- 1 [The Military Commission was called to order at 1643, 13 June
- 2 2013.]
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Please be seated. Commission is called
- 4 to order. All parties are again present that were present
- **5** when commission recessed.
- **6** Mr. Kammen, do you wish to be heard further on the
- 7 monitoring issue?
- **8** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Very briefly.
- **9** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And I don't want to belabor the
- 11 point. Clearly, the government will disagree, but what I
- 12 think we've seen here is the perfect example of plausible
- 13 deniability. This is the magic monitoring machine that nobody
- 14 knows anything about. Somehow it gets fixed somehow, but
- 15 nobody ever tells anybody, and certainly, nobody ever tells
- 16 the people in charge. The guys who aren't here forget to tell
- 17 Welsh, forgets to tell Tibor, forgets to tell -- everyone
- 18 forgets to tell, but let's put that to the side.
- 19 You know, there's been a lot of talk about lack of
- 20 trust, and clearly, maybe that goes both ways. Here's what we
- 21 want that, at least for our purposes, ends this.
- We'd like a specific order from the commission to
- 23 the relevant officials that they are not to monitor

- 1 attorney-client meetings. Now, there should be no controversy
- **2** to that, because they say they don't. So if they're really
- 3 not doing it, why would they care?
- 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: The other relief we want ----
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: When you say monitor, you're referring
- 7 to audio monitoring?
- **8** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Audio monitor or record, or audio
- 9 record.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: But we're talking about audio, you
- 11 understand.
- 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: They want to look in and not
- **13** listen ----
- **14** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay.
- 15 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: That comes to our other issue, but
- **16** we'll ----
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah, that's in a minute. Don't get
- **18** ahead of yourself.
- **19** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Another time.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Your second request for relief?
- 21 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: The second piece of the relief we
- 22 want is anytime we are there for an attorney-client meeting,
- 23 we can, upon request, inspect the premises. He said it would

- 1 be all right. So we go there, if we have the slightest bit of
- 2 question, there's only one place we need to really look.
- 3 There's a hatch where you can look up, and you can see;
- 4 there's nothing there, fine. But we'd like to be able to do
- 5 it. You know, we don't need to make an appointment, if we're
- 6 there.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: But this is in the course of
- 8 another ----
- **9** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yeah, if we're there meeting with
- 10 Mr. Nashiri, and we -- let us look. All they need to do is
- 11 bring in a stool. It's not even a ladder. They want to put
- **12** him ----
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: The only thing that causes me pause
- 14 there is -- I mean, Colonel Bogdan said he doesn't have
- 15 problem with inspections. It's when you used the term
- 16 periodic, and then he went back and forth a little bit.
- 17 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, when we pinned him down to the
- 18 extent we could, he was okay so long as it was happening in
- **19** conjunction.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: When you would show up and have a visit
- 21 and then you would request to inspect, and then -- but there's
- 22 still got to be a decision point here. What I'm saying is I
- 23 can't envision every possibility down there.

1 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, the decision point would be, 2 it's -- let's say at noon. 3 MJ [COL POHL]: No, I'm saying is you go for a visit and 4 you want a permission to inspect in the course of a visit ----5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Mm-hmm. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: --- of the ----7 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: ---- of the room we're in. 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Of the room you're in. Okay. I think I 9 can -- just seems to me is it's -- as I say this, and you're 10 probably going to hear this again in a minute, is I don't run 11 confinement facilities, and it seems to me there's got to be 12 some discretion on that issue that I've got to rely on them. 13 But what I'm saying is if an inspection is requested, if 14 denied, denial be provided in writing with a reason why. 15 because they could have logistic issues. I'm not saying that 16 I'm going to do this, but I'm saying if I grant you that 17 relief, they still need to have some -- they may have a reason 18 why that particular time it's not -- and I know what you are 19 thinking to yourself; it's because they have reinstalled it 20 and don't want you to know about it. 21 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, that was one of the things that 22 was coming through my mind. 23 MJ [COL POHL]: I understand.

- **1** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: There were several others, but ----
- 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So that's the two reliefs that
- 3 you want on this issue.
- 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes, because we can spend a lot of
- 5 time going back.
- **6** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 7 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Like I say, I think we have seen
- 8 plausible deniability, but we just want to go forward, and we
- **9** want to go forward with some certainty.
- 10 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 11 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And this is what he said he was
- 12 willing to do.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Commander Lockhart.
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir, thank you.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Kammen has given you an olive
- 16 branch.
- 17 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Well, partially.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Let me ask you this: Do you
- 19 object to the order of no audio monitoring of privileged
- 20 attorney-client communications?
- 21 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: I do object to the fact that an
- 22 order needs to be given. It is something that is not done and
- 23 are we going to start ordering every legal premise, don't do

