- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0906,
- 2 13 September 2021.]
- **3** MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission is called to order.
- 4 Trial Counsel, please account for all the government
- 5 counsel who are present both here and at the RHR.
- **6** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Good morning, Your Honor.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: Good morning.
- 8 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Representing the United States are
- 9 Mr. Clay Trivett, Mr. Robert Swann, Mr. Edward Ryan,
- 10 Mr. Christopher Dykstra. Major Jackson Hall has joined us and
- 11 is no longer in the Remote Hearing Room.
- 12 Also at counsel table are paralegals Mr. Dale Cox,
- 13 Mr. Rudolph Gibbs, and Ms. Carissa Grippando. Also present in
- 14 the courtroom from the Federal Bureau of Investigation,
- 15 Supervisory Special Agent Rami Nimri and Supervisory
- **16** Intelligence Analyst Kimberly Waltz.
- 17 These proceedings are being transmitted via closed
- 18 circuit television to sites in the continental United States
- 19 pursuant to the commission's previous orders.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Trivett.
- 21 Learned Counsel, please account for all defense
- 22 counsel who are both present here and at the Remote Hearing
- 23 Room.

- **1** Mr. Sowards.
- 2 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning.
- **3** Gary Sowards appearing on behalf of Mr. Mohammad, who is here,
- 4 along with David Nevin and Rita Radostitz. I'm also joined in
- 5 the courtroom by Samantha Kennedy, and I'm unaware of anyone
- 6 presently in the Remote Hearing Room.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Sowards.
- 8 Ms. Bormann?
- **9** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Present today in court are
- 10 Mr. Bin'Attash, Major Jay Peer, and myself.
- 11 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Thank you.
- **12** Mr. Bruck?
- 13 LDC [MR. BRUCK]: Good morning, Your Honor. David Bruck
- 14 for Ramzi Binalshibh. Present with me are Mr. Wyatt Feeler
- 15 and Major Szonja Johnson. Present at the Remote Hearing Room
- 16 are Ms. Donna Cline and Lieutenant Clayton Lawrence. And I
- 17 believe that Major Johnson has to go on the record for the
- 18 first time.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 20 DC [Maj JOHNSON]: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is
- 21 Major Szonja Johnson of the United States Air Force. I have
- 22 been detailed by Brigadier General John Baker, Chief Defense
- 23 Counsel, Military Commissions Defense Organization. My

- 1 detailing letter was AE 004DDD, which was filed last Friday
- 2 electronically, 10 September 2021. I am qualified and
- 3 certified under Article 27(b), sworn under Article 42(a) of
- 4 the Uniform Code of Military Justice. I'm qualified and
- 5 certified under the Rules of Military Commissions 502 and 503.
- 6 I've not acted in any ways that would tend to
- 7 disqualify me, and I've read all the relevant protective
- **8** orders and signed all the relevant MOUs.
- 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you. If you could please raise
- **10** your right hand.
- 11 [Counsel was sworn.]
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you. You may have a seat.
- Mr. Connell?
- 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Good morning, Your Honor. Present in
- 15 Courtroom 2 are myself, James Connell, and Lieutenant Corey
- 16 Krzan of the United States Navy. Present in the courtroom at
- 17 the Remote Hearing Room in Virginia are Alka Pradhan and
- 18 Lieutenant Commander Leah OBrien of the United States Navy.
- **19** MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- 20 And Mr. Gleason?
- 21 DC [MR. GLEASON]: Good morning, Your Honor. Present in
- 22 the courtroom for Mr. Hawsawi is Sean Gleason, Ms. Suzanne
- 23 Lachelier, Lieutenant Colonel Jennifer Williams. Major Joseph

- **1** Wilkinson II is present at Guantanamo, but he is currently
- 2 absent from the courtroom. And Mr. Hawsawi's learned counsel,
- 3 Mr. Ruiz, is absent from the courtroom and the Remote Hearing
- 4 Facility as he has been excused by the commission.
- 5 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Gleason.
- 6 And I note that Mr. Hawsawi, it appears, is absent.
- 7 The other accused, Mr. Mohammad, Mr. Bin'Attash,
- 8 Mr. Binalshibh, and Mr. Ali are all present.
- **9** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Judge, I would like to put something
- 10 on the record regarding Mr. al Hawsawi.
- 11 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure. Please step forward.
- 12 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: We had agreed with Mr. al Hawsawi
- 13 that he would come to court in meetings on Saturday. And this
- 14 morning we got a message that he was not coming because he was
- 15 in pain. We were told that -- and this is from him. We were
- 16 informed that he was not able to get the shot, the pain
- 17 medication that he takes; that he was told he might be able to
- 18 get it when he comes to court; that the person who administers
- 19 it, because it is an injection, would be here. And he was in
- 20 too much pain to move.
- 21 His blood pressure was very elevated, 172 over 125.
- 22 And he did not feel disposed to be able to come to court.
- Upon arriving in court, my fellow counsel was informed

- 1 by the government that Mr. al Hawsawi had now received a shot,
- 2 apparently, and we -- that's essentially the words -- the word
- **3** we have. I -- I hesitate to -- and I believe the prosecution
- 4 was probably informed by the JTF. At this point, we have
- 5 conflicting information and there's been a pattern of
- 6 conflicting information from JTF. So Mr. Hawsawi would like
- 7 to come to court, is our understanding, but because of the
- 8 pain that he's in -- and we don't want to trigger an FCE here,
- 9 but because of the pain he's in, he's unable to make it.
- I don't know how long it takes for the injection to
- 11 take effect and I don't know, you know, whether he will feel
- 12 disposed once it does take effect. I don't know when it was
- 13 administered either. He -- yeah.
- 14 So that -- I mean, we've got a pattern with JTF and
- 15 this is my concern. I was going to address this afterwards,
- 16 but I'll address it now just so to give Your Honor a context.
- 17 The JTF has gone from -- in the last week, telling us on a day
- 18 when we had agreed to have meetings, telling Mr. Hawsawi that
- 19 we had cancelled and telling us that he had cancelled. Then
- 20 an hour later, telling us, oh, yeah, there's a meeting and we
- 21 rush over to Echo II only to find out that he's been there and
- 22 he was told we had cancelled.
- 23 Another time when we had agreed with him not to have a

- 1 meeting, this was just on Friday, September 10th, we were told
- 2 in the morning, oh, Mr. Hawsawi wants to meet this afternoon.
- 3 Counsel went over there and then was told he's not here.
- 4 Counsel was kept there for several hours with the impression
- 5 that messages were being exchanged back and forth to JTF to
- 6 verify whether or not Mr. Hawsawi wanted to show up.
- 7 Ultimately, he never did show up. And when we spoke with him
- 8 later, we found out there never was any communication with him
- 9 on Friday about a meeting and he never requested a meeting on
- **10** Friday.
- 11 So my point, coming back to this morning, is even
- 12 though we have word that he supposedly got this injection of
- 13 pain medication, it's difficult for us to really believe
- 14 what's happening on the ground. And the -- my understanding
- 15 right now is Mr. Hawsawi would like to come, and my
- 16 understanding from him is that he has been in too much pain to
- 17 make it here. And I say this with full understanding that he
- 18 does not want to trigger, I hope Your Honor's full
- 19 understanding, he does not want to trigger an FCE but he would
- 20 like to come.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: A forcible cell extraction?
- **22** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Sorry.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: I'm just trying to make sure I'm

- 1 understanding.
- 2 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Yes, sir. Apologies for using the
- 3 acronym, forcible cell extraction.
- **4** MJ [Col McCALL]: All right.
- **5** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: So I just wanted to give you the
- 6 background that we've had with JTF and the difficulties in
- 7 communication. They have an SOP to walk -- how to walk a
- 8 straight line over there, but they can't somehow develop an
- **9** SOP for how to communicate to counsel and to Mr. al Hawsawi
- 10 whether or not we have a meeting. It's -- it's beyond me why
- 11 it's still so complicated after 13 years.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. I appreciate you bringing that to
- 13 the commission's attention. I want to see if perhaps the
- 14 government has a witness that can address some of these issues
- 15 and then we'll go from there.
- 16 Mr. Trivett? Or Mr. Swann?
- 17 LIEUTENANT COLONEL, was called as a witness for the
- 18 prosecution, was sworn, and testified as follows:
- 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 20 Questions by the Trial Counsel [MR. SWANN]:
- 21 Q. Please be seated. Are you an Assistant Staff Judge
- 22 Advocate with the office of the Staff Judge Advocate here at
- 23 Guantanamo Bay Cuba?

