday period, in order to try to get clearance -- get 16 approved meetings before the hearing. And we were able to get 17 those cleared hearings the week before the hearing. And we 18 met with him -- we were able to get transportation and meet 19 with him on the Friday, Saturday, and Sunday preceding the 20 first week of this session. 21 And that is the only access we have had to him in 22 person since August 15th. So we have had no access to him 23 between August -- August 15th of 2017 and 26th of January of

- 1 this year; unable to speak to him in person about anything.
- Now, had we been able to meet with him, we would not
- 3 have been allowed to talk to him. We would not allow
- 4 ourselves, and for reasons explained in AE 101, to talk to him
- 5 about any substantive litigation matters except the bare
- 6 necessity of litigating his health and to try to maintain an
- 7 attorney-client relationship with a charged detainee in
- 8 Guantanamo who is suffering greatly and who a six-month break
- 9 in the relationship is -- is a nontrivial matter just in terms
- 10 of the basics of attorney-client representation.
- So we needed to meet with him, we needed to get to
- 12 know him, we needed to find out how he was doing and so on.
- 13 And we felt like we could do that and we would have been able
- 14 to do that if we had been able to meet with him earlier. But
- 15 that was all we could do when we got here on January 25. And
- 16 first and foremost, we talked to him about his health in order
- 17 to inform the commission and figure out what we were going to
- **18** say.
- And we -- so we were -- but we were unable to do
- 20 anything else by virtue of AE 101. And with respect to
- 21 AE 101, again I want to emphasize the timing, because this is
- 22 not some belated excuse that we came up with to explain why,
- 23 even if we had had access, we couldn't talk to him. We filed

- 1 the predecessor of AE 101, which was then titled AE 094, in --
- 2 I don't have the date in front of me, but I believe it was
- **3** July of 2017.
- 4 And we -- it was then hung up, if I can describe it
- 5 informally as classification review limbo for months, for a
- 6 month, maybe six weeks, I think. It was finally turned
- 7 around. It was filed as AE 101, I believe, in August, and it
- 8 has been pending since then. We have not slept on our rights
- 9 with respect to that either. We have been trying to solve the
- 10 access problem for months, in the most timely possible way,
- 11 and we now stand -- and -- and, at the same time, and I will
- 12 finish with this, I already mentioned it, without even the
- 13 minimal ability to at least let our client, who we couldn't
- 14 meet with and can't talk to, the most basic documents required
- 15 for him to meaningly to, you know, prepare to assist us in the
- 16 cross-examination. And I will remind the commission he was --
- 17 he was required to be there on the first day in order to allow
- 18 the identification during the direct examination. He showed
- **19** up. He did it.
- He waived the second day. He did not hear it because
- 21 he was medically unable. I mean, it was -- this was
- 22 immediately in the brief period leading up to the very first
- 23 sequence of four emergency operations that he has been

- 1 subjected to over the past five months, and still scheduled
- 2 probably for another one at some in the indeterminate future.
- 3 That's the medical background of this. So he did not -- he
- 4 did not even hear the second day of testimony.
- 5 The government marked the transcript as U//F0U0.
- 6 Similarly the Nashiri deposition, marked U//FOUO. The
- 7 government knows the regulations say that unless if it is
- 8 not -- everything has to be marked DISPLAYABLE TO THE DETAINEE
- 9 to be displayed and specifically RELEASABLE TO THE DETAINEE
- 10 if -- in order to be released to him.
- 11 That is -- it is absolutely clear in the -- from DoD
- 12 regulations, from prior practice. We have a recent e-mail
- 13 confirming this from Mr. Bumpus, the WHS security manager for
- 14 the commissions, that only information marked RELEASABLE TO
- 15 THE DETAINEE is actually sendable to him.
- 16 We, as early as November, and I think orally earlier,
- 17 we began reminding the government of this fact. I refer the
- 18 commission and the government to AE 0990, footnote 41 on
- 19 page 10, where the commission -- the defense says, "Yet the
- 20 government has marked the transcript of Mr. al Darbi's
- 21 deposition as FOUO, meaning that defense counsel must be
- 22 present while Mr. Al-Tamir reviews it."
- That was filed on 13 November. We repeated that, and

- 1 there were other -- there may have been e-mail communications
- 2 about this, I don't recall; there were certainly oral
- 3 communications about it, about the problem.
- 4 On 27 November, in AE 099T, page 2, we noted that --
- 5 and this was a notice to the commission and the government
- 6 relating to his health. We noted, again, that "Undersigned
- 7 counsel is barred from providing copies of the transcript of
- 8 the direct examination of Mr. al Darbi and related materials
- 9 to Mr. Al-Tamir because their classification markings permit
- 10 Mr. Al-Tamir to review such documents only with counsel
- 11 present." As I'd mentioned earlier, the commission on
- 12 5 December specifically pointed out to the parties that we
- 13 have been unable to show him the Darbi deposition because of
- 14 the classification marking problem. We have never, to this
- 15 day, received one that we can leave with him to review.
- And that is only part of the problem. Leaving --
- 17 apart from the Nashiri deposition transcript, which is -- has
- 18 the same problem and which is critical for him to review,
- 19 there is a significant amount of discovery that was disclosed
- 20 that also does not have the required markings that we can show
- 21 him. Some of them are marked RELEASABLE, so the government
- 22 knows about this; most are not. Some are marked NOT
- 23 RELEASABLE, fair enough. But there is a vast amount of other

- 1 U//FOUO documents or other unclassified information that, 2 because it hasn't been marked RELEASABLE, we haven't been able 3 to show him. And that -- some of it is listed on -- at the 4 end of the facts section in AE 107A. I apologize for the lack 5 of page numbers, but it's at the very -- the second-to-last 6 paragraph before the argument section, which is Section 6. 7 So in short, Judge, what we need before we can 8 proceed with the deposition is a reasonable time to discuss 9 with our client and get his input and insight into 10 Mr. al Darbi's direct testimony, Mr. al Nashiri's -- I mean, 11 his testimony in the al Nashiri case, these other documents,
- 13 have not had the chance to talk to him, and this is the
 14 government's star witness.
 15 This is not something that we can do -- given the

and more generally, to just to discuss the whole strategy. We

12

- volume of material, this is not something that can happen -this is not an eight-hour project. This would be something
 that we, in another setting with a medically comp -- fully
 medically able defendant -- I mean, I would be spending days
 with the client, days of in-court -- I mean, in-session time
 with him, multiple days working with him, trying to, you
 know -- suggesting other angles, getting his input.
- There are lines of attack that he may know something

- 1 about that we know nothing about because of his greater
- 2 knowledge of the underlying -- some of the underlying facts of
- 3 the case, at least. We don't know. We've not had that
- 4 opportunity. And so that's what we would do if we were able
- 5 to talk to him about subject matter other than his medical
- 6 condition.
- 7 Now, based on the neurosurgeon's testimony and our
- 8 experience, we are talking about if -- assuming that we can --
- 9 if we got the continuance until the next session, we would
- 10 have the interim period to basically meet with him. We can
- 11 reasonably anticipate, I think, three out of four -- at least
- 12 three out of four half days. And, you know, look, he's -- he
- 13 seems to be getting better in some way. The pain is still
- 14 there. We hope he keeps getting better. We can't promise
- 15 that, and the neurosurgeon couldn't promise that.
- But, you know, if -- to the extent he can work with
- 17 us for more than that period of time, three half days out of
- 18 four total, we will, but we -- that does not add up very
- 19 quickly to the amount of time that's realistically required
- 20 for a criminal defendant to adequately participate in his
- 21 defense, to contest the testimony of the government's star
- 22 witness.
- That is conditioned, I would -- I have to add, on the