- 1 this, don't do that? There's no monitoring that's being done.
- 2 And what I want to start with -- if you may indulge me for a
- 3 second, and I promise I will be brief.
- 4 The defense's motion was it a motion to abate.
- 5 They wanted an evidentiary hearing, which they got, and what
- 6 it establishes is this: I think all parties agree,
- 7 absolutely, there is no evidence that monitoring of
- 8 attorney-client meetings happened.
- 9 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I don't agree, but I agree that's the
- 10 evidence. I just don't necessarily believe ----
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: I got it.
- 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: ---- that it's accurate.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: I got it.
- 14 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: What was shown in the courtroom
- 15 today with both witnesses and everything that has been
- 16 presented, is that no monitoring of attorney-client meetings
- 17 occur. And there's certainly no evidence of anything specific
- 18 to this case; therefore, an order is unnecessary.
- The government would just say that it's not good
- 20 policy to make orders on things where orders are not needed.
- 21 Certainly, monitoring does not occur, has not occurred, and
- 22 will not occur.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: But Commander Lockhart, the evidence

- **1** before me is there's monitoring capability ----
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Was.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Can I finish?
- **4** TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: There was. There's some matters before
- 6 me that there was audio-monitoring capability. There's no
- 7 evidence before me that that capability was ever used for
- 8 attorney-client meetings, but there was evidence before me
- 9 that it was used in some other meeting.
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: And in a consensual format, correct.
- 11 MJ [COL POHL]: I understand. I got it.
- 12 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Two different things, sir.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: I got it. I got it. So it's different
- 14 than the absence of. There's some evidence of the capability,
- 15 and no evidence that it was ever used.
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: And on top of that, sir, it no
- 17 longer exists.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: But, of course, things at the camp stay
- 19 the same over time, don't they?
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Correct, but this has never been an
- **21** issue.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Rules change.
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: But this has never been an issue.

- **1** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I gotcha. Go ahead.
- 2 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: So that's the first thing. The
- 3 second thing is, again, the defense made a motion to abate.
- 4 There's clearly nothing before this court that would warrant
- 5 that. The government would obviously urge that that motion be
- 6 denied.
- 7 The second thing -- and I want to make sure that
- 8 we're clear about this. My understanding of Colonel Bogdan's
- 9 testimony was that he didn't have any objection to, when
- 10 defense counsel was there, for them to physically inspect the
- 11 inside of the actual meeting room.
- He had pause when they initially said they wanted
- 13 to be able to inspect the facility anytime they were there.
- 14 When Mr. Kammen limited his question to the room that they
- 15 were already in, if they could look up in the ceiling, that's
- **16** where he didn't have any problems.
- 17 I can imagine it would -- might be very
- 18 disruptive, especially if other meetings are going around,
- 19 with other detainees, and that would put a burden on JTF,
- 20 which the government would not want Your Honor to order.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: And the government would suggest
- 23 this: If the defense wants to inspect that going forward,

- 1 that request will be made to JTF. If the defense has any
- 2 problems about that -- again, to what Colonel Bogdan agreed --
- 3 I am absolutely confident they will bring it to your
- 4 attention, and it can be corrected. But let's allow JTF to
- 5 run the detention facility, allow them to be able to make good
- **6** on the discussions that they had on the stand, very on the
- 7 spot with the defense, and let's move on from there, sir.
- **8** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- **9** TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Thank you, sir.
- **10** MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
- **11** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Court please.
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Mr. Kammen.
- 13 BY LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: In the absence of a court order,
- **14** it won't happen. Absent ----
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Which one are we talking about?
- 16 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: The second.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 18 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And all we'd like is an order.
- **19** MJ [COL POHL]: I gotcha.
- 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And to be clear, all we want is to
- 21 inspect the room we're in.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And that's -- okay. You have
- 23 drifted a little bit away from your motion, but that's as

1 things have developed, that's what you want to do moving 2 forward. Okay. 3 Let's move to the spiral notebook. Do you have 4 anything to add? I think we have almost -- I think I 5 understand your position from before. 6 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, sure. 7 MJ [COL POHL]: I'll always give you an opportunity. 8 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I mean, clearly what troubled -- what 9 seems to trouble you is that you feel some obligation to 10 defer. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: Isn't that the law? 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Not completely. You don't ----13 MJ [COL POHL]: And I agree it's not completely, but I'm 14 saying -- I believe what I said ----15 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: There may be a presumption of 16 deferral ----17 MJ [COL POHL]: Right. 18 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: ---- but the presumption of deferral 19 under the law is trumped -- dissipates when what is being 20 enforced is really not rationally related to the goals. And 21 what we know ----22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So standing alone, standing

alone, without showing -- and you've discussed your prejudice.

23

- **1** I got it. Let me move that.
- 2 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Sure.
- **3** MJ [COL POHL]: So you think standing alone, an
- 4 Article I judge has the authority to second-guess the opinions
- 5 of the confinement facility manager -- confinement facility
- 6 commander under some -- I guess an arbitrary and capricious
- 7 standard, and if I find it's arbitrary and capricious, even if
- 8 it has no impact on the trial before me, I have the authority
- **9** to say, stop doing that.
- 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, when it's imposed upon the
- 11 litigants who appear in the trial before you, it does have an
- 12 impact, and that's point. That's what gives you -- that's the
- 13 nexus. This is not random people who are going in. It's the
- 14 people who are going there to do work in the trial before you.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 16 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And that's the problem. The problem
- **17** here, Your Honor, is -- you know, is we see it all the time.
- 18 He's gone, then we have the next guy, and then we have the
- 19 next guy, and we have all sorts of rules. You've issued
- 20 orders in two cases. He's -- Woods or whoever the 2011 order
- 21 was issued. Those are -- you know, we can read those. We car
- 22 figure out what our obligations are. And everybody else,
- 23 until him, has figured out what his -- what our obligations