- **1** A. I am.
- 2 Q. All right. Lieutenant Colonel, Colonel, did you have
- 3 advise -- did you have occasion to advise Mr. Hawsawi of his
- 4 right to attend today's proceeding?
- **5** A. I did.
- **6** Q. And do you have in front of you what's been marked as
- **7** Appellate Exhibit 838F?
- **8** A. Yes.
- **9** Q. This document consists of three pages?
- **10** A. Correct.
- 11 Q. On the second page of that document, there appears to
- 12 be a signature. Is that the signature of Mustafa Ahmed Adam
- **13** al Hawsawi?
- **14** A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And did you advise him of his rights using the English
- **16** version of this form?
- **17** A. I did.
- 18 Q. And did he indicate that -- well, first of all, did he
- 19 indicate that he wanted to attend today's proceeding?
- **20** A. Not to me.
- 21 Q. All right. Now, you've heard what Ms. Lachelier has
- 22 said this morning.
- **23** A. Correct.

- 1 Q. First of all, did Mr. Hawsawi get his shot this
- 2 morning?
- A. He did.
- **4** Q. And did he get that shot after he signed this waiver
- 5 to attend today's proceeding?
- **6** A. He did.
- 7 Q. All right. Drill down into that a little bit. What
- 8 time did you go to see him this morning?
- **9** A. Approximately 0607.
- 10 Q. And was he in bed or what?
- 11 A. No. He was -- he was up, moving around.
- **12** Q. And what did you do next?
- 13 A. I asked him -- I asked him if he wanted to attend the
- 14 session here today, and he said -- he said no, he was in pain.
- 15 Q. All right. Did he indicate what kind of pain he was
- **16** in?
- 17 A. Not at that time.
- 18 Q. Then did he indicate -- what did you do with respect
- 19 to this waiver at that time?
- A. At that point in time, I told him I'd have to read him
- 21 this waiver. He went over, grabbed a chair, sat down, and
- 22 listened to me read this waiver verbatim through to him. And
- 23 then after I was finished reading the waiver, he motioned for

- 1 me to hand him the document so he can sign the document, and
- 2 then he signed the document.
- **3** Q. All right. Do you believe his waiver this morning was
- **4** a voluntary waiver?
- **5** A. I do.
- **6** TC [MR. SWANN]: Nothing further, sir.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: Defense, would you like to question this
- 8 witness?
- 9 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 10 Questions by the Assistant Defense Counsel [MS. LACHELIER]:
- 11 Q. Good morning, Major -- sorry. Good morning, Colonel.
- **12** At what time did Mr. al Hawsawi sign the waiver?
- 13 A. He signed the waiver approximately 0607.
- 14 Q. And it's your testimony that he got the shot after he
- 15 signed the waiver ----
- **16** A. I saw ----
- **17** Q. ---- correct?
- 18 A. ---- him receive the shot after he signed the waiver,
- 19 correct.
- **20** Q. And what time did he get the shot?
- 21 A. Approximately 0730.
- Q. Did he -- you did not ask him how he was feeling?
- **23** A. I did not.

- 1 Q. You did not have a discussion with him about his
- 2 health or anything, any details about his health?
- **3** A. Not at -- not at the time when he signed the waiver.
- 4 Afterwards I overheard the nurse discuss his health with him
- 5 as she was giving him his shot.
- **6** Q. Okay. So you don't know how long it takes for that
- 7 shot to take effect?
- **8** A. I do not.
- **9** Q. Were you there when he was praying this morning?
- 10 A. I believe -- I believe -- I was there when prayers
- 11 were happening, correct, this morning.
- 12 Q. So you -- but you weren't there when -- you weren't
- 13 there when he fell next to Mr. Mohammad during prayer this
- **14** morning, were you?
- **15** A. I did not see that.
- 16 Q. And you said he sat down when you read him the waiver;
- 17 isn't that correct?
- **18** A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. And that was at approximately 6:00 or 6:30 you said?
- **20** A. 0607.
- 21 Q. Okay. Was he asked again after the shot? After the
- 22 shot would have had time to take effect, so not right at 7:30
- 23 when it was given, but was he asked again whether he wanted to

- 1 come to court?
- 2 A. Yes. When I -- when I arrived here, I called back to
- 3 the watch commander and asked if they were asking him if he
- 4 wanted to come back, and that was probably at -- approximately
- 5 an hour after he received the shot. And they stated that when
- **6** they tried to get -- to ask him if he wanted to come back to
- 7 the commissions, he was asleep and he wasn't coming to the
- 8 door.
- **9** Q. Okay. So you actually did not talk to him after the
- 10 shot. You -- you -- the information you just conveyed is from
- 11 the watch commander, correct?
- **12** A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. So you do not have personal knowledge, actually, of
- **14** what his state was after the shot this morning?
- **15** A. No.
- **16** Q. Okay.
- 17 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Thank you.
- 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: Mr. Swann, anything further with this
- **19** witness?
- 20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 21 Questions by the Trial Counsel [MR. SWANN]:
- Q. Colonel, did he ever tell you that he wanted to come
- 23 but for the pain that he claimed that he was in?

- 1 A. He did not say that to me.
- 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. What I'm going to do is I'm
- 3 going to go ahead and take a recess and consider this issue.
- 4 Again, as I mentioned on Friday, this past Friday, I'm trying
- 5 to be flexible here where we're not requiring the accused to
- 6 come to every hearing. And yet I don't want to proceed when
- 7 there's a cloud over whether or not it was a voluntary
- 8 decision on the part of an accused not to come, even though
- **9** with Mr. Hawsawi we're not getting into necessarily matters
- 10 where his counsel are -- you know, they've deferred until
- 11 Mr. Ruiz is available. So we're not really getting into
- 12 matters dealing with him.
- 13 But I'm going to consider this and figure out what
- 14 options we have. And again, what I would like counsel to
- 15 consider is if they're requesting that we -- again, one luxury
- 16 we have this week is that we do have some matters that we're
- 17 taking up, some ex parte hearings. We were going to have the
- 18 ex parte briefing from Mr. Mohammad's team this afternoon. We
- 19 could flip-flop and have continued argument this afternoon and
- 20 perhaps hear the ex parte briefing this morning. I'm going to
- 21 consider that as an option. And -- but I will ask counsel if
- 22 that's something they are interested in. But for now, we're
- 23 going to go ahead and just take a short recess.