- 1 solution to the AE 101 problem and the grant of the relief and
- 2 the, you know, agreements from the client based on the kind of
- 3 relief we are asking for. We are assuming that that will --
- 4 would issue, you know, shortly, and that would then allow us
- 5 to start immediately.
- **6** But to be holding court hearings in the meantime, to
- 7 be asking the client to be -- after going through the current
- 8 court hearings and then continue, even on our proposed
- 9 schedule, like through not just next week but the week after
- 10 and the week after, he's going to wear out. And it is simply
- 11 unrealistic to ask him to do that.
- And let me finally say, as I have been saying all
- 13 along, this commission's task in this context, as I understand
- 14 it, is to ensure that the rules are followed, to ensure that
- 15 the -- the defendant's -- the accused's constitutional and
- 16 statutory rights are honored by the proceedings, that he gets
- 17 them fully satisfied.
- Now, does the government have interests also? Yes,
- 19 the government has interests that sometimes have to be taken
- 20 into account in any -- in any context. But here, the
- 21 government's interests are in a -- a transfer -- let me be
- 22 very specific about our relief, a six- to eight-week,
- 23 probably, delay in the execution of a transfer to a foreign

1 country of a detainee who they promised to do that to. They 2 don't want to break their promise, okay? They don't want 3 the -- we wouldn't want the detainee to be disappointed. 4 will be, clearly. And, you know, that -- and those are all --5 maybe those are factors that should be weighed, maybe not. 6 But when you weigh the government's desire not to 7 delay a transfer by a month or a couple of months against the 8 appearance of being railroaded, I'll say, of the -- this 9 deposition and these proceedings in order to accommodate, you 10 know, Mr. al Darbi, and against his disappointment, I think 11 the balancing, to the extent there is a balancing involved, is 12 absolutely crystal clear, and that it would be a clear 13 violation of Mr. Al-Tamir's rights, constitutional and 14 otherwise, to say that those minor inconveniences may be --15 might there be embarrassment to have to ask Saudi Arabia to 16 wait two months for -- to receive their detainee? I frankly 17 doubt it, but let's assume there is. That doesn't outweigh 18 Mr. Al-Tamir's right to actually make a meaningful defense. 19 And so I would ask two things, and I want to follow 20 up with this last request, because I think this is actually 21 critical, and it's based in part on recent political events. 22 The first is we ask for the continuance, okay? The -- as 23 requested and for the reasons I stated.

1 The second is I think the commission needs to know 2 that -- from an authoritative source, that this transfer is 3 actually going to happen. If the transfer is actually up in 4 the air or in question in any way, then there is no reason not 5 to continue these proceedings as they were scheduled in the 6 original scheduling order and as modified for this current 7 calendar year and do this deposition at a reasonable time 8 after we have had a chance to talk to our client. Recent 9 political events, and I am referring to the recent executive 10 order that, you know, reaffirms the President's belief in the 11 need for Guantanamo and to use it, rumors circulating 12 elsewhere suggest that it is not -- it's up in the air, it's 13 not clear to us that this is going to happen. 14 And we would ask, before you deny our motion for 15 continuance, that you get a declaration from the Secretary of 16 Defense, who has final authority for transfers, that he 17 intends to transfer Mr. al Darbi on a date certain that would 18 actually then -- you could then weigh into this balance. 19 I mean, our position is not that that is dispositive, 20 but that that -- I mean, in fact, whether -- whenever they --21 whatever declaration he provides, there is no question -- I 22 mean, we don't think it's going to outweigh Mr. Al-Tamir's 23 rights. But you do not have to even address the continuance

1	at all or, I mean, it makes it a foregone conclusion if the
2	Secretary of Defense is unwilling to say he actually is going
3	to be unavailable in a manner that requires us to force this
4	forward under these circumstances.
5	And unless you have questions, Judge, I'm finished.
6	MJ [Col RUBIN]: No questions. Thank you. You have
7	answered all of my anticipated questions. Thank you.
8	Trial Counsel. Does the government wish to be heard?
9	ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, may we have a brief
10	five-minute recess in place?
11	MJ [Col RUBIN]: Let's take five minutes. The commission
12	is in recess.
13	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1033, 5 February 2018.]
14	[END OF PAGE]
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1042,
- 2 5 February 2018.]
- 3 MJ [Col RUBIN]: The commission is called to order. All
- 4 parties present when the commission recessed are again
- **5** present.
- **6** Trial Counsel, is the government ready to present
- 7 oral argument?
- **8** ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, Your Honor.
- **9** MJ [Col RUBIN]: You may proceed.
- 10 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, apologies for the somewhat
- 11 of a misorganization, potentially. The defense covered, by my
- 12 count, five different motions in its argument on what should
- 13 have been two motions. I do want to address some of those,
- 14 even though they will be argued later, but I need to hit them
- 15 briefly in the context of the continuance request.
- **16** Additionally, the -- the pure length of
- 17 Mr. Thurschwell's argument, I won't take that long,
- 18 Your Honor. But at some point if -- it may be helpful to the
- 19 commission if the commission has questions to inquire, and I
- 20 will certainly answer those questions to the best of my
- **21** ability.
- Your Honor, with respect to the doctor,
- 23 Mr. Thurschwell's recollection of the doctor's testimony is

- 1 slightly different from my own; however, at the end of the
- 2 day, that doesn't really matter. To accept the defense's
- 3 argument is to suggest that any criminal defendant in any
- 4 jurisdiction could subjectively complain of pain and that
- 5 would forever shut down the proceedings anytime that occurred.
- 6 That's simply an absurd reading or absurd rationale of the
- 7 accused's right to be present.
- 8 It's been consistently the government's position that
- 9 the accused can always voluntarily waive his right to be
- 10 present. If he's not feeling well, if he had, you know, a bad
- 11 night's sleep, whatever the reason -- and the government has
- 12 never suggested that he doesn't have a valid medical
- 13 condition. He does have pain. The neurologist did say that
- 14 the description of his pain didn't match what -- what the
- 15 neurologist was observing, but he's certainly had pain.
- And the government is sympathetic to that, which is
- 17 why the government has consistently been reasonable in the
- 18 accommodations that were requested by the defense. At every
- 19 opportunity, we've made accommodations, both in the camp, in
- 20 Echo II, where he meets with his counsel, and in the
- 21 commission itself in terms of scheduling and how that was run.
- 22 The government has bent over backwards for the accused to
- 23 afford him the opportunity to be here, if possible. However,

- 1 if he doesn't feel well or he is in pain, the neurologist's
- 2 testimony was clear; it's not doing him any harm to be here.
- 3 He can't just say, "I'm not feeling well, therefore
- 4 I'm not waiving my presence voluntarily, but I'm not going to
- 5 show up," which is the defense's position. That's an
- 6 incredibly unreasonable position, Your Honor. And again, that
- 7 would allow any accused to hold the process hostage by virtue
- 8 of his subjective complaint.
- 9 Now, with respect to the 101 argument, Your Honor,
- 10 101, as I'm sure the commission is aware, the other
- 11 commissions -- this is an on -- has been an ongoing issue.
- 12 The underlying issue or allegations of 101 are, number one,
- 13 pure speculation; number two, it's a red herring argument,
- 14 Your Honor. It's a red herring that has been rotting in the
- 15 Guantanamo sun for months.
- Now, I'm hopeful that we'll get to that argument
- 17 today. I am not going to argue that motion in full, but
- 18 realize that that has absolutely nothing to do with what we're
- 19 talking about here. 101 is a speculative, tactical decision
- 20 on the part of the greater defense organization. And
- 21 understanding that they're doing their job -- I'm not
- 22 suggesting that they're being unethical about it -- it's a
- 23 tactical decision on their part to attack the system, whether