- 1 are. He comes in -- and I won't get into all of the other
- 2 issues, but he comes in and he sees the world through a very
- 3 strange prism, a prism of distrust.
- 4 Now, you know, there's -- there's a certain amount
- 5 of being offended on the defense side when he says -- the
- 6 defense lawyers, two military officers at least, and somebody
- 7 who I think has earned maybe a little bit of respect here and
- 8 other places, would ever contemplate doing what he suggests.
- 9 If he had had any suggestion -- if over the years somebody had
- 10 said, you know, that Nashiri team, they're pretty borderline,
- 11 or we caught them doing this, we caught them doing that,
- 12 that's a different issue. Never been such a suggestion.
- So the notion that if somebody's going to, say,
- 14 disassemble something and slip it, that these people would
- 15 remain secret, silent -- silent? Putting aside the
- 16 monitoring, putting aside everything else, I mean, that's part
- 17 of the offensive part of this. The other part is, again, we
- 18 need some predictability. These rules -- you know, the high
- 19 point came, would you permit a binder? Well, I'd have to see
- 20 it. Well, you know ----
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: You think that was unreasonable of him?
- **22** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I'm sorry?
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Do you think that was unreasonable and

- 1 irrational of him to say, I've got to see what you want to
- 2 bring in before I know whether you can bring it in?
- 3 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I think at some point, yes. But
- 4 quite candidly, Your Honor, it becomes a moving target. You
- 5 go to show up to visit a client and he decides I don't like
- 6 that binder. Well, what binder do you like? Well, I'll have
- 7 to see it. You're chasing phantoms.
- **8** We need to do our work. You've issued the rules.
- 9 Commander Woods issued the rules, and now in response to some
- 10 unknown, unpublished rule that exists only in Colonel Bogdan's
- 11 mind, everyone's disrupted.
- **12** MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 13 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: We -- I mean, to cut to the chase,
- 14 you have the authority to do this.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Now ----
- 16 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And we'd ask you to do this.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you. Trial Counsel, anything
- **18** further, Butch?
- 19 ATC [MAJ RUGE]: Yes, sir. As the commission's already
- 20 recognized, there is some ample case law on this, and we just
- 21 need to recognize that on this subject, the law is what the
- 22 law is. It's not what lawyers in this room might deem
- 23 reasonable, but the analysis is, it involves deference.

1 Now, the case law that Mr. Kammen references is 2 all -- if there is an abridgement of any right of a detainee, 3 then the analysis is, is the policy reasonably related to a 4 legitimate security interest. And that's what all of the 5 evidence that was presented by the defense's witness led to. 6 The commander came in and explained exactly why his -- why his 7 policy was related to that interest. 8 I think really, the issue comes down to -- well, 9 first, starting with the fact that as the commission has 10 recognized, you don't get to that analysis because there's no 11 cognizable prejudice based only on the preference of the 12 defense counsel. 13 And the last thing I want to say on this is the 14 offensiveness argument I think kind of goes both ways. 15 what the government finds offensive is the notion that this is 16 all about the defense counsel, and that there is no security 17 interest in the safety of the soldiers who are working inside 18 of that facility, and the detainees whose responsibility --19 who the commander has responsibility to make safe inside that 20 facility. And from that -- that is his responsibility, and 21 because that's his responsibility, he needs to maintain that 22 authority as the law describes, and all of the case law we

23

cite in our pleadings.

1 Anything further? 2 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you, sir. 3 ATC [MAJ RUGE]: Thank you, sir. 4 MJ [COL POHL]: Last word, Mr. Kammen. 5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I just want to make it clear. I 6 don't think there's been any suggestion that we would not 7 comply with any -- first, we will comply with anything he 8 orders. But secondly, we have absolutely no desire to do 9 anything that would in any way impact on the safety of anyone. 10 They say take out staples; that's rational, happy to do it. 11 No paper clips; that's rational, happy to do it. So any 12 reasonable request, happy to comply with. 13 When the request is unreasonable or -- then it 14 becomes a different issue; or arbitrary, capricious, simply 15 whimsical, that's the issue here. 16 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Thank you. One moment. 17 The next thing I want to address is AE 45, but 18 actually, before we can get to 45, I think we've got to 19 address 153, which is a -- when -- just as a factual predicate 20 so people know where we're at, when the April hearing was 21 postponed, I sent a docketing order for sessions in August, 22 September and October. This is different than the scheduling 23 order, I understand that, but this is obviously a scheduling

- 1 issue. And Mr. Kammen filed a response basically asking for
- 2 all three weeks of hearings to be postponed because of a
- 3 conflict with another case, correct?
- 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes. And for anybody who may be --
- 5 this was first -- this conflict was first disclosed to the
- 6 commission last October in an 802. And I sort of read your
- 7 order as to ask is that conflict still a conflict, and we
- 8 provided the evidence that it was. I certainly will keep the
- **9** commission advised.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Now, is -- now, just so it's clear, that
- 11 you have a case in Indiana ----
- 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes.
- 13 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- a death penalty case due to
- **14** start ----
- 15 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: It's not a death penalty case. It is
- 16 a homicide case.
- 17 MJ [COL POHL]: Homicide case, due to start the first
- **18** week of August.
- 19 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: August 5th.
- 20 MJ [COL POHL]: Anticipated to last?
- 21 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I wasn't the lawyer in the two prior
- 22 trials.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Yeah.