- 1 Commission is in recess.
- 2 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0922, 13 September 2021.]
- 3 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0933,
- 4 13 September 2021.]
- 5 MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission is called to order. The
- 6 parties are still present with the absence of Mr. al Hawsawi.
- 7 So this is what I'd like to do going forward.
- 8 Mr. Swann, you know, I'm not comfortable with the state of the
- 9 testimony on Mr. al Hawsawi's desire or not to be here. So if
- 10 you can -- you can go ahead and leave the courtroom and if you
- 11 can find out from the JTF whether the shot has taken effect,
- 12 whether Mr. Hawsawi wants to be brought here, because there
- 13 are some matters we can take up outside of his presence that I
- 14 need to put on the record. But if you can find out more
- 15 information on whether or not he wants to come now that he has
- 16 received his shot back in -- around 7:30.
- 17 TC [MR. SWANN]: I've done that already, sir.
- 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Perfect.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: I sent folks to make the inquiry. I
- 20 should have an answer shortly, assuming that Mr. Hawsawi
- 21 decides to wake up. But that's in -- that's in the works.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Swann.
- 23 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Judge, I would ask that they present

- 1 a new form to Mr. Hawsawi if there is a waiver.
- 2 Just to draw the court's attention, I don't know if
- 3 you noticed, but the form was doctored. Mr. al Hawsawi signed
- 4 it at 6:00 in the morning per the SJA's testimony and then
- 5 there was a 9:00 time entered on the form, and the SJA's
- 6 testimony verified that Mr. Hawsawi was not asked later
- 7 whether he wanted to come or not. So the form -- the time on
- 8 the form was changed after Mr. al Hawsawi signed it and we
- 9 would like to see -- if he decides not to come this morning,
- 10 we would like to see a form that is signed by him at the
- **11** appropriate time ----
- **12** MJ [Col McCALL]: I'm not ----
- **13** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: ---- not doctored.
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: I'm not going to get into whether it was
- 15 doctored or not. I'll just say a new form, given that there
- 16 was a question as to his -- whether it was a voluntary waiver.
- 17 Let's go ahead and get that.
- 18 All right. While that is working, we'll go through
- 19 some other procedures, matters I want to take up. All right.
- 20 So first of all, just some housekeeping. Just for the record,
- 21 I did not conduct a conference pursuant to Rules for Military
- 22 Commission 802 on this past Friday. Instead, we recessed for
- 23 lunch and for the commission to receive an ex parte

- 1 presentation from Mr. Binalshibh's defense team as to their
- 2 defense theory of the case.
- 3 And then I want to go ahead and make a ruling on the
- 4 challenges that are before the court. So the first item we're
- 5 going to take up is the court's ruling as to the defense
- **6** motion for the judge to disqualify or recuse himself from this
- 7 commission. I've reached a ruling on this issue and will
- 8 state the salient points on the record this morning. This
- **9** will be followed shortly by a written ruling.
- 10 By way of procedural background, on
- **11** 6 September 2021 ----
- **12** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge?
- 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yes.
- 14 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: We're getting a notice from the
- 15 interpreters to slow down because they can't keep up with you
- **16** when you're reading.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that. Thank you,
- 18 Ms. Bormann. I will try to speak slower. When I'm reading, I
- 19 know that that causes strain for the interpreters.
- 20 All right. By way of procedural background, on 6
- 21 September 2021, I invited the parties to ask voir dire
- 22 questions of me pursuant to Rule for Military Commission
- 23 902(d)(2). I also released a 2006/2007 officer performance

- 1 report and a letter of evaluation in AE 001Q and a 2015
- 2 officer performance report and two letters of evaluation in AE
- **3** 001R.
- 4 Counsel for Mr. Mohammad, Mr. Bin'Attash,
- 5 Mr. Binalshibh, and Mr. Ali questioned me. Counsel for
- 6 Mr. Hawsawi requested to defer voir dire due to the absence of
- 7 learned counsel, Mr. Ruiz. The commission granted the
- 8 deferral.
- **9** The commission did not schedule proceedings on 9
- 10 September 2021 to allow the parties to prepare any challenges
- 11 that they had to my service as presiding judge and to consult
- 12 with their clients, the accused.
- On 10 September 2021, the government advised that they
- 14 had no challenge. Counsel for Mr. Mohammad and Mr. Bin'Attash
- 15 made challenges to my qualifications. Counsel for
- 16 Mr. Binalshibh joined the challenges. Counsel for Mr. Ali did
- 17 not. Counsel for Mr. Hawsawi did not take a position as they
- 18 had, as previously mentioned, deferred voir dire.
- 19 The first challenge, which was made by counsel for
- 20 Mr. Mohammad, was essentially that I am disqualified under
- **21** R.M.C. 902(a) because of my discussions with Chief Judge
- 22 Watkins regarding my decision to -- whether or not to recuse
- 23 myself after the Assistant Secretary of Defense clarified that

- 1 the chief trial judge did not have the authority to waive the
- 2 two-year experience requirement in paragraph 6-3.d. of the
- 3 Regulation for Trial by Military Commissions and that this
- 4 creates an appearance, to a reasonable person, that I have
- 5 knowledge of facts that give me a personal interest in the
- 6 litigation, creating an appearance of partiality, even if no
- 7 actual partiality exists.
- 8 Specifically, counsel for Mr. Mohammad assert that
- 9 notwithstanding the 7 September 2021 decision by the U.S.
- 10 Court of Military Commissions Review on this issue, my
- 11 decision to recuse myself was premature and is evidence of, or
- 12 at least creates the appearance of, that I had taken a side in
- 13 the AE 811 litigation prior to affording counsel for the
- 14 accused an opportunity to argue that paragraph 6-3.d.
- 15 conflicts with the judicial eligibility requirements in 10
- **16** U.S.C. Section 948j(b) and R.M.C. 503(b).
- 17 Findings: Based upon the evidence before the
- 18 commission and the voir dire by the parties, I make the
- 19 following findings:
- 20 One, I was initially detailed to this case on 16
- 21 October 2020. On 19 October 2020, the government filed AE 806
- 22 setting forth their position that I was not qualified to serve
- 23 as the judge in this case because I lacked the two-year

- 1 judicial experience requirement set forth in paragraph 6-3.d.
- **2** of the Regulation for Trial by Military Commissions.
- 3 Two, on 26 October 2020, the Chief Trial Judge,
- 4 Colonel Douglas Watkins, sent an action memorandum to the
- 5 Secretary of Defense requesting him to clarify that the chief
- 6 trial judge had the authority to waive the two-year judicial
- 7 experience regulatory requirement. I was aware that
- 8 Colonel Watkins had requested this clarification.
- **9** Three, on 16 November 2020, the Deputy Secretary of
- 10 Defense advised the chief trial judge that he did not have the
- 11 authority to waive the two-year requirement.
- 12 Four, shortly after receiving notice of the 16
- 13 November 2020 decision by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, I
- 14 decided to recuse myself from this case, as I did not have the
- 15 required two years of judicial experience. Sometime in
- 16 November of 2020, I communicated this to the chief trial
- 17 judge. Colonel Watkins relayed to me that he would detail
- 18 someone else to be the military judge, so I didn't feel a need
- **19** to move forward with recusing myself.
- 20 Five, on 8 December 2020, the government filed AE
- 21 806A, a motion for me to recuse myself because I didn't meet
- 22 the two-year judicial experience requirement. I had already
- 23 decided to recuse myself before the government filed this