- 1 there is evidence or not, whether multiple commissions have
- 2 ruled on the issue or not. They're still raising it; they're
- 3 still relying on it as being something that it's not, despite
- 4 multiple rulings of multiple commissions. And I'll allow
- 5 Lieutenant Commander Lincoln to flesh that out further if
- **6** Your Honor desires.
- With respect to the -- what we're really talking
- 8 about, Your Honor, in terms of a continuance is the
- 9 accused's -- or the defense's opportunity to be prepared to
- 10 present, from a due process standpoint, or whatever derivative
- 11 right the accused has to adequately prepared counsel. That's
- 12 really what we're talking about, nothing else. Everything
- 13 else is chaff.
- Now, ignored by the defense, conveniently, was the
- 15 fact that since 5 December, he was cleared to move to attorney
- 16 meetings. Not until 9 January did the defense afford
- 17 themselves of the opportunity to come visit their client. And
- 18 that was 9 January when the request was put in; the actual
- 19 scheduled visit was two weeks later. The request, which on
- 20 its face purported to limit it to only medical information,
- 21 the defense had no intention of preparing for the scheduled
- 22 deposition, Your Honor, and they made that clear in that
- 23 request. Defense had since August to prepare for this

1 deposition. They had 99.5 percent, probably, of the discovery 2 related to this in June or very early August. The only thing 3 that has trickled in over -- since then are kind of ongoing 4 government discovery obligations or redesignations that were 5 requested by the defense of information that they already had. 6 Which brings me to the transcript issue and the 7 references to the -- what we heard a couple of days ago from 8 the defense complaining about not being able to show things to 9 their client or leave things with their client. Your Honor, 10 it's correct that the defense complained of that in November. 11 But in the context of how it was complained about, they just 12 said, "Well, we can't show it -- we can't send it to him, so 13 we have to be there." They were cleared to be there and they 14 were actually there, and the accused again didn't feel well; 15 the government is sympathetic. The defense never requested, 16 as far as anyone in the prosecution can determine, never 17 requested that the transcripts be remarked in any way. 18 was not any such request. 19 Now, the defense did request, on a handful of 20 documents that had been turned over in discovery, that those 21 be remarked. Those -- the requests for that remarking did not 22 occur prior to 14 January, as far as the government has been 23 able to determine. So for the last three weeks, there has

1 been ongoing discussion and efforts by the government to 2 reclassify or remark what we could so that they could provide 3 it to their -- their client or discuss it with their client. 4 Again, all of this is -- I'm addressing in response 5 to what is essentially testimony from Mr. Thurschwell. 6 since the government did not have an opportunity to respond to 7 the motion because it was filed late and, you know, new 8 information is being provided to the commission, if I -- if we 9 obtain other information, Your Honor, that contradicts with 10 what I said, I apologize. But we -- in a search and in a 11 polling of the prosecution team, we have e-mails dating back 12 to, you know, the beginning of the year. Searching all of 13 that, we could find nothing that prior to 14 January, the 14 defense had requested to reclassify anything to use with their 15 client. 16 Yes, they complained of it twice in November, but 17 they never -- even since 14 January, never requested the 18 transcript. And in terms of the entirety of the history of 19 this case since the deposition, to my knowledge, Your Honor, 20 the defense did not request that the -- that the deposition 21 itself ever be remarked. They complained about it in a couple 22 of different contexts, but they never requested that it be 23 remarked.

1 Certainly, had the government been aware that that 2 was the holdup, that they -- that but for that, they would 3 have sent it to their client and their client could have 4 reviewed it and then we wouldn't be having this discussion, then we could have potentially solved that for them had they 5 6 simply asked. They did not. 7 Now, the reason that they did not, Your Honor, is 8 because, again, the -- the coordinated efforts were never to 9 be ready for this -- this deposition. Leading up to the 10 August deposition, whether it was bifurcated or not, the 11 defense had ample opportunity, months to prepare with their 12 client for the deposition, including a cross-examination 13 portion. 14 And as Your Honor is aware, in most such 15 circumstances, they would go right into the cross-examination 16 after the direct. There would be no additional time to 17 reloop, to review what had just happened in the commission. 18 And that's true whether the accused waived -- voluntarily 19 waived his presence or not, which he did in the second day of 20 the commission -- of the deposition. The defense would be in 21 the same position that -- they're in the same position now 22 that they would have been in prior, yet they have had an 23 additional six months to prepare.

1 The Supreme Court, and this is briefed in -- more 2 fully in AE 102F, Your Honor, the Supreme Court in 2003 in the 3 case of Overton v. Bazzetta, 539 U.S. 126, made clear in the 4 context of access to counsel that written communication is 5 sufficient. The Supreme Court said it doesn't have to be 6 ideal. Face-to-face interaction, while desirable and 7 understandable, is not the standard, it's not required, it 8 doesn't have to be ideal. Written communication is 9 sufficient. 10 So the defense has had six months or more, 11 notwithstanding the lead-up to the deposition in which they 12 had ample time to prepare, but it has had six months or more 13 to communicate with their client through a variety of methods. 14 I -- I don't know how many total letters were passed back and 15 forth, Your Honor, and I would request that if that matters to 16 the commission, you can certainly request -- ask that question 17 of defense counsel without going into specifics, but I would 18 wager that it was well over 50 -- 50 communications -- 50 19 written communications since then. 20 Even if AE 101 were a legitimate issue, which it is 21 not, their concerns under that issue would have been resolved 22 by just written communications with their client. And again, 23 no requests for a reclassification to transmit things to their

- 1 client were made, as far as we could tell, prior to
- 2 14 January.
- 3 So the feet dragging is their job, Your Honor, I get
- 4 it. I was a defense counsel for seven years, I have been a
- 5 prosecutor for eight years. It is the defense's job when it
- 6 is in their client's best interest to delay things, it is the
- 7 government's job to try to move things forward, and it is the
- 8 judge's job to try to figure out the fair outcome. I'm not
- 9 suggesting that they are doing anything unethical, but this is
- 10 a tactical effort by the defense, which is understandable.
- 11 And again, the government has always said that the accused has
- 12 a legitimate medical condition.
- Now, the defense has accused, inferred, implied a
- 14 number of times that this is a problem of our own creation;
- 15 that we are the reason that he is in the hospital chair as
- 16 opposed to a regular chair. Your Honor, and there is simply
- 17 no evidence of that. In fact, the opposite is true. There is
- 18 ample evidence, and the defense is well aware of it, that this
- 19 has been a degenerative condition that the accused was
- 20 diagnosed with long before he was in U.S. custody. Before he
- 21 was in U.S. custody, he was told by surgeons in a different
- 22 country that he was not a surgical candidate. The irony of
- 23 that -- and this information is within the defense's

- 1 possession, Your Honor. The irony of that, of course, is that
- 2 since this became an emergent issue, he has been receiving
- 3 outstanding medical care, ongoing medical care. And if the
- 4 defense has an issue with that, they can certainly -- they
- 5 have raised in the habeas context. I am quite certain at some
- 6 point we will see a civil suit in Federal District Court for
- 7 medical malpractice. All of that is a red herring, all of
- 8 that is chaff in this context. Your Honor.
- 9 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Trial Counsel, if you could, the defense
- 10 counsel provided a proposed way forward. What is the
- 11 government's proposed way forward?
- 12 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, the government's proposed
- 13 way forward is that we continue to -- if it is -- if all that
- 14 the accused can take is the half days, the government does not
- 15 object to continued half days as we have been doing.
- 16 When it comes to the deposition piece of it,
- 17 technically under 702, the defense -- the accused does not
- 18 have a right to be present under 702 for a deposition. We
- 19 were obviously hoping to avoid that and we, the government --
- 20 in the government's initial request asked that the accused be
- 21 present. There has been a shift, as you may recall. It's
- 22 kind of a flip of positions; maybe the government should be
- 23 sitting on the left side. But early on, the defense was