- **1** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Both of the two prior trials have
- 2 lasted approximately 90 days.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. This is going to be the third
- 4 time this individual has been tried, so ----
- 5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yeah.
- 6 MJ [COL POHL]: You theoretically would think it would
- 7 take about 90 days again?
- **8** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes, at least, yes.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: So you want to ----
- 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: What I'd like to do in sort of a
- 11 perfect world would be to set the next court session in early
- 12 November. Rather, I've had discussions with the government,
- 13 with the prosecution. If we're going to keep an October date,
- 14 I'd like to either move it up a week or back a week. Long
- 15 before this, I made another commitment I'd like to keep, but I
- 16 understand I can't be greedy, but -- so I'm happy to move it
- 17 up a week.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 19 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And if that trial is done, certainly,
- 20 we can keep the October date.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 22 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I'm also happy to keep the September
- 23 date, and if something happens, we'll notify the commission.

1 MJ [COL POHL]: When do you -- there are certain 2 notifications -- okay. That's your position. Let me hear 3 what the government has to say and we'll work this out. 4 Commander? 5 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Thank you, sir. It is the 6 government's position that this case and Mr. Kammen's 7 detailing to this case and involvement in this case preceded 8 the Camm trial. I understand that he is scheduled to be in 9 Indiana on 5 August -- Indiana on 5 August. I just do have 10 one point of contention. We did also speak with the 11 prosecutors on that case. The first trial I was told lasted 12 six weeks and the second one three months. It is unknown as 13 to how long it might last. 14 MJ [COL POHL]: As all trials are. 15 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Absolutely, and that goes into part 16 of the government's position. The government's initial 17 position ----18 MJ [COL POHL]: Go ahead. 19 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. The government's position 20 is that the hearing dates should be kept as they were 21 scheduled, understanding that that presents an issue for 22 Mr. Kammen, but it's one that he took on after his 23 representation here.

1 MJ [COL POHL]: So let me see if I have got this 2 straight, is Mr. Kammen starts -- your view is he starts this 3 trial in Indiana on the 5th of August, comes down here for 4 hearings, picks the trial back up, comes back and forth, is 5 that ----6 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Well, the government recognizes that 7 the ----8 MJ [COL POHL]: Or do I just say this trumps the other 9 one? 10 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Our initial position would be, yes, 11 but understanding that, who decides which trial has 12 precedence? We have scheduled hearings. They have a 13 scheduled trial. This is a death penalty case, as the defense 14 has said over and over again, that makes it somehow more 15 important; that that is not a death penalty case, and we 16 have ----17 MJ [COL POHL]: But that means is that Mr. Kammen is 18 free to -- to withdraw from that case at this point in time? 19 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: He certainly could. The 20 government's not going to tell him what he needs to do. 21 MJ [COL POHL]: No, but I mean, realistically -- okay. 22 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: He could ask for a continuance in 23 that case, sir, and he has not.

1 MJ [COL POHL]: And then if he does and the trial is now 2 scheduled for January, and I don't think we're going to be 3 done in January, just -- that's just kind of my instinct, and 4 then he asks for another three months hiatus then and then he 5 asks for another continuance until this is done? 6 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: That is the government's first 7 position, absolutely. 8 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. What is the government's second 9 position? 10 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Okay. And one last thing on the 11 first position, if you don't mind, sir. 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Yes. 13 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: When he did take the obligations of 14 representing Mr. Nashiri in this case, there were certain 15 rights and acknowledgements that he had to agree to, and one 16 of those specifically said that he would not take any other 17 obligations that would prohibit the forward movement of this 18 case. And what I am seeing is a representation that the Camm 19 case will -- if their trial continues on 5 August, will hinder 20 the forward progress of this case. That is an issue for the 21 government. 22 If Your Honor is willing to entertain ----23 MJ [COL POHL]: Go ahead. I'm listening.

1 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Okay. 2 ---- willing to entertain a continuance of some 3 sort, the government would ask that it be narrowly tailored, 4 and the government would ask that only the August hearing be 5 postponed, and that the September and October hearing would 6 still be adhered to. We would also ask that a November 7 hearing would be scheduled now, so everybody has it on the 8 table, and then one of two things could happen. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Hold that thought for a second. 10 Go ahead. 11 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. One of two things could 12 happen. The Camm trial starts on 5 August, and as you said 13 earlier, litigation, you never know what happens with 14 schedules. And it may not start on 5 August. It may plead. 15 It may have a continuance. It may get dismissed by the 16 government. There are many things that could happen that are 17 outside of our control. So why cancel the hearings now, not 18 knowing that? That would -- that is the first thing that's 19 important. Keep the hearings intact. 20 If a need comes later, as we get closer -- I think 21 we're in June right now, still two months away. If we get 22 closer, and it looks as though the Camm trial is going to 23 occur on 5 August, then cancel only the 5 August week, okay?