- 1 motion and communicated this to -- and I had communicated this
- 2 to Colonel Watkins. As such, the government motion had no
- **3** effect on my decision.
- 4 Six, on 14 December 2020, Chief Judge Watkins detailed
- 5 himself to this case, effectively ending my service as the
- 6 presiding military judge at that time.
- 7 Seven, at some point after 14 December 2020, the
- 8 defense filed AE 811 in this commission alleging unlawful
- 9 influence by the Secretary of Defense upon the Chief Trial
- 10 Judge, Colonel Watkins. Counsel for Mr. Bin'Attash and
- 11 Mr. Ali also filed a writ with the U.S. Court of Military
- 12 Commissions Review alleging the same.
- 13 Eight, on 31 July 2021, I had been in place as a
- 14 military judge for two years.
- Nine, on 19 August 2021, I was renominated by The
- **16** Judge Advocate General of the Air Force to the pool of
- 17 military commissions judges.
- Ten, on 20 August 2021, the new Chief Judge, Colonel
- 19 Lanny Acosta, detailed me to be the presiding judge over this
- 20 commission.
- 21 Eleven, on 7 September 2021, the U.S. Court of
- 22 Military Commissions Review issued a decision on the defense
- 23 writ, A, vacating all decisions issued by Judge McCall while

- 1 he had less than two years of judicial experience because he
- 2 was not qualified to sit as the accused trial judge in the
- 3 military commission due to the lack of two years of judicial
- 4 experience and, B, holding that the Deputy SECDEF did not act
- 5 improperly, in that he did not unlawfully influence Chief
- 6 Trial Judge Watkins' decisions or Judge McCall.
- 7 Twelve, the U.S.C.M.C.R. decision is binding on this
- 8 court unless overruled by that court or a superior court.
- 9 Thirteen, the gravamen of the challenge is that I have
- 10 taken a position regarding whether paragraph 6-3.d. of the
- 11 R.T.M.C. conflicts with 10 U.S.C. Section 948j(b) and
- 12 R.M.C. 503(b), and I have an interest in the answer. I do
- 13 not. As to the question of whether my handling of this matter
- 14 creates an appearance of not being impartial, a judge has a
- 15 sua sponte duty to recuse himself if he determines that there
- 16 is a proper reason to do so. Once I was aware that Colonel
- 17 Watkins did not have the authority to waive the two-year
- 18 requirement of judicial experience, I properly decided that I
- 19 would recuse myself. There is no reason that such a decision
- 20 would cause any appearance of partiality or bias.
- 21 Fourteen, I now meet the eligibility requirements of
- 22 10 U.S.C. Section 948j(b) and R.M.C. 503(b) and also the
- 23 two-year judicial experience requirement in paragraph 6-3.d.

- 1 of the R.T.M.C. Whether the regulation conflicts with the
- 2 statute is irrelevant to my qualifications to preside over
- 3 this military commission.
- 4 Ruling: The challenge from counsel for Mr. Mohammad
- 5 is denied.
- **6** The second challenge was made by counsel for
- 7 Mr. Bin'Attash and it asserts that I am disqualified from
- 8 presiding because I cannot meet the standards set out in the
- **9** Air Force Rules of Professional Conduct Rule 1.1 regarding
- 10 competence, CANON III of the -- to the Air Force Uniform Code
- 11 of Judicial Conduct regarding diligence, and Chapter 3 of
- **12** Standard 6-1.1 of the Air Force Standards for Criminal
- 13 Justice, which provide that the military judge should give
- 14 each case individual treatment and base their decisions on the
- 15 particular facts of the case.
- 16 Collectively, the challenge is that I don't have the
- 17 time to digest the voluminous record that this case has
- 18 generated and that I don't have sufficient qualifications to
- 19 preside over a capital case. However, at the end of the
- 20 challenge, counsel for Mr. Bin'Attash stated that they don't
- 21 object to me absorbing information, but ask that I delay
- 22 litigation on matters that require me to adjudicate objections
- 23 and arguments when I'm not yet prepared.

- **1** Findings: One, I meet the statutory and regulatory
- **2** qualifications to preside over this case.
- 3 Two, Rule for Commissions -- Military Commissions
- 4 505(e)(1) provides that before assembly, the military judge
- 5 for a commissions case may be changed by the chief trial judge
- 6 without cause shown on the record. This commission has not
- 7 been assembled.
- 8 Three, this challenge isn't only directed at me.
- 9 Taken to its logical conclusion, it alleges that any newly
- 10 detailed military judge would be unqualified to preside over
- 11 this case given its complexity and the volume of filings and
- 12 rulings that have already been completed.
- 13 Four, as Congress established, the Military Commission
- **14** Act in part for the -- established the Military Commissions
- 15 Act in part for the express purpose of trying this case and
- 16 these accused. This commission can reasonably infer that
- 17 Congress, and subsequently the Executive Branch agencies
- 18 charged with implementing the Military Commissions Act,
- 19 specifically considered the requisite qualifications for a
- 20 military judge knowing the possible complexity associated with
- 21 trying a high-profile capital case involving international law
- **22** and the handling of classified evidence.
- Even with all these issues in mind, Congress and the

- 1 Executive Branch established the qualifications that we have
- 2 before us, without exception, for the particular nuances or
- 3 difficulties of this case.
- 4 Five, while I am aware of the challenges of assuming
- 5 the role of military judge at this stage in the proceedings,
- **6** having considered my obligations under the Air Force Rules of
- 7 Professional Conduct, the Air Force Standards for Criminal
- 8 Justice, and the Air Force Code of Judicial Conduct, I do
- 9 believe that I possess the requisite skill to diligently and
- 10 competently perform the duties of the military judge in this
- 11 commission.
- 12 Six, I have tried to expedite my learning curve by
- 13 requesting ex parte presentations from the defense regarding
- 14 their theories of the case and an ex parte presentation from
- 15 the government to understand what has taken place in
- 16 classified discovery and what summaries and substitutions are
- **17** currently pending.
- 18 Seven, at a bare minimum, we are at least one year
- 19 away from trial. I will ensure that I am fully apprised of
- 20 the procedural history and the background of any motion before
- 21 I -- prior to any ruling. I am not bound by any particular
- 22 timeline to get to trial.
- Eight, at the conclusion of counsel for

- 1 Mr. Bin'Attash's challenge, she asked that I delay litigation
- 2 on matters that will require me to adjudicate objections and
- **3** arguments while I am not in a prepared state and while I am
- 4 not acting consistently with -- with my legal requirement as
- 5 an attorney for the United States Air Force and as a judge. I
- 6 can affirm that I will not act immediately on matters that I
- 7 believe I am unprepared to adjudicate.
- 8 So my ruling is the challenge from counsel for
- **9** Mr. Bin'Attash is denied. I can preside over this case in
- 10 both a competent and diligent manner in compliance with all
- 11 Air Force professional responsibility mandates. And again, a
- 12 written ruling will be forthcoming.
- 13 All right. Moving on to some more procedural matters.
- **14** I see -- yes, Mr. Connell.
- 15 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, may I ask for one clarification?
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yes.
- 17 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, in your findings regarding the
- 18 first challenge, you stated that the defense filed AE 811 and
- 19 that Mr. al Baluchi and Mr. Bin'Attash had filed a writ. In
- 20 your written follow-up, will you be sure to clarify that
- 21 Mr. Bin'Attash and Mr. al Baluchi have a separate position
- 22 stated in the AE 811 series which is in AE 811A? I ask solely
- 23 because the positions of the parties and the trial court are