- 1 saying, well, he doesn't have to be there, and the government
- 2 says, no, we really want him there, Your Honor. And
- 3 eventually we came down to we really want him there, if
- 4 nothing else, for the in-court identification which he was
- 5 there for. But it was the government's position from the very
- 6 beginning that the accused be present for the deposition to
- 7 avoid any potential future issues, which I am sure the defense
- 8 will raise in a confrontation context.
- 9 MJ [Col RUBIN]: What's the government's position -- and I
- 10 think all sides would agree with me that taking of the
- 11 deposition, or at this point completing of the deposition, is
- 12 different than ultimate -- ultimate admissibility of the
- **13** deposition?
- 14 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, sir, that's absolutely true. As
- 15 we have argued many times, there are multiple additional steps
- 16 that the government will have to go through to demonstrate
- 17 that deposition's admissibility.
- 18 MJ [Col RUBIN]: What is the government's proposed way
- 19 forward regarding the deposition? So if the commission denies
- 20 the continuance and proceeds forward, is the government's
- 21 intent to essentially go eight hours per day or to have half
- **22** days?
- 23 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, with -- well, it would

- 1 depend on the commission's rulings. Obviously there are a
- 2 couple of other outstanding issues. If the commission is
- 3 ready to proceed to the deposition as in your capacity as the
- 4 deposition officer and defer those rulings, that would change
- 5 my answer slightly. However, I think we could certainly go
- 6 half days for the deposition. I don't know that the
- 7 cross-examination will be, you know, three or four full days
- 8 or half days spread out over six or eight days.
- **9** MJ [Col RUBIN]: So at least right now, the government,
- 10 you don't have a definitive way forward? It depends on if the
- **11** deposition were to go?
- 12 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, the definitive way forward
- 13 is, at least for the remainder of the court sessions, half
- 14 days. From a deposition standpoint, we could do half days,
- 15 and then if it -- if it seems, as the commission alluded to a
- 16 couple of days ago, if doing it, you know, two hours every
- 17 other day is going to take out until April, then obviously the
- 18 government would reassess its position.
- But as I stated, even if the accused weren't here,
- 20 the deposition could proceed without him being present because
- 21 702 -- R.M.C. 702 does not afford the accused a right to be
- 22 present for the deposition. So the government has tried to
- 23 remain flexible, Your Honor, and tried to accommodate the

- 1 accused whenever possible. 2 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Is the government requesting a 3 modification to the deposition conduct order, which I believe 4 has language to the effect that the accused shall be present? 5 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, sir. The -- I believe it's 090I, 6 Your Honor. As I stand here, I don't know that the government 7 requires that at this stage. To keep the record consistent, 8 were the government to say this portion of the deposition 9 will -- the government would like to conduct whether the 10 accused is present or not, then that would actually require a 11 modification of 090I, I believe it's paragraph 6.b., 12 Your Honor, in response to our request at the time that the 13 accused be present, the commission ordered it -- ordered his 14 presence, unless he voluntarily waives. 15 Now, coming back to my earlier point, it's the 16 government's position that not feeling well and therefore not 17 being here is a voluntary waiver. So from that standpoint, a 18 modification of that order isn't necessarily required. Were 19 the commission to rule against the government on the issue of
- 21 reassess. But that's been our consistent position,

what equals a voluntary waiver, then we would have to

- 22 Your Honor, and it's consistent with what the other
- 23 commissions do.

20

1 As you know, when 9/11 defendants don't feel well, 2 they -- the SJA then comes on the stand and relays what they 3 said, there is a written waiver, and the proceedings go 4 forward, just like any other criminal jurisdiction anywhere in 5 the world, Your Honor. 6 MJ [Col RUBIN]: But that requires a written waiver. 7 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: It would require -- yes, sir, it would 8 require a written waiver. But the defense has made clear in 9 this instance that any such written waiver would -- would 10 claim or exclude or purport to exclude voluntariness as a 11 piece of it. 12 As we have said, the defense -- if the accused is 13 cleared to be in court and participate medically, which he is, 14 his choice not to come because he doesn't feel well, because 15 he is in pain, which we believe he is in pain, that is a 16 voluntary choice, Your Honor. That is a voluntary choice to 17 absent himself. And R.M.C. 804, as he has probably heard in 18 excess of 50 times now, says he can do that, he can 19 voluntarily absent himself, but that doesn't delay the 20 proceedings and doesn't stop us from going forward. 21 MJ [Col RUBIN]: How would the commission know if that's 22 the case, whether it's pain or something different? 23 example, let's say he fell and reinjured himself.

1 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, sir. And that's what I 2 understood our colloquy at the very end of yesterday's session 3 to mean. And it's a valid concern. Under 099I, Your Honor, 4 we are required to apprise the court of any significant change 5 in the accused's medical condition. So certainly if he were 6 to have a fall or to have some significant change in his 7 underlying medical condition that impacts his ability to be 8 here, then in that circumstance I presume that's what the 9 commission was referring to when you said, I'll need to hear 10 from the SMO, I'll need to hear from the SJA. 11 That's a perfectly reasonable scenario and we are 12 required under 099I to provide you with that information, you 13 know, not necessarily even -- so if that were to happen 14 tonight, Your Honor, our reading of 099I means we need to 15 notify the commission immediately that this is what happened. 16 And we have complied with 099I since it was issued. 17 The -- in the -- on the other side of the coin, short 18 of a change in the accused's medical condition, the government 19 proposes that the commission do what the other commissions do, 20 which is hear from the SJA; you know, have him sign -- provide 21 a form similar to the many ones that he has been provided by 22 his counsel that he signed waiving his presence. 23 could provide him with that; the SJA could get on the stand

- 1 and testify, just as what happens in the other commissions,
- 2 Your Honor.
- 3 There's no question that the accused is fully aware
- 4 of his rights to be present. He's been advised of it by this
- 5 commission, by two military judges, and by his counsel
- 6 probably over a hundred times at this point. The government
- 7 is asking for a ruling on whether, absent a change in his
- 8 medical condition, consistent with the doctor's testimony
- 9 where he is cleared to be here, that if he chooses to come --
- 10 chooses not to come, that that is a voluntary waiver,
- 11 Your Honor. And, of course, we will meet the requirements of
- 12 the voluntary waiver, just as we always have.
- 13 Your Honor, with respect to the request by the
- 14 defense that the -- this commission somehow poll the Executive
- 15 Branch to find out whether they -- what they really meant when
- 16 they negotiated in good faith with Mr. al Darbi years ago,
- 17 whether -- which was ratified by a military commission -- is
- 18 an amazing request, Your Honor, to be fair. The suggestion
- 19 that the commission even has the authority to override that is
- 20 even more amazing, and certainly with no legal basis of which
- 21 I am aware.
- 22 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Trial Counsel, from your perspective,
- 23 your team's perspective, are you aware of any information that