- 1 So then, we sort of see how that trial goes, and
- 2 maybe for whatever reason this is a speedy trial and it goes
- 3 quickly and it's over with. And then there's no issues. We
- 4 can have the September hearing as scheduled.
- In addition to that, as what happens with many
- 6 cases that are lengthy, there could be a request in the Camm
- 7 case for a week off. And we could come down to GTMO and do
- 8 important work here, and continue on.
- **9** Same thing with October. October, again,
- 10 government's understanding is one of the iterations of the
- 11 Camm trial took six weeks, could be over by then. Keep that
- 12 hearing intact. And then, again, add a November hearing.
- 13 If Your Honor is considering allowing delay until
- 14 the completion of the Camm trial, this is incredibly important
- 15 to the forward progress of the trial, this trial. Set some
- 16 deadlines. Have some deadlines during that time period. All
- 17 law motions must be filed by X date. And we provided in 153
- 18 in our response an attachment that would provide -- propose
- 19 deadlines. All evidentiary motions must be done by this date.
- **20** All discovery motions must be done by this date.
- 21 And understand that Mr. Kammen will be working on
- 22 the Camm trial, but we have all worked on multiple cases at
- 23 the same time and, in fact, it's a rarity to only work on one.

- 1 In addition to that, defense has two very experienced Air
- 2 Force defense counsel, and my understanding is two other
- 3 counsel who assist. I believe one of them was in the
- 4 courtroom yesterday.
- 5 So if Your Honor is willing to entertain not
- 6 having any hearings during however long the Camm trial goes,
- 7 we would absolutely urge that deadlines be imposed during that
- 8 time period. The worst outcome would be to just put this case
- 9 on hold while there's another case going on, so we're just
- 10 going to stop all work, and pick it up when it ends.
- 11 Then what the government would ask is with those
- 12 deadlines, let's schedule three weeks in November, come down
- 13 here and let's hear all of those motions and let's get it
- 14 done. Because if we don't, that is going to continue to delay
- 15 this important trial. As I know you're well aware, the
- 16 government has been asking for a trial schedule for well over
- **17** a year.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: And to be fair -- and what's my response
- **19** usually been?
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Discovery wasn't done. Absolutely.
- 21 To be fair. But it is now.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: It's all done?
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. We sent a supplement to

1 our motion, with the caveat that we continue to discover new 2 discovery, as I ----3 MJ [COL POHL]: But not ----4 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: ---- I guarantee you we will until 5 the day of trial. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: But you're saying that 99% of your 7 discovery is done. 8 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: No, it's done. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: It's 100 percent done? 10 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: There's newly discovered stuff that 11 will always be in the pipeline. 12 MJ [COL POHL]: There's nothing waiting for me in 13 Washington to do a 505 review on? 14 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: There is and that's newly discovered 15 material that made its way through. But that's never going to 16 We will always have cats and dogs because we continue 17 with our duty to seek for things. We also continue to get 18 discovery requests from the defense which we respond to. 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Great. 20 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Understand. So what we're at now is 21 discovery is done. The government is asking for a trial 22 schedule, and to postpone all forward progress of this very

important case from the time period of now, tomorrow, whenever

23

- 1 we leave here until November is not realistic, and it doesn't
- 2 help this case move forward.
- 3 So on our far end of what we would dislike,
- 4 meaning no hearings until November, at least set deadlines and
- 5 let's get motions filed, and schedule three weeks to come down
- 6 in November. And I will -- I would ask, though, that
- 7 regardless, none of the hearing dates be cancelled. We all
- 8 know with all of the people here, if we cancel anything,
- 9 people's schedules will fill up.
- 10 I've got to slow down. I apologize.
- 11 People's schedules will fill up, and it will be
- 12 hard to reschedule it.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 14 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Thank you, sir.
- 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Kammen. There's a couple things.
- 16 First of all, is this the only case that you have out there
- 17 that could cause a similar problem in this case?
- 18 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes. Yes.
- **19** MJ [COL POHL]: Yes.
- 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And I want to be forthright, because
- 21 the undertaking they talk about was executed in 2008, and
- 22 after that was executed, General Martins, as part of the Obama
- 23 task force discontinued things for two years. So you can't

- 1 ask a private lawyer to sit and say maybe someday they will
- 2 file this case and I can go back to work. You have to take
- 3 cases.
- **4** MJ [COL POHL]: I got it. I got it. Okay.
- 5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: So I'm a little offended by the
- 6 approach of the prosecution, when the reason we're in this
- 7 position is because they delayed this proceeding for over two
- 8 years.
- 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.
- 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: But this is the only other -- the
- 11 Camm case is the only other major case ----
- 12 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. So once that's done ----
- 13 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I'm yours.
- 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And from reading the judge's
- 15 order in the Camm case, he says, 5 August is a real drop-dead
- 16 start date.
- 17 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes, and in fact, you know ----
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm assume that you know the judge, when
- **19** he says that ----
- 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Let me share something with you,
- 21 because at the last pretrial, they had filed this request that
- 22 sort of said -- ask for a continuance or ask to adjourn one
- 23 week a month and come here. Putting aside the unrealistic