- 1 so important to the appellate court.
- 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: I will do so.
- 3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir.
- 4 MJ [Col McCALL]: I'll make sure to clarify those
- 5 positions.
- 6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. The commission also issued
- 8 five rulings over the weekend that I wanted to bring to your
- **9** attention. Four of the rulings, AE 697E, AE 776D, AE 775D,
- 10 and AE 785G were rulings pursuant to Military Commission Rule
- 11 of Evidence 505(h) and Rule for Military Commissions 806(b)(2)
- 12 regarding closed hearings.
- 13 The fifth ruling was AE 833RR, a ruling on
- 14 Mr. Hawsawi's motion to defer briefing ordered in AE 833FF and
- 15 objection to proceeding in the absence of learned counsel
- **16** dated 12 September 2021.
- 17 Before we proceed -- so Mr. Trivett, I do have a
- 18 couple of questions in regard to AE 833DD, the government's
- 19 notice of non-objection to certain defense notices.
- 20 So on page 2 of AE 833DD, in its discussion of
- 21 materials noticed in AE 775C and 776C, the government only
- 22 addresses two of the three classified items which were
- 23 noticed, that being the classification guidelines in

- **1** MEA-FBI-0022584-89.
- 2 Mr. Mohammad's notices in AE 775C and AE 776C,
- 3 however, also referenced a third item. It's the memorandum
- 4 dated 1 July 2021. Appears to be the same document as AE 628
- 5 with six -- E times six Attachment B. So my question for you,
- 6 Mr. Trivett, is: Was -- was that an oversight or did the
- 7 government intend that its discussion of Mr. Mohammad's notice
- 8 in AE 785F, would it cover that 1 July 2021 memo?
- 9 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Sir, I -- I think it's an oversight.
- 10 If I can have one minute to confer.
- 11 MJ [Col McCALL]: Please. Take your time. So I'll just
- 12 go ahead while you're looking, but in issuing the closure
- 13 orders, I presumed that to be the case. I know counsel had
- 14 mentioned on the record that they didn't object to any of the
- 15 505 notices. But before actually having the closed session, I
- 16 wanted to give you the opportunity to review that and confirm.
- 17 So take your time. Let me know.
- 18 [Pause.]
- 19 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you for the commission's
- 20 indulgence, sir. We don't have an objection to that. It was
- **21** an oversight.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. And it's addressed in a footnote
- 23 in my rulings, so I think it's covered with it being on the

- 1 record. Okay. Thank you.
- 2 All right. One other matter. Over the weekend, I
- 3 also reviewed what has been filed so far in AE 833CC, that's
- 4 Mr. Mohammad's motion to defer the government's ex parte
- 5 presentation. I've reviewed the filing, the government's
- 6 response, along with the case law and prior rulings that were
- 7 referenced therein. At this time, unless I see something in
- 8 the written replies that are due today that changes my
- 9 inclination, I'm no longer inclined to hear oral argument on
- 10 this issue. I feel comfortable with the law and what I'm
- 11 allowed to do. I just wanted to let the parties know that.
- 12 So for the other matters, before we move into the
- 13 other AEs that I do want to hear oral argument on for sure,
- 14 Mr. Swann, did you get any further clarification or do we need
- 15 to take a recess?
- 16 TC [MR. SWANN]: The latest clarification is, is that the
- 17 witness has returned to the camp and he's going to redo the
- 18 waiver. Probably will require to wake up Mr. Hawsawi, but
- 19 we'll do that. And then the witness will inform me exactly
- 20 what happened.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Well, so what we'll do is -- we
- 22 don't need to rush to this issue. So we'll go ahead and take
- 23 a recess and -- open-ended. And if the government can let my

- 1 team know when we're ready to go back on the record with some
- 2 clarification of this issue, and then we'll go forward at that
- 3 point.
- **4** TC [MR. SWANN]: We can do that, sir.
- 5 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. Thank you. The commission
- **6** is in recess.
- 7 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0957, 13 September 2021.]
- 8 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1107,
- 9 13 September 2021.]
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission will come to order. I
- 11 notice the accused are still present, except for
- 12 Mr. al Hawsawi. And it also appears that Mr. Binalshibh has
- **13** stepped out.
- 14 LDC [MR. BRUCK]: We expect him to be back momentarily.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 16 All right. Mr. Trivett or Mr. Swann, does the
- 17 government have any further evidence regarding Mr. Hawsawi's
- **18** absence this morning?
- 19 REDIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED
- 20 Questions by the Trial Counsel [MR. SWANN]:
- Q. Colonel, have a seat, please. I remind you that you
- 22 are still under oath.
- In the last hour or so, did you return to the camp and

1 revisit Mr. Hawsawi? 2 T did. Α 3 Q. And do you have a three-page document in front of you 4 which is marked Appellate Exhibit 838H? 5 Α. T do. 6 Is there a signature on the second page of that 7 document? 8 There is. Α. 9 Did you follow the procedure that you used earlier 0. 10 this morning in advising Mr. Hawsawi of his right to attend 11 today's proceeding? 12 Α. I did. 13 And what did he say he wanted to do? 14 He -- he asked if there was a closed session in the 15 afternoon. I informed him at 1400. And he said he didn't 16 want to attend. So he -- he did not want to come. 17 TC [MR. SWANN]: I have no further questions, sir. 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Swann. 19 Ms. Lachelier, do you have any questions for this 20 witness? 21 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Yes, briefly, Judge. 22 [END OF PAGE]

23

1 RECROSS-EXAMINATION CONTINUED

- 2 Questions by the Assistant Defense Counsel [MS. LACHELIER]:
- **3** Q. Hello again. I just wanted to clarify, was he
- 4 informed that he could come this morning? You said -- because
- 5 you mentioned he asked about a closed session.
- **6** A. Yes. I told him if he wanted to come now, we would
- 7 bring him now.
- **8** Q. Okay. And he asked if there was a closed session or
- **9** he was interested in coming this afternoon?
- 10 A. He asked if there was -- he asked me if there was a
- 11 closed session this afternoon.
- 12 Q. Okay. So as if to confirm whether there was or was
- **13** not a closed session coming?
- **14** A. Correct.
- 15 Q. Okay. Understood.
- **16** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: I have no further questions, Judge.
- 17 Thank you.
- 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- 19 All right. The witness can step down, leave the
- 20 courtroom.
- 21 [The witness was excused, and withdrew from the courtroom.]
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission finds that Mr. Hawsawi
- 23 has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to be present

1 at today's session. 2 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Judge, I did want to add -- sorry, I 3 apologize ----4 MJ [Col McCALL]: No, please. Go ahead. 5 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: ---- I didn't realize you were going 6 to make your findings right away. We already had marked 7 Appellate Exhibit 838G and we provided a copy to the 8 government. I just wanted to put that in the record, and 9 we'll provide copies to the co-accused's counsel. And it's 10 just -- it just makes a record of a special request we sent to 11 JTF that explains the scenarios that I gave you this morning 12 of what occurred. I won't go into it again, but that way it's 13 on the record for the commission to understand exactly what 14 happened with the miscommunications. 15 And I wanted to emphasize to the judge we don't have 16 the ability to call back by phone. I don't know if you were aware of that or not. We've asked in the past for that 17 18 ability. They're now in Camp V. Camp V does have telephonic 19 ability that habeas counsel uses the telephone. And even if 20 it was just for the purpose of confirming these kind of 21 morning sessions, do you want to come to court or not, a 22 simple direct phone call with us would avoid this telephone 23 game and the delays we had this morning. It seems like it