- 1 would lead to a conclusion or belief that Mr. al Darbi will
- 2 not be released on the date set forth in his pretrial
- 3 agreement?
- 4 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, here's what I can say to
- 5 that. From our perspective, from the U.S. Government's
- 6 perspective, we have done everything consistent with the PTA
- 7 to achieve that result. As you know, this is a diplomatic
- 8 arrangement requiring a foreign country to take action. I
- 9 can't say whether -- I can't say whether what Saudi Arabia is
- 10 required to do may not ultimately -- Saudi Arabia, for
- 11 example, could say, well, we're changing our mind from the
- 12 diplomatic notes that have been provided to the defense.
- 13 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Is the government aware of an executive
- 14 order that was recently promulgated -- it may not be directly
- 15 on point, I believe it was within the last week -- basically
- 16 words to the effect that the United States Government will not
- 17 prevent transfer ----
- 18 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, sir.
- 19 MJ [Col RUBIN]: ---- based on a previous court -- you
- 20 know, a court agreement?
- 21 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Correct. Your Honor, our reading of
- 22 that executive order -- and when that executive order came
- 23 out, it was useful, and I'm sure the defense will explore this

- 1 line of questioning with Mr. al Darbi -- we were encouraged by
- 2 it because there was some concern on Mr. al Darbi's part that,
- 3 you know, a decision of a previous president might not be
- 4 honored by the United States Government. And we had insisted
- 5 all along that we were -- firmly believed that it would, for
- 6 obvious reasons. To me, that executive order ratified our
- 7 faith that the U.S. Government is standing behind its
- 8 commitment made in good faith as part of the pretrial
- 9 agreement.
- 10 MJ [Col RUBIN]: So to clarify the question, the
- 11 government has -- you, the prosecution team, you have no
- 12 independent evidence right now to conclude that Mr. al Darbi
- **13** will not be transferred?
- 14 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Sir, what I have only is speculation,
- 15 and I can't go into it beyond that because it involves
- 16 diplomatic discussions.
- But what I can say is that the U.S. Government has
- 18 fully upheld our end of the pretrial agreement, and we have --
- 19 we do not have control or ability to affect, you know, a
- 20 foreign sovereign's decisions. We are hopeful that that will
- 21 all be worked out in a very short period of time. Beyond
- 22 that, what I have is speculation, Your Honor.
- 23 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Understood.

1 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, I believe I've hit the 2 points I wished to make. Certainly if the commission has 3 additional questions ----4 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Just one question. Understanding and 5 agreeing that admissibility is separate and apart from 6 conducting the deposition, if everything raised by the defense 7 would -- I guess have you considered the impact of all of these items? If the commission denies the continuance request 8 9 and the deposition is concluded, conducted and concluded, have 10 you considered -- has the government considered the impact of 11 all these issues, which I believe would be litigated anew if 12 and when the government moves to admit that deposition? 13 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Yes, Your Honor. 14 MJ [Col RUBIN]: What I am asking is: How much risk is 15 the government willing to take, and have you considered that? 16 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, the government has; we 17 have as a prosecution team, from a tactical standpoint. believe that it's fair to say that were the commission now to 18 19 rule that we're now to deny the continuance, that the basis 20 for not being prepared is decided. 21 In other words, the defense -- well, or potentially, 22 from the government's perspective, the court is in a bit of 23 a Hob- -- is facing a bit of a Hobson's choice: Proceed where

- 1 the defense is saying they're not prepared, despite them
- 2 having had six months to prepare, more than that; or, you
- 3 know, bake into the appellate record potential IAC on the back
- 4 end, because the defense chose tactically to only have
- 5 discussions about medical issues instead of the underlying
- 6 facts about the cross-examination or, conversely, whether
- 7 the -- the whole presence issue. So the government
- 8 appreciates the conundrum.
- **9** It's the government's position that, should the
- 10 continuance be denied, that that settles the question of
- 11 whether the accused has adequately prepared counsel.
- 12 Your Honor, as we've seen, you know, Mr. Thurschwell is an
- 13 outstanding advocate. He has a large team of highly qualified
- 14 attorneys who have had all of this information, in terms of
- 15 the cross-examination piece of it and the testimony of
- 16 Mr. Darbi, since June, mostly, and a little bit in early
- 17 August. That's more than enough time for them to prepare.
- 18 They would not get the luxury that they've been afforded; in
- 19 any other setting, they would be rolling right into
- 20 cross-examination.
- 21 And, you know, as Mr. Thurschwell so eloquently
- 22 stated yesterday, you know, he intends to explore -- in his
- 23 argument on the psychologist, he intends to explore a long

- 1 line of questioning on lots of different issues with
- 2 Mr. Darbi. He's clearly prepared to do that. That doesn't
- 3 necessarily, even at this point, require any additional
- 4 conversations with his client.
- 5 So from the government's -- will there be other
- 6 issues with respect to admissibility in the future in light of
- 7 702(d), 702(d)'s discussion stating that the accused is not
- 8 entitled to be present? The government anticipates, if he's
- 9 not present, litigating that issue at some point in the
- 10 future. I'm certain the defense will claim that his
- 11 confrontation rights, from wherever they derive, have not
- 12 been -- have not been afforded him and therefore the
- 13 deposition won't be admissible. I don't believe I'm putting
- 14 words in the defense's mouth when I'm stating that.
- 15 You know, will the availability of the witness at the
- 16 time of trial be litigated? Absolutely it will. So there is
- 17 inherent risk in attempting to do what we're doing. But the
- 18 reason that we're trying to preserve his testimony is because
- 19 we believe it is likely, and certainly within the realm of
- 20 real possibility, that Mr. Darbi will be unavailable for
- 21 trial. That prompted the government's desire to preserve his
- 22 testimony because of -- you know, we've stated this a couple
- 23 of times -- all of which was prompted by a shift in defense

- 1 tactics for them to allege, after two years of being on the
- 2 merits, that all of a sudden now we have the wrong guy.
- 3 So that's why Mr. Darbi became a very important
- 4 witness for us. Is he our star witness, as Mr. Thurschwell
- 5 says? That's perhaps an overstatement, but maybe not an
- 6 unfair one. But certainly he is an important witness given
- 7 the shift in defense tactics.
- 8 MJ [Col RUBIN]: All right. Thank you, Trial Counsel.
- **9** ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Thank you, sir.
- 10 MJ [Col RUBIN]: No further questions.
- 11 Mr. Thurschwell, I'm going to give you the last word
- 12 on this.
- ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: There are numerous points that I
- 14 need to respond to, Judge. We are covering a lot of territory
- 15 and I'm going to try to keep it short, but I may fail to keep
- **16** it as short as I'd prefer.
- 17 I asked, given the current political situation and
- 18 various -- the new EO and so on, for the government to produce
- 19 a declaration by the SECDEF to the effect that they will, in
- 20 fact, be transferring Mr. al Darbi on February 20th, in order
- 21 to clarify the basis for the need for all of this, to put the
- 22 stress on Mr. -- primarily put the medical stress on
- 23 Mr. Al-Tamir that going forward, plowing through would, but

- 1 also the orderly process of this commission, according to its
- 2 original schedule with the opportunity to actually litigate
- 3 issues as they arise. We should need to know that that is
- 4 actually going to happen.
- 5 What I heard, Judge, at the end of the day, two
- 6 things. Bottom line, all I have is speculation about whether
- 7 this is -- this transfer is actually going to happen. Judge,
- 8 the prosecution is here as the representative of the United
- 9 States Government. They should be in a position -- I would
- 10 like to see a declaration by the SECDEF, who is the one who is
- 11 authorized to make it. But at a bare minimum, the government
- 12 here represent -- the prosecution team represents the United
- 13 States Government. It's their client, and if their client has
- 14 a position that's relevant and necessary for this commission
- 15 to be aware of in order to proceed, they ought to be in a
- 16 position to provide it. And the fact that they can't, I
- 17 think, speaks volumes.
- 18 They have said that we have done everything
- 19 consistent with the plea agreement in order to make the
- 20 February 25th transfer happen. Let me -- excuse me one
- 21 moment. I don't have the cite in front of me, but if you look
- 22 at the language in the PTA, and I can find it for you later,
- 23 the promised transfer date is, I quote, on or about February