1 situation ----2 MJ [COL POHL]: Mr. Kammen, you don't even need to 3 address that. 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Okay. I thought I would share with 5 you kind of the judge's response. 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Well, I -- yeah. I suspect he would 7 respond similar like other judges would respond. Okay. 8 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Here's what I'm going to propose. 10 There's two issues here. One is a trial schedule. 11 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Sure. 12 MJ [COL POHL]: I mean, I ----13 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: I'm sorry, sir, are we still going 14 to be heard on the trial schedule? I thought we were just --15 I want to make sure we addressed ----16 MJ [COL POHL]: I thought you mentioned that last time. 17 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: We ----18 MJ [COL POHL]: You're -- don't -- I'm not deciding 19 anything. Let me finish, and see where I'm at and then I'll 20 let you talk, okay. 21 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Much easier that way. Okay. Okay. 23

On 5 August you're going to start the Camm case,

- 1 and so on 5 August, you're going to know whether or not it's
- 2 an actually going to go to trial as you expect it to be a
- 3 fully contested jury trial, I suspect.
- 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes.
- 5 MJ [COL POHL]: That's the current status.
- 6 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes.
- 7 MJ [COL POHL]: But you have been a lawyer long enough,
- 8 to know that can change but that's what you believe it to be.
- 9 Okay. So I'm going to grant your motion -- understand this --
- 10 on the August dates only.
- 11 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Fine.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. If you wish a continuance on the
- 13 September or October dates, as currently scheduled, okay,
- 14 because you're in the Camm trial, said request must be filed
- 15 not later than three weeks before the date, that's to give the
- **16** government an opportunity ----
- 17 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: All right.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Now, we're going to go catch up in
- 19 November and December.
- 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Okay.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. And this is not a trial schedule.
- 22 This is simply a hearing schedule. If for some reason we
- 23 can't go in October ----

1 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Could we ----2 MJ [COL POHL]: Then the next week I got -- I'm going to 3 be down here the next week anyway. 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Could we set then the October date 5 for the week earlier? 6 MJ [COL POHL]: Any guarantees -- well, my only -- here 7 is my thought and this, I generally don't -- I generally do 8 these in 802s and we put it all on the record, but we're where 9 we're at. My proposal is this, is that we keep the dates as 10 scheduled, with the understanding if you request a continuance 11 because you are still involved in that trial for the September 12 date, and in September you say I'll still be involved, then 13 the October date it is. And my concern with moving that up a 14 week and we're going to be right where we are now anyway. I'd 15 rather keep the October date we have currently, I know it 16 creates a little bit of conflict for you. I want to put in 17 two weeks in November and two weeks in December, okay? 18 So that would be 4th -- the 4th to the 15th of November and 19 the 9th -- route now, the 9th through the 20th of December. 20 That would put us in December where -- actually perhaps even 21 ahead to where we would have been if we did all of the 22 hearings as normally scheduled because we have gone basically 23 every other month, okay?

1 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I mean -- sure. You know, I would 2 appreciate it if you could consider ----3 MJ [COL POHL]: Moving the December up a week? 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: The October up a week or back two 5 weeks. 6 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Your Honor, the government's concern 7 with moving the October hearing date up a week is that if the 8 Camm trial is really going to be three months ----9 MJ [COL POHL]: That's my concern also. 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: ---- that we might miss it. 11 MJ [COL POHL]: That's my concern also, Mr. Kammen. 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: That's why I'm thinking if we have it 13 two week later, we're less likely to miss it. 14 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: That's going to be like the week 15 before we're down here for two weeks. 16 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: We're ----17 MJ [COL POHL]: Stop, stop, stop. Okay. Okay. As we negotiate schedules, let's do this, and I -- and I fully 18 19 understand what dates I'm talking about here, so okay. 20 We move October to begin the 28th of October, 21 okay, for two full weeks. And we go 2 December for two full 22 weeks. Those four weeks are written in stone. I say that 23 like they really are, but as much as we can ----

1 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Fine. 2 MJ [COL POHL]: ---- with the understanding that 3 September dates and the August dates, the August dates -- your 4 continuance request is granted this time. The September date, 5 we're talking about that triggering mechanism. 6 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Sure. 7 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. 8 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. 9 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Now, back to trial schedules. 10 The government has responded to a request for a trial schedule 11 with a certain -- and again, I know we got dates there, but 12 let's just talk about day one through day whatever rather 13 than -- because as the pleading's filed, I don't believe you 14 filed a response to that. 15 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I thought we did, because it's ----16 MJ [COL POHL]: A long time ago. 17 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: They relied on their initial filing, 18 yes, sir. 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Nothing in our -- has happened that 21 has made our initial filing, to us, look both unrealistic or 22 unreasonable, given the realities of practicing before the 23 commission, and all of the impediments to ----