- 1 would be something fairly simple to institute. There is the
- 2 capacity to do it at Camp V, and habeas counsel calls from the
- **3** U.S. to their -- to their clients.
- 4 So I just would mention that to the judge. It seems
- 5 like we could get around all this nonsense, quite frankly.
- 6 But I would like to admit AE 838G to explain to the commission
- 7 exactly what happened with the meetings.
- 8 MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that, Ms. Lachelier. And
- 9 just to make sure, but at this time you're not asking for any
- 10 particular relief from the commission, correct? This is just
- 11 a note on the record of what you had gone through and ----
- 12 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Correct. It's a pattern. I think
- 13 what we want to try to show the judge, both this current list
- 14 of events but also in the past, this is a recurring pattern,
- 15 unfortunately, and that's why I mentioned the phone calls. We
- 16 don't want these delays for an hour each morning, each time
- 17 there's a confusion about what Mr. Hawsawi said. And so some
- 18 way to get around that would -- so that we have a direct
- **19** ability to communicate and find out.
- He has -- he does have significant pain issues. His
- 21 situation does change from one day to the next. So it's
- 22 difficult for us to have a word the previous day that will be
- 23 confirmed the next morning. He was previously on two pain

- 1 medications, now he's graduated to a third pain medication.
- 2 He takes all three, including this injection I mentioned this
- 3 morning. So this is a recurring problem with us,
- 4 unfortunately, because of Mr. Hawsawi's health conditions.
- 5 And we're just trying to both alert the commission to it and
- **6** note that there was -- there are ways around it and to try to
- 7 resolve it.
- **8** MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- **9** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Thank you.
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: And I appreciate that, and the
- 11 commission is going to look into, you know, what options we
- 12 have on improving this process so that this isn't a continual
- 13 issue.
- **14** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Okay. Thank you, Judge.
- **15** MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. It is 11:12, almost 11:13.
- 16 Let's go ahead and we'll move into oral argument on AE 766.
- 17 That's Mr. Mohammad's motion to compel discovery of all
- 18 documents related to Mr. Mohammad's ICRC requests. Mr. -- oh,
- **19** Mr. Nevin?
- 20 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Your Honor, if I could, Ms. Radostitz is
- **21** going to argue this motion.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right.
- 23 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: I just wanted to say that, before we do

- 1 that -- it will only take me a moment. I heard you say this
- 2 morning that you had decided that there would be no oral
- 3 argument on 833 unless we changed your mind ----
- 4 MJ [Col McCALL]: That's my inclination. That's right.
- 5 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: ---- with our reply. Yeah. And I just
- 6 wanted to ask Your Honor, I imagine you know what I'm going to
- 7 say, but if you would -- if you would kindly give us the
- 8 opportunity to be fully heard before you make decisions on
- 9 the -- even on a matter that's collateral to the -- to the
- 10 final ruling, like holding an oral argument. This is -- this
- 11 is actually, I guess, the basis of our challenge that I
- 12 understand you've denied. And I mean no disrespect, but --
- 13 but I do request that you give us an opportunity fully to be
- 14 heard before arriving at conclusions about the case.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: I understand. I will look at the
- 16 replies. I will consider it some more on whether or not to
- 17 have oral argument. I know this is a discretionary area.
- 18 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: I understand the linkage that you're
- 20 seeing between that and the challenge.
- 21 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: I'll take it under consideration.
- 23 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thank you, Your Honor.

1 MJ [Col McCALL]: Mrs. Radostitz. 2 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Good morning, Your Honor. 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: Good morning. 4 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: In AE 766, Mr. Mohammad asks the 5 commission to compel the government to provide discovery 6 regarding communication facilitated by the International 7 Committee of the Red Cross, the ICRC. I'm going to limit my 8 oral argument to the items that we -- were not fully addressed by the government in their reply, instead of going through the 9 10 back-and-forth. I will also start with saying we do not see this as a motion for reconsideration. The information that 11 12 we're asking about and that has not yet been received is not 13 information that was already decided in other motions. 14 We have -- I want to acknowledge we have received some 15 of the information that we requested. We have received a 16 variety of SOPs. They are from various years and time 17 periods. But what we -- what I'm going to focus my argument 18 on is what we haven't received and why we need it. 19 So I want to give a little bit of background. The 20 government has conceded that the Geneva Conventions require 21 that the ICRC be allowed to facilitate communication between a 22 detainee, our client, charged with a war crime, and his or her

family. And since 2007, when Mr. Mohammad was brought to

23

- 1 Guantanamo, that has happened. I will note for the record
- 2 that it did not happen prior to 2007. The ICRC made numerous
- 3 requests about the location of people who had been reported as
- 4 disappeared, and our government refused to disclose where
- 5 those people were, including Mr. Mohammad.
- **6** But since 2007, the government has grudgingly
- 7 fulfilled their obligation through allowing Mr. Mohammad to
- 8 write to his family, although the number of letters is limited
- 9 to two letters per month and four postcards per month. And
- 10 then he is allowed to have calls on a semiregular basis.
- 11 Those have been interrupted because of the pandemic. And so
- 12 I'm going to talk about what was normal prior to the pandemic,
- 13 because everything has been disrupted, and that's not really
- 14 what our argument is about.
- Mr. Mohammad has a wife that he's been married to for
- **16** 30 years. Since he was brought to Guantanamo he has not had
- 17 the ability to communicate with her. He has eight children,
- 18 five boys and three girls, one of whom was born after he was
- 19 captured. He's attempted to maintain not just a relationship
- 20 with his family in general, but a relationship individually
- 21 with each of his children, just like everyone would like to
- **22** do.
- He also has seven living sisters who he tries to

- 1 maintain relationships with. And, as is common with his
- 2 Balochi heritage, he has dozens upon dozens of nieces and
- 3 nephews, many of whom he is very close with, others of whom he
- 4 has tried but failed to create and maintain relationships.
- 5 And that is through the assistance of the International Red
- 6 Cross and the United States and also the IC -- International
- 7 Red Crescent Society in his family's home country.
- 8 And how this works is the letters, he's provided the
- 9 paper that the ICRC creates. He sends it through the system.
- 10 It then goes to a censorship office. They read them, redact
- 11 things. This part of the process is what we don't know much
- 12 about and have asked for more information about. And then
- 13 those letters are sent on to the family through the ICRC in
- 14 the U.S. and the Red Crescent Society.
- 15 We don't know what is censored in those letters. And
- 16 then the same happens in reverse. His family members are
- 17 allowed to write to him. They are only allowed to do that at
- 18 -- they can write whenever they want, but they are only
- 19 delivered when the ICRC in their home country provides them to
- 20 the ICRC here who then physically brings them to Guantanamo.
- 21 They then are taken to a -- through a censorship process.
- 22 Again, we don't know much about that and that's what we're
- 23 asking for more information in. And then the censored letters

- **1** are provided to Mr. Mohammad. They are never provided to
- 2 counsel.
- 3 So there's been significant litigation about who is --
- 4 okay. So that's the letters part.
- 5 The second part is the calls. And a lot of how I have
- 6 to describe these is limited because of classification
- 7 guidance, so I'm going to be very careful in how I talk about
- 8 this. And Mr. Nevin is actually going to handle the
- **9** classified argument on this piece because of my travel
- 10 schedule, and he'll be able to explain that part a little bit
- **11** more in depth.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: But for now, I'm just going to call
- 14 them "calls."
- 15 So Mr. Mohammad is told that a call is scheduled with
- 16 his family and he gives a list of ten people who he would like
- 17 to be -- to participate on that call. That list is then
- 18 provided to someone in the U.S. Government who makes a
- 19 determination on some basis -- we don't know what -- as to
- 20 which of those ten people -- names will be provided to the
- 21 ICRC, who will then set up the visit.
- We don't know how that decision-making is made.
- 23 That's one of the things that we're asking for more