- 1 20th. It's not even a date certain in the strict sense. 2 The delay we are requesting is not extraordinary, and 3 the language -- I think it would be fully consistent under 4 these circumstances with the PTA itself to transfer him six to 5 eight weeks later if that's what it turns out to be. And I 6 can't promise anything because Mr. Al-Tamir's medical 7 condition is unstable. But I will say that -- and I will come 8 back to this, you know, our efforts to date have been, again, 9 entirely good faith. And in particular, his efforts to be 10 here and assist in the forward movement of this proceeding 11 have been absolutely clear. And so -- and I will come back to 12 that when I talk about some of the government's other 13 suggestions about what's wrong with the current way forward. 14 So "on or about February 20th" is good enough under 15 the pretrial agreement. They say we have done everything 16 consistent with the agreement. Well, are they committing to 17 the -- are they committing -- they clearly are not committing 18 the SECDEF to transferring because we have no guarantee now at 19 all that he is going to be transferred.
- And I will leave aside the -- you know, the sudden

 1 changes of policy, particularly of a political nature, that

 2 are made by the President himself by informal means suddenly

 3 at the last second. I won't address those, but that's hanging

- 1 out there, as long as -- at least as long as we don't have a
- 2 declaration from the authorized official that this is going to
- 3 happen.
- 4 But beyond that "on or about February 20th," has the
- 5 government made any effort to contact/discuss via the State
- 6 Department with Saudi Arabia whether a two-month delay would
- 7 be acceptable in order to accommodate the constitutional
- 8 proceedings that are going on in Guantanamo right now? I
- 9 haven't heard that. Maybe they have, but I haven't heard them
- 10 say that. All we have is speculation.
- And so as a minimum baseline, I think that's a reason
- 12 enough to say, we can get done what we can get done in the
- 13 scheduled time we have for this scheduled session according to
- 14 our proposed way forward; and then anything we don't get done,
- 15 and that would specifically, for all the reasons I have said,
- 16 should include not getting the deposition done, can happen at
- 17 the next scheduled session, until we know that this is going
- 18 to happen -- that there is an actual reason to change this
- 19 commission's set schedule.
- Okay. I heard the government -- let me -- let me
- 21 take a quick look through my notes, Judge, for the moment.
- 22 Let me -- let me address -- try to address the government's
- 23 points one by one in order so I can keep them organized.

1 The government began by saying our position is that 2 any criminal defendant in any criminal proceeding could 3 subjectively complain and shut down the proceedings. 4 our position is based on the only evidence, expert evidence in 5 front of the commission now, which is the neurosurgeon's 6 testimony. And I have tried to link our argument to that --7 his testimony. 8 Our argument that Mr. Al-Tamir's subjective 9 expressions of pain are the only legitimate basis, medically 10 and legally, for determining how far he can go is not based on 11 some broad thesis. I was -- I obtained -- I based that on the 12 testimony of a surgical expert testifying about the advice he 13 would -- medical advice he would give a patient in a post --14 immediate post-operative setting about the limits on their 15 activity. That's what we are talking about. 16 The fact that 9/11 defendants -- that a judge in the 17 9/11 case says that not feeling well is not good enough and 18 constitutes a voluntary waiver, well, Judge, the answer is the 19 9/11 defendants haven't had four emergency surgeries in the 20 past four months, and the testimony from the neurosurgeon 21 wasn't addressing their situation, and my argument wasn't 22 addressing their situation. So let's put that aside, first of 23 all.

1 Second of all, AE 101. I am more than happy to agree 2 with the government's contention that AE 101 is a fish that's 3 rotting in the Guantanamo sun right now. I won't call it a 4 red herring; it's some other kind of fish and it stinks and 5 it's there and it has to be resolved. We are attempting to 6 resolve it in an orderly fashion and have been since last 7 July. 8 The government's characterization of it as a 9 speculative tactical decision on the part of the greater 10 defense organization, that is the Military Commissions Defense 11 Organization, is a clear swipe at the leadership of that 12 organization, Brigadier General Baker, who, based on his 13 review of the evidence, and fully, fully within his designated 14 role under the Regulation for Trial by Military Commissions, 15 issued certain cautious advice that is of a public nature that 16 is unclassified in the form of the e-mail that's attached to 17 AE 101 about this. 18 I don't think we need to impugn General Baker's 19 integrity or the suggestion -- he represents no party. When 20 he issued that e-mail, he was not representing a party, he is 21 not entitled to, he doesn't represent a defendant under the 22 regulation. He made that ruling based on his best judgment of 23 his statutory role and regulatory role. So let's leave

- 1 Brigadier General Baker and this notion of a conspiracy by --
- 2 on the part of defense counsel generally to stop things. We
- 3 are not -- the al Nashiri team did what it did. We are not
- 4 the al Nashiri team. We are doing what we need to do.
- 5 And the main point about AE 101 which the government
- 6 did not address is that it is -- it is a more than legitimate
- 7 basis for us -- if we could have met with Mr. Al-Tamir, which
- 8 we could not until very recently, for why we could not have
- 9 discussed the things we need to discuss in connection with the
- 10 deposition. Okay. Now, the government says that we have had
- 11 since August to prepare for this deposition. They say that --
- 12 and let's start with that. And they suggest that we have been
- 13 twiddling our thumbs somehow or, you know, we have been using
- 14 this -- these events tactically as a way of preparing.
- Judge, you have in front of you exhaustive AE 505 --
- 16 M.C.R.E. -- excuse me, M.C.R.E. 505(g) submissions,
- 17 M.C.R.E. 505(h) arguments, ex parte submissions about the work
- 18 we have been doing. We have not been sleeping on our -- on
- 19 the requirements of preparing for this massive deposition that
- 20 is based on a thousands-and-thousands-of-page record. I'm not
- 21 going to go into how long they held Mr. al Darbi and all the
- 22 interviews they did with him, but we have hardly been
- 23 twiddling our thumbs.

1 The problem is a defendant is entitled to consult 2 with his attorney about a government witness who the 3 government believes is key to their case who testifies 4 directly based on that witness' claimed knowledge of the 5 activities and observed activities of our client. We have to 6 be able to talk to our client about that, about that 7 testimony. We have been unable to do so. That is what we're 8 here talking about. We have not been sleeping on any other 9 rights -- or, I'm sorry, any other obligations to execute our 10 duties as defense counsel. 11 Now, let me come back, and the -- also mentioned that 12 as of December 5th, we could have been meeting with the 13 client. I addressed this, and I'm not going to go into it in 14 detail. December 5th, we get this notice from JTF saying, in 15 an e-mail, "Hey, you can come meet with your client," right? 16 And we're like. "What? That's not what we've been 17 hearing from him." He's in a subjective -- having subjective 18 levels of pain and symptoms that -- you know, we're shocked. 19 But -- and so no medical opinion at all that that can be --20 that that can take place. 21 Eventually, shortly thereafter, the government files 22 a -- their notice, and I don't have the -- it's in the AE 099I

sequence, in which the government says, "Hey, you can see your

23

client, come on down," and doesn't attach a medical

1

2 declaration to that effect, okay? So that's -- in the 3 meantime, we are getting these letters from our client that we 4 subsequently explain and attach in AE 099AA why we are deeply 5 concerned. There's no medical opinion here. This looks 6 driven by the commission's decision on December 5th, you know, 7 saying, "I'm taking into account an inability of the defense 8 to meet in my further rulings," and -- but mostly we're 9 getting these -- this information from the client that says, 10 you know, "I'm in pain. I'm not ready to meet." 11 And so, nevertheless, we begin the process, to the 12 extent we can, of -- of going to meet with him. But I -- I 13 need to emphasize again, because I want to stick with the 14 testimony in front of the commission and -- and not -- try not 15 to rely on speculation, okay, to quote the government. 16 neurosurgeon made it clear that, even when we did get a 17 declaration on December 15th, I think was the date or 18 thereabouts, we finally received the declaration from the SMO, 19 I think it was -- I can't remember if it was him or herself --20 that he was medically cleared for transport to attorney-client 21 meetings. We now know, based on the expert neurosurgeon's 22 testimony, that all that meant was that he was not going to be 23 harmed physically. Finally, we had a medical testimony that