1 MJ [COL POHL]: I got it. Here's what my intent is to 2 I'm going to take your two trial schedules, and issue a 3 trial schedule order, and at that time, if you wish respond, 4 which I'm sure you both will, of certain things, because 5 we're -- I'm not pointing fingers or anything else, but we're 6 almost two years after the arraignment, and it seems to me 7 that if discovery is completed, substantive motions should --8 systemic motions should have already been addressed or should 9 be almost ready to go, and we should be getting close to 10 evidentiary motions, which we'll quite frankly -- okay. So 11 that's where we're at on this. Any questions? 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: No questions, no. 13 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. 14 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: No, sir. 15 MJ [COL POHL]: Is it all clear? I'll send a docketing 16 order with just the dates out so everybody understands what 17 they are. Your request for the continuance for the August 18 dates is granted. We have four extra weeks that we're going 19 to add on, and September is depending how your trial goes. 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yeah, and as I have said all along, 21 we will keep the commission apprised. If something happens, 22 we certainly notify folks ----23 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay.

1 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: ---- so you can proceed. My 2 reason -- well, we wanted to respond to your request. 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Okay. All's clear? 4 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. Thank you. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: So, the only outstanding issue is 92. 6 Is that correct? 7 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir. 8 MJ [COL POHL]: And 142 ----9 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes. 10 MJ [COL POHL]: --- which is part of it, too. I 11 understand. 12 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Yes I'm gathering that 120 is 13 postponed? 14 MJ [COL POHL]: Yes. Yes. And I think it will become 15 evident why in a second. Okay. 16 Concerning AE 92, I will have a written order to 17 this effect to put into the record but just for the purposes 18 of this record, I make the following findings: The classified 19 information both parties seek to disclose is relevant and 20 necessary for a fair determination of the issue before the 21 commission. This is an interlocutory legal proceeding and 22 does not relate to evidence the prosecution intends to 23 introduce on the merits of its case. Closure of portions -- a

- 1 portion of these proceedings in exclusion of the -- excuse me.
- 2 And possible exclusion of the accused is necessary to protect
- 3 information, the disclosure of which could reasonably be
- 4 expected to damage national security including intelligence or
- 5 law enforcement sources and methods.
- **6** Now, as far as exclusion of the accused is for
- 7 purposes of litigating AE 92, and only AE 92, and based on the
- 8 particular facts that relate to AE 92, and the fact that the
- 9 accused is not the source of the classified information on
- 10 AE 92, and not to make a blanket ruling on AE 142, for the
- 11 purposes of closure under 806 to address 92, and 92 only, and
- 12 it's no precedent for any other closed session, the
- 13 commission -- or the accused will not be present for the
- 14 litigation of the closed session of AE 92.
- **15** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: May I be heard?
- MJ [COL POHL]: Yes.
- 17 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Only for the purposes of making an
- **18** objection.
- 19 MJ [COL POHL]: Sure yeah. Yeah. Go ahead.
- 20 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well, if you're not done, then I'll
- **21** wait.
- 22 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. Back to the findings, because
- 23 that particular finding that addresses the exclusion of the

- 1 accused, I wanted to get to 142. After reviewing the ex parte
- 2 declarations contained in the various appellate exhibits which
- 3 are identified in the order, the commission finds the
- 4 compelling governmental interests that the public disclosure
- 5 information identified by the -- identified could result in
- **6** grave damage to national security.
- 7 The closure of the proceedings ordered herein is
- 8 narrowly tailored to protect information that if publicly
- **9** disclosed would pose a grave danger to national security.
- 10 Only the portions of the proceedings directly pertaining to
- 11 the classified information identified by the parties will be
- 12 closed to the public and a redacted transcript of the closed
- 13 session excising only classified national security information
- 14 will be provided in accordance with the Regulation for Trial
- 15 by Military Commission and Military Commissions Trial
- 16 Judiciary Rules of Court. The closure of a portion of the
- 17 proceedings effectively will protect the classified
- 18 information at issue by not disclosing the information to
- 19 individuals who do not hold the requisite security clearance
- 20 or need to know.
- Pursuant to M.C.R.E. 505(h) hearing conducted on
- **22** AE 92 and AE 124 on 11 June 2013 and 12 June 2013, there are
- 23 no less restrictive means or reasonable alternatives other

- 1 than closure of a limited portion of the proceedings that
- 2 would adequately protect the compelling interests in
- 3 protecting this national security information.
- 4 The government's interests in national security
- 5 realized by protecting certain classified information
- 6 outweighs both the accused's and the public's interests in the
- 7 right of access to this material and to these proceedings.
- 8 Accordingly, the commission orders oral argument
- 9 on AE 92 in a closed session and this session will be limited
- 10 only to evidence and arguments pertaining to the classified
- 11 information described in AE 124, and a full detailed written
- 12 order will be issued forthwith.
- Mr. Kammen. Do you wish to object?
- 14 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: With respect, Your Honor, the court's
- 15 ruling and the procedures employed by the court do not comply
- 16 with the Rules 505 under the Military Commission. The
- 17 government has not complied with its obligations of notice in
- 18 any way, shape, or form, and the commission's order, at least
- 19 as it presently stands, is not in compliance with the public's
- 20 interests or the rules.
- 21 Specifically, Your Honor, there has been no
- 22 effort, certainly by the government, to tailor the hearing in
- 23 any way to protect the public's right of access or