- 1 information about. But what will happen is that that list
- 2 may -- it will start with ten people, but by the time it gets
- 3 to the ICRC, it will have fewer than ten people on it. And
- 4 Mr. Mohammad is never allowed to add more people. So he
- 5 doesn't know how many have been stricken by the censors. So
- 6 now what should have been a family call with ten people could
- 7 be only with three people because maybe the seven people that
- 8 were approved by the censors have scheduling conflicts and
- 9 they're not able to go on -- on whatever day it's scheduled
- **10** for.
- 11 So without any clarity about how that process works,
- 12 we're unable to assist Mr. Mohammad or his family in figuring
- 13 out how to take full advantage of what the government says is
- 14 the process for these family calls.
- And so that's really what we're -- those are the
- 16 things that we're really concerned about. So we're not
- 17 seeking to relitigate who is stricken from those. What we
- 18 want to know is the process for how they're restricted. We're
- 19 not saying that we want to know why Mr. Mohammad hasn't been
- 20 allowed to visit with his wife since he's been to Guantanamo
- 21 or since his capture. We want to know the process for
- 22 determining who is and who isn't. And I think that that isn't
- 23 as clear in the government's response as -- as we want it to

- 1 be.
- 2 So I want to step back for a minute and say this about
- 3 this process of discovery. As you noted in the AE 833
- 4 scheduling order, there are at least 33 separate discovery
- 5 motions currently pending before this commission. I think
- 6 there's actually probably more than just 33, but that's the
- 7 part that we're talking about right -- right now. And that
- 8 kind of leads to the question of why.
- **9** And the process for discovery is the government has
- 10 provided a bunch of discovery. We look through that discovery
- 11 and we try to figure out what is missing, and we make a
- 12 discovery request. If you're seeing -- if the government
- 13 says, oh, yeah, we missed that, here it is, then you don't
- 14 hear anything about it. But if you did -- but if they say,
- 15 no, we're not going to give that to you, then we make a motion
- **16** to compel discovery.
- And every time we make a motion to compel discovery,
- 18 in their response the government uses boilerplate language
- 19 that says, and I'm going to quote it, prosecution takes its
- 20 discovery obligations seriously and will produce any
- 21 documentation or material requested by the defense that is
- 22 material to the preparation of the defense.
- 23 And I'm not trying to infer that they don't take their

1 obligations seriously, but the volume of discovery litigation 2 in this case suggests there is a fundamental misunderstanding 3 of what that obligation means and what those -- what the 4 language of the rules requires. And there's -- there's a 5 difference between taking an obligation seriously and 6 fulfilling the obligation accurately, and that's really what 7 is the basis for our motion here and other motions that we'll 8 be arguing over the next few days. Here, we believe that the 9 government has a fundamental misunderstanding of what their 10 obligation is, what mitigation means, and what is material to 11 the defense, and that's why we're standing before you with a 12 motion to compel. 13 In this motion, we're seeking information that could 14 and will assist the defense to meet our ethical obligations in 15 this capital case to develop a robust mitigation case as well 16 as to better understand what the government's interests are in 17 interfering with our ability -- our client's ability to 18 communicate with his family. We seek discovery in order to 19 understand what decisions are being made, how and why and 20 what, if anything, we can do to change those decisions. And 21 maybe we can't change the ultimate decision, but our job is to 22 advocate on behalf of our client and, in order to do that, we 23 have to understand what the rules are, what the guidelines

- 1 are, what the guardrails are.
- 2 And so we believe the information that we're seeking
- 3 to -- can lead to further discoverable materials and may lead
- 4 to other opportunities for investigation, et cetera. And also
- 5 to be clear, we're not asking that this commission get
- 6 involved with legitimate security operations of the JTF, nor
- 7 are we asking them, as I said, to order any specific person to
- 8 participate in the family calls or to receive unredacted -- or
- 9 uncensored letters, that our client receive uncensored
- 10 letters. We believe we should receive those so that we can
- 11 make a mitigation case.
- So what we're asking the commission to do is compel
- 13 the government to provide an explanation of how the decisions
- **14** are made. What's the process? Who are the decision-makers?
- 15 Who makes these individual requests? So that then we can
- 16 advocate based on that. Maybe they'll give it to us and maybe
- 17 they -- maybe they will change their minds and they won't.
- 18 But if we don't know how that process works, we can't do our
- **19** job as advocates.
- One of the reasons that we need this information is
- 21 because we have an ethical obligation, it's in the ABA
- 22 Guidelines, to develop a relationship with our client's
- 23 family. And we can't do that after the trial has commenced,

1 because it's not only relevant to sentencing if there is a 2 sentencing phase. So this is -- this motion is really to help 3 us create -- or help us gather more mitigation evidence. 4 In AE 824 -- I'm sorry, I don't have the letters, but 5 it's our response to the government's -- or our reply to the 6 government's brief. At pages 23 through 26, we explain in 7 length -- at length the government's misunderstanding of what 8 the mitigation evidence is. And so I'm not going to go into 9 it again here because I think we well briefed it. But I will 10 note that way back in 2013, Judge Pohl noted, without any 11 objection from the defense that -- and this is a quote -- As a 12 general rule, mitigation is in the eyes of defense counsel. 13 If you believe something is mitigating, regardless of 14 what the government may believe, my instinct is that it will 15 be treated as a mitigating factor for counsel to argue. 16 Well, in order to develop that mitigation, we have to 17 have the discovery that leads to it, and that's exactly what 18 we're looking for here. 19 What we believe is included in this is the opportunity 20 to know who -- what witnesses we might want to go talk to 21 and to understand the relationship building. I mean, that's 22 really what mitigation is all about. If we talk -- look at 23 the Supreme Court case of Skipper v. South Carolina.

- 1 that case revealed is that the Supreme Court believes that how
- 2 it -- how a defendant is -- is maintaining relationships while
- 3 still incarcerated is relevant to mitigation and is evidence
- 4 that would -- would be allowed to be presented.
- 5 And so some of this evidence might be Skipper
- 6 evidence, some of it might just be witnesses that we would
- 7 want to call in a mitigation case. In order to do that, we
- 8 need to have the underlying discovery of these -- these
- 9 letters.
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: Ms. Radostitz, let me just make sure I'm
- 11 understanding. So I get from your motion what your team is
- 12 saying is some of the mitigation evidence that you would want
- 13 from these ICRC requests. But walk me through -- connect the
- 14 dots on -- I mean, so you have access to your client. I
- 15 assume from your client you're able to get contact information
- 16 for this large, extended family that you've kind of listed
- 17 out. So the defense team is able to go straight to them to,
- 18 you know, find out their relationship and their -- some of
- **19** that mitigation evidence, correct?
- 20 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Correct. This is comp licated with
- 21 regard to Mr. Mohammad, because our U.S. Government has
- 22 precluded us from visiting the country in which his family
- 23 lives. We are precluded by State Department rules, and so we