1 moved -- simply moving him to an attorney-client meeting 2 wasn't going to harm him physically. 3 That testimony did not mean, as the neurosurgeon 4 testified, that he was going to be in anything but extreme pain, or not; be able to participate and pay attention to his 5 6 attorneys in that attorney-client meeting, or not; and so 7 the -- and the subjective expressions of his symptoms, which 8 we tried to attach all of the relevant ones in that relevant 9 time period to AE 099AA, because that's all we had, the 10 subjective symptoms were making it clear that this was -- this 11 was not going to be productive. Nevertheless, we moved 12 forward. So I just -- and finally did get to see him. 13 With respect to his ability to meet with clients -- I 14 mean, meet with his attorneys, I think it is notable that, 15 notwithstanding that notice on December 5th originally and 16 then the subsequent SMO declaration ten days later, that 17 Mr. Al-Tamir was not actually moved from the hospital facility 18 where he was then held until January 16th. And so whatever 19 the medical determination about where he could safely be held 20 with the appropriate accommodations, I mean, that was not --21 and they're saying we can -- in December 5th, they're saying, 22 "Oh, yeah, he's good to go, go meet with him." They -- the 23 determination of where they were willing to let him actually

- 1 be out of the hospital didn't occur until January 16th. And
- 2 that is the background of our recent efforts to meet him as
- 3 soon as we could. Okay. I don't want to belabor that. I
- 4 just -- it needs to be clear that we have made every effort to
- 5 meet with him when he was capable of actually meeting with us,
- 6 at least to talk about his medical condition.
- 7 Let me now come -- this -- I found this argument
- 8 astonishing. The government essentially does not deny that we
- 9 pointed out in pleadings -- at least two pleadings in November
- 10 that there is a problem; that we can't even send the most
- 11 relevant material to our client, who we're not allowed to meet
- 12 with, to him so that he can at least begin to try to prepare
- 13 because of their marking of the documents. Two notices.
- 14 Judge. You noticed it in the commission's ruling in AE 099Y,
- 15 which was -- I don't have the date, but I think it was in
- 16 December, the commission pointed that out to them that we have
- 17 not been able to meet because of their markings.
- 18 So did we directly request that they do that? My
- 19 recollection is that there was some oral discussion of it. I
- 20 don't -- we couldn't find an e-mail either. We looked. But
- 21 there's no question that we were -- they were -- we raised it,
- 22 they were on notice. But far more important -- one moment,
- 23 Judge.

- 1 [Pause.] 2 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: DoD Instruction 5200.01, Volume 4, 3 dated February 24th, 2012, is the version I have, at 4 paragraph 4 -- I'm going to say 2 -- I'm doing this on the 5 fly, Judge, indulge me. It's on -- it's on, I'm just going to 6 say, paragraph 6 on page 16 of enclosure 3, paragraph 2.d.(2), 7 access to FOUO information, and I will just talk about, for 8 these purposes, the deposition transcripts, direct testimony, 9 Mr. Al-Tamir's case and Mr. al Nashiri's case. 10 (2) says, "The final responsibility for determining 11 whether an individual has a valid need for access to 12 information designated as FOUO rests with the individual who 13 has authorized possession, knowledge, or control of the 14 information, not with the prospective recipient." 15 Judge, we're not in a position -- you know, this is 16 their job. Their job is to mark infor- -- they know what it's 17 It's their job. They were on notice. The notion that, 18 by our failure to notify them by an e-mail, when they've been 19 notified by other means that were sufficient for the 20 commission to take note of the problem, you know, as of 21 November, does not explain the fact that we still have not
- The government mentions that they now have been

22

received them.

- 1 making ongoing efforts to remark those documents. That's
- 2 great. I don't know, but I'm not sure why the deposition
- 3 wasn't the very first thing they, now that they're trying,
- 4 that they did; but we haven't gotten it yet.
- **5** Okay. So -- and -- two last points. The first is
- 6 this -- the sufficiency in a kind of last-ditch, I'll call it,
- 7 effort to try to explain how we actually could have prepared
- 8 if we really were trying to prepare, the government points to
- 9 the fact that we have been corresponding with our client, and
- 10 they cite to Overton. Judge, for Overton, I don't -- and I
- 11 don't recall the exact facts, but I will be surprised if it
- 12 dealt with a situation comparable to this in terms of the need
- 13 and the specific issues that were -- that were ongoing,
- 14 ongoing production of discovery by the government over this
- 15 period; you know, extremely important government witness;
- 16 right to confrontation at issue in this -- in this possibility
- **17** of us -- I don't think it applies.
- 18 But even if argument -- I mean, if it did, we
- 19 still -- what would we be writing to him about? We can't even
- 20 send him the transcript because of this other problem. So the
- 21 notion that correspondence is a substitute is -- is absurd.
- 22 It's absurd.
- I think I addressed the question of whether a

- voluntary waiver -- you know, not feeling good is a
 voluntary -- enough for a voluntary waiver. It's not, I mean,
 and we -- we -- you know, that's perfectly clear from the
- 4 neurosurgeon's testimony and from, I think, the order, the
- 5 basic idea that this is about -- not about medical clearance,
- 6 you know, in the medical sense. But I want to -- I want to --
- 7 the government subjected -- at the request of the commission,
- 8 the government offered that it could inform the government
- 9 through these ongoing 099I notices about the medical condition
- 10 of the defendant, and that should be good enough, as opposed
- 11 to his reports of his own symptoms.
- I mean, the answer is, first, they can't -- I know

 they tried to feel his pain, and we appreciate that, but they
- 14 don't. And so as the -- as the neurosurgeon's testimony made
- 15 clear, it's reliant on the patient's good faith description --
- 16 no question that these are all good faith from Mr. Al-Tamir --
- 17 description of his level of pain that you make those decisions
- **18** on.
- 19 And finally, all we have gotten from the government
- 20 so far in the 099I series are declarations that include the
- 21 statement that I discussed with the neurosurgeon that he is
- 22 medically cleared for transport. Now, maybe they will start
- 23 modifying that to make another decision, but -- make some

- 1 other language, but that -- those 099I notices, pursuant to
- 2 the neurosurgeon's testimony, do not answer the question of
- 3 whether he is actually medically fit, as a legal matter, to
- 4 participate in what he needs to participate in his defense.
- 5 They are not adequate for the commission to make any decisions
- 6 like that.
- 7 Last -- last point, Judge, and then I will ask to
- 8 consult with my team just to see if I missed anything. The
- 9 government now raises -- urges you to -- to essentially agree
- 10 that this deposition can proceed in the absence of the -- of
- 11 Mr. Al-Tamir. And two points about that.
- 12 One is the government noticed that they would be
- 13 filing a motion requesting that. That is an enormously
- 14 questionable procedure. We absolutely object to a decision
- 15 based on their oral request here without a full opportunity to
- 16 respond in writing to that suggestion. If they want to file
- 17 the motion that they said, they can. If they don't, we
- 18 request a full opportunity in writing to respond to that
- **19** request. That's point one.
- Point two is, okay, if the judge is -- if you are
- 21 inclined to entertain that possibility, I think it would make
- 22 sense -- I mean, we can litigate that. We are still here. We
- 23 are here this week. We will do our best to respond in