- 1 Mr. Nashiri's access. And given that, Your Honor, we object.
- 2 Mr. Nashiri may -- I think wants to address the court briefly
- 3 about his concerns about being excluded from any portion of
- 4 his death penalty proceedings, but he has certainly asked me
- 5 to express in the strongest possible, forceful as possible, he
- 6 does not want to be involuntarily excluded from any portion of
- 7 this proceeding that could be used to kill him, and I think
- 8 that that is absolutely an affront in a capital case, to
- **9** American justice.
- I understand the court's position, but we wanted
- 11 to make that record, and that the exclusion of Mr. Nashiri
- 12 violates numerous treaty obligations of the United States. It
- 13 violates the Detainee Treatment Act. It violates, we believe,
- 14 as we have said, the Military Commissions Act of 2009. It
- 15 certainly violates Mr. Nashiri's right to be free of cruel and
- 16 unusual punishment. It violates whatever rights to due
- 17 process of law he may have in this proceeding, and it violates
- 18 whatever constitutional rights he may have under the Fifth,
- 19 Sixth, and Eighth Amendments to the Constitution of the United
- 20 States.
- 21 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you, Mr. Kammen.
- Trial Counsel, do you wish to be heard?
- 23 ATC [MS. BALTES]: I do, just because I think it's

- 1 important to point out that the government has complied with
- 2 everything under M.C.R.E. 505 that is required and in any type
- $oldsymbol{3}$ of a proceeding where the use of classified information is
- 4 sought by either party. The defendant's reading of the
- 5 statute as we discussed yesterday in the 505(h) hearing is
- 6 completely inconsistent with both a plain reading of the
- 7 statute and federal case law, and the CIPA statute that
- 8 governs the classified information in federal court.
- In addition, the commission's ruling is completely
- 10 consistent with federal court precedent, which has found that
- 11 on an interlocutory matter regarding a question of law, a
- 12 defendant's rights are not impaired by the exclusion of that
- 13 person when classified information is discussed, as long as
- 14 their attorneys are present, and in fact have found that the
- 15 attorneys can also be excluded for certain ex parte portions,
- 16 which is not what the government has requested here and not
- 17 what the court has ordered.
- 18 MJ [COL POHL]: Thank you.
- 19 Mr. Kammen, do you -- your objection is noted for
- 20 the record, obviously.
- You indicated that your client wished to be heard
- 22 on this, but don't -- let me finish, please. He is accused in
- 23 this case, he is not the lawyer here. I understand you speak

1 on his behalf. But I'm aware of no procedure that permits 2 defendants to stand up and talk about what they don't like or 3 do like about the procedures. Are you with me on this? 4 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: This is such an unusual procedure. 5 MJ [COL POHL]: Okav. 6 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: And ----7 MJ [COL POHL]: I'm just going to say this. I'm just 8 going to say -- you mentioned that in your pleading, and now I 9 want to make sure, I heard you say that, but as it is 10 interpreted as a request for Mr. Nashiri to address the court 11 on this issue, if that's what it is, that request is denied, 12 okay? I just want to -- I think it's only fair to put it on 13 the record rather than have him go from there. 14 Now, the propose would be to have this hearing 15 tomorrow at 9:00, and as it's the last matter that we have 16 before the commission this week, is there any -- if it is the 17 last matter, I'm just talking about this deals with 18 transportation of the accused, is if it is the only thing 19 we're going to do tomorrow and he's not to be present, I'm 20 going to ask you, Mr. Kammen, do you want him waiting outside 21 or would you like to go back and visit him later on? Let me 22 just -- does anybody think there's going to be any open 23 hearing tomorrow?

- 1 TC [CDR LOCKHART]: No, sir.
- **2** LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Apparently not, no.
- 3 MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. As I say, the only thing left is
- **4** 92. 0kay? 0kay.
- 5 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Let me ask the government: How long
- 6 do you think this hearing will take?
- 7 ATC [MS. BALTES]: Our presentation will be quite brief.
- 8 MJ [COL POHL]: I always hear "quite brief" just seems
- 9 to me Mr. Kammen.
- 10 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: We'd like to be able, if the court
- 11 would order the opportunity for us to visit with Mr. Nashiri
- 12 in the afternoon.
- MJ [COL POHL]: Okay. I am sure that we will get done
- **14** in the morning.
- 15 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: I would think.
- 16 MJ [COL POHL]: From looking at it, I think it's not
- 17 going to take more than an hour and I think that's probably
- 18 long. And do you have any reason to believe that if you have
- 19 the afternoon off, there would be any prohibition of you
- 20 visiting your client?
- 21 LDC [MR. KAMMEN]: Well --
- TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Sir, we can help facilitate that.
- 23 MJ [COL POHL]: Make that happen since he was scheduled

```
1 to be here.
 2
          TC [CDR LOCKHART]: Yes, sir.
 3
          MJ [COL POHL]: Commission is in recess until tomorrow
 4 at 0900.
    [The Military Commission recessed at 1735, 13 June 2013.]
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
```