- 1 whatever way we can, but -- but we would ask for a reasonable
- 2 amount of time to brief it.
- 3 But it -- the -- the upshot of this will be, I think,
- 4 that it is futile to hold a deposition outside the presence of
- 5 the defendant. I'm not going to argue, you know, that the
- 6 language that they put in the discussion section there, which
- 7 is not even legally operative about the defendant not being
- 8 present -- I'm not going to argue the fact that our current
- 9 order states that he will be present, or that the government
- 10 itself, clearly worrying at that time about the confrontation
- 11 clause issues, asked that you insert in that order that the
- 12 defense be present for the deposition. Let's leave that aside
- 13 for the argument we end up having.
- I think at the end of the day it's going to prove to
- 15 be absolutely futile, the notion that we can litigate their
- 16 right to hold it in front of him and we will talk about the
- 17 admissibility of it later.
- I mean, this is -- we will certainly include an
- 19 argument that -- it is -- I mean, this will never be admitted
- 20 and this case will be -- if this is their lead witness, this
- 21 case will be overturned on appeal if they go -- you know, if
- 22 you, you know, go forward with a trial deposition of the only
- 23 witness that they say is a key witness in the absence of the

- 1 defendant, that they intend to use as a trial deposition and
- 2 to ----
- 3 So I ask for the opportunity, A, to brief that; and
- 4 B, you know, suggest strongly to the commission that it's
- 5 going to be futile down the line and that -- saying let's just
- 6 try it and see what happens. The impact on Mr. Al-Tamir's
- 7 health, the impact on the orderly proceedings that we have
- 8 been arguing should be respected so far in the schedule and
- 9 could be accommodated reasonably by the government, given
- 10 their own plea agreement, on or about February 20th, it simply
- 11 makes no sense to try to push this thing forward now.
- And that's -- let me have one moment to consult and
- 13 then I think I am done, Judge.
- 14 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Yes.
- 15 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, if you have no questions, I
- **16** will stop talking.
- 17 MJ [Col RUBIN]: I have no questions. Thank you, sir.
- 18 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, may I be heard on just a
- 19 couple of quick points?
- 20 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Yes. I am going to give you about two
- 21 minutes.
- 22 ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Your Honor, the defense grossly
- 23 mischaracterizes what I said about General Baker. I did not

- 1 impugn his integrity. In fact, what I said was that it was a
- 2 tactical choice; and I acknowledge the defense, that's the
- 3 type of tactical choices the defense should be doing. So if
- 4 anything, I applauded his efforts. The defense has done an
- 5 excellent job in their representation of the accused.
- **6** MJ [Col RUBIN]: The commission did not take this as a
- 7 personal or professional attack involving the general.
- **8** ATC [MR. SPENCER]: Thank you, sir.
- **9** Additionally, Your Honor, the defense
- 10 mischaracterized what I said about -- in the context of the
- 11 diplomatic discussions that are ongoing, bilateral
- 12 international discussions. It might surprise the defense,
- 13 but, you know, Mr. Spencer, the prosecutor, is not part of
- 14 State Department discussions with Saudi diplomats. So I can
- 15 speculate as to what those discussions are. What I can say is
- 16 that we have upheld our end of the bargain from the
- 17 U.S. Government's perspective.
- I do agree with Mr. Thurschwell that the "on or about
- 19 20 February" date is an on or about and there is some
- 20 flexibility from the government's -- the Executive's ability
- 21 to transfer him and Saudi's ability to pick him up; and, of
- 22 course, that's because of the logistics involved in that
- 23 transfer. That is irrelevant to the question of whether the

- 1 judge should move, the commission should move forward. It is2 irrelevant to the question of whether the defense is prepared,
- 3 and that's again in the context of a continuance request.
- 4 That's what we are talking about, is are they prepared.
- 5 Finally, Judge, I would say with respect to their --
- 6 their suspect -- or suspicion of the lack of information being
- 7 provided by the -- by the doctors in the December time frame,
- 8 the defense itself actually submitted what I believe is
- 9 appellate -- or Exhibit 11 to AE 099AA, a letter from their
- 10 client on 6 December talking about how the doctor had cleared
- 11 him medically to meet with them. So they were well aware that
- 12 this was a medical decision, based on consultations with the
- 13 surgeon; the accused himself talks about the surgeon being
- 14 present.
- Now, it's clear from Exhibit 11 of 099A that the
- 16 accused didn't like that decision and was arguing with them
- 17 about that decision, but clearly the defense was aware. So at
- 18 that point when the judge did -- when the commission did
- 19 reference their only ability to use the deposition in the
- 20 presence of their client, based on the information that the
- 21 government had been provided, we were hopeful that they would
- 22 meet with their client that month because they had ample
- 23 opportunity to do so.

1 Had the defense said, no, we can't, we need this to 2 be remarked, then the government would have gotten on that 3 immediately. And the defense did not. 4 Thank you, sir. 5 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Mr. Thurschwell, any additional argument? 6 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, we believe it's highly 7 relevant to your decision about the continuance of the 8 deposition whether this transfer is going to happen and when 9 it is going to happen. The government, who I will refer to as 10 the government, as we always do, is the government. 11 the lawyers for the United States of America. It is the 12 United States of America in whose hands and in whose official 13 hands lies the decision about whether and when that transfer 14 will happen. 15 If they can't tell you, nobody can. And if nobody 16 can, there is no reason to change the -- the -- the schedule 17 that this court has set and is consistent with Mr. Al-Tamir's 18 constitutional rights, statutory rights, and medical needs. 19 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Thank you. Counsel, I'm going to extend 20 today's session just a little bit. I don't anticipate a 21 lengthy session when we go back on the record. I do note 22 we're getting close to prayer time. I would like to take a 23 recess until 1300. If the defense believes that it would be

- 1 helpful to the accused to return to the pod, lie down, we
- **2** could go later. If not, I propose 1300.
- 3 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Can I ask what you anticipate
- 4 happening at 1300 and how long you anticipate it going on?
- 5 MJ [Col RUBIN]: I anticipate being on the record probably
- 6 less than ten minutes.
- 7 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Okay. Judge, if we can consult
- 8 with our client, that will be helpful.
- **9** MJ [Col RUBIN]: Yes.
- 10 [Pause.]
- 11 ADC [MR. THURSCHWELL]: Judge, if I can inquire, because
- 12 it is relevant. We're talking to Mr. Al-Tamir. We don't have
- 13 a definite answer yet, but I think it's relevant. If we are
- 14 going to be doing -- you anticipate argument when we return or
- 15 simply -- it would be one thing; or just announcing rulings,
- 16 that would be another.
- 17 MJ [Col RUBIN]: What I anticipate right now is announcing
- 18 a ruling, and that's it for the rest of the day. No more
- **19** argument.
- **20** DC [CDR COOPER]: Your Honor?
- 21 MJ [Col RUBIN]: Yes.
- DC [CDR COOPER]: Mr. Al-Tamir is at his breaking point,
- 23 but he has said that he will go back, lie down, and come back

```
1
   in if it's for a brief period of time on the record at 1300.
 2
        MJ [Col RUBIN]: 1300.
 3
        DC [CDR COOPER]: Yes, sir.
 4
        MJ [Col RUBIN]: Very well. Again, I don't anticipate --
 5
   it will be relatively short.
 6
        DC [CDR COOPER]: Yes, sir.
 7
        MJ [Col RUBIN]: All right. The commission is in recess
 8
   till 1300.
 9
    [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1144, 5 February 2018.]
10
                             [END OF PAGE]
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```