1 can't do that. 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. 3 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: And so one of the ways -- things 4 that we have to do is narrow who we would want to talk with, 5 and one of the pieces of evidence that helps us narrow that 6 are the letters that are coming in to him. 7 And I think a follow-up question that you might be 8 asking is: Well, why don't you just get those from 9 Mr. Mohammad? And the answer to that is what he receives and 10 what was actually written are two different things. And so we 11 want the original letters on both sides versus -- and also to 12 know what the -- what has been censored out of his letters, 13 because we have access to, and the government has provided, 14 the original letters that Mr. Mohammad has written. 15 we don't have is the censored letters that go to the families, 16 if that makes sense. 17 And one piece of this is that the government has given 18 notice that they are going to seek to introduce some of these 19 letters into evidence, and they have picked which letters it 20 is that they want to put into evidence. We want to see all of 21 them so that we can just see the whole gamut of the letters, 22 rather than just the ones that they're seeking. And I also

want to be clear, we don't think they're admissible and we'll

23

- 1 have -- we'll make that argument and fight that fight down the
- 2 road. But before we get to be able to fight that fight, we
- 3 need to see what the evidence is.
- 4 MJ [Col McCALL]: Understood.
- **5** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Subject to your questions.
- **6** MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. No further questions at this
- 7 time.
- **8** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Thank you.
- 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: Government? Oh, again, I'm trying to
- 10 get used to this process, Government. So any other defense
- 11 counsel? I'll go ahead and cycle through. That was from team
- 12 Mohammad.
- Ms. Bormann?
- 14 I see negative responses from the defense teams.
- 15 Government, go ahead.
- 16 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Thank you, Your Honor. I probably
- 17 jumped the gun a little myself.
- 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: No. I'm getting used to this process of
- 19 having a number of defense teams. But go ahead. Proceed.
- 20 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Sir, I would just like to start off
- 21 with saying what we have provided them, so that you're aware.
- 22 As of this time, we have provided all ICRC communications that
- 23 Mr. Mohammad wrote to his family, to defense counsel, much of

- 1 it display -- displayable to the accused. We have also
- 2 provided all JTF-GTMO standard operations procedures related
- 3 to ICRC communications relevant to these accused.
- 4 In addition, and to answer a question that
- 5 Ms. Radostitz raised about not knowing what is, quote/unquote,
- 6 censored, we've also provided comprehensive classification
- 7 guidance regarding family communications that specifies what
- 8 the accused must refrain from saying in ICRC communications.
- And that's contained at Appellate Exhibit 360Q. And
- 11 that was done at the behest, or at the order of Judge Parrella
- 12 earlier in this case in the AE 360 series, which is exactly
- 13 where we have litigated all of this stuff prior.
- 14 Your Honor, I'm not going to get up here and brief too
- 15 long, because I think the precedent in this case is well
- 16 established and well briefed. But as far as where we've
- 17 litigated this case, I would draw your attention to Appellate
- **18** Exhibits 093, 321, 360, 399, and 473.
- 19 360 is the discovery series that we dealt with this
- 20 issue before and ultimately which is what gave rise to us
- 21 disclosing all ICRC communications with the accused, going
- 22 from 2014 going forward.
- 23 And 473 deals with, in that series Mr. Binalshibh's

- 1 defense counsel were seeking to have a phone call with one of
- 2 his brothers, which was denied. And ultimately, in that case,
- 3 the commission ruled that managing outside contact with
- 4 detainees is self-evidently a legitimate penological interest.
- 5 And beyond that, Your Honor, I would -- subject to
- 6 your questions, I don't have anything further.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: No questions.
- 8 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **9** MJ [Col McCALL]: Ms. Radostitz.
- **10** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Yes, Your Honor. Just briefly.
- 11 So if they've provided from 2004 going forward, we
- 12 would ask the court to -- or the commission to at least order
- 13 from 2006 to 2014. Because if that's already been decided
- 14 that that's a -- you know, an unobjectionable, I don't know
- 15 why years before that would be any different. And counsel did
- 16 not address the letters that are received by Mr. Mohammad that
- 17 we have also requested.
- And one thing that I probably should have said, and
- 19 it's not in direct rebuttal but if you'll give me just a
- 20 little bit of leeway, what I should have said is ----
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure.
- 22 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: ---- that Mr. Mohammad's memory -- I
- 23 mean, Ms. Bormann spoke about this the other day, is that his

- 1 memory has been incredibly impaired by the torture that he
- 2 endured. And so relying on our clients for information about
- 3 how to reach their family, about who is the most significant
- 4 person in the family that would be the great mitigation
- 5 witness is a really hard thing to do. It's hard in any
- 6 capital case. We rarely in a capital case want to rely on our
- 7 client's memory because most of our clients have experienced
- 8 trauma. But in this case, that trauma was exacerbated by the
- 9 torture that Mr. Mohammad endured. And so getting these --
- 10 the letters from the family to him is very important to our
- **11** mitigation case.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- **13** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Thank you.
- 14 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Sir, I was corrected, that we have
- 15 actually gone above and beyond what the commission has
- 16 ordered. We have turned over all the communications from 2006
- 17 going forward, not 2014 is what was ordered in the AE 360
- **18** series.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: And this was the communication going
- **20** from Mr. Mohammad going out?
- 21 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Correct, Your Honor.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: So let me ask this, if you could step
- 23 back to the podium for the government.

- 1 So trying to make sure I'm understanding. I'm not
- 2 sure this was covered in either of the briefings or the
- 3 response, but -- so for letters that are coming in to
- 4 Mr. Mohammad, if they are censored for some reason, a
- 5 classified reason, is the -- I mean, even the fact that it's
- 6 coming from a certain person, is that information as well
- 7 censored? Like, so that -- I understand that counsel may not
- 8 be allowed -- or Mr. Mohammad may not be allowed to know that,
- 9 let's say, a certain brother has written him, what the
- 10 substance of that letter was for some classified reason,
- 11 perhaps. And maybe we'll get into this more tomorrow. But is
- 12 even the fact that that brother reached out -- is -- I mean,
- 13 can that information -- is that information not given to the
- **14** defense?
- 15 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Sir, as this issue wasn't -- and I
- 16 looked back at the original request in their -- in their
- 17 motion. I was not absolutely tracking this is what they were
- **18** seeking at all.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yeah, I don't know that it was
- 20 necessarily raised.
- 21 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Yeah.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: But I believe it came up in argument
- 23 that, I mean, if they're trying to figure out these

- 1 connections and who is reaching out and still seeking a
- 2 relationship with their client, that that then plays into
- 3 perhaps building the mitigation defense.
- 4 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: And -- and part of that is the actual
- 5 reach-out from the ICRC on that -- that side. I can't speak
- 6 necessarily to that. All I can speak is to what actually ICRC
- 7 hands to the Department of Defense.
- 8 Now, obviously, the detention facility has force
- 9 protection concerns and so forth like that, so some of the
- 10 information -- and personally, I have not seen any of this --
- 11 may or may not get censored. I don't know. And the
- 12 commission certainly nothing has been proffered from defense
- 13 counsel about what kind of information has been censored. So
- 14 I don't -- I -- I'm -- I'm kind of -- I -- I don't know what I
- 15 don't know at this point in time. And I don't -- I haven't
- 16 seen any letters from defense counsel about what -- what has
- 17 made its way through the process.
- MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, and maybe we're speaking past each
- 19 other.
- **20** DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Yeah.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: So that gives me concern. Maybe I'm
- 22 misunderstanding but, you know, my understanding of how the
- 23 process would work would be the ICRC receives some type of

- 1 correspondence from a relative. They then send it to the JTF
- 2 who are making some initial redactions based on their process.
- 3 But, I mean, the government needs to know what is being
- 4 redacted and what is not going through, correct? Because,
- 5 again, the government has discovery obligations to let the
- 6 defense know whether this was a proper redaction, whether this
- 7 was something that should have been given over in discovery.
- 8 I mean, because the defense is not going to know that. They
- **9** have no way of knowing that, correct?
- 10 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Correct. If I could have one moment,
- 11 Your Honor.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Take your time. Yeah.
- 13 [Pause.]
- 14 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure.
- 16 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: As far as how we've -- obviously, in
- 17 the AE 360 series, we were ordered to turn over statements of
- 18 the accused, and that's why we turned over what we did. We
- 19 did not feel we had an obligation, a discovery obligation, to
- 20 turn over what the accused were actually receiving. Now, if
- 21 there's actual redactions in those documents and the -- and
- 22 the defense want to know that, we will certainly consider that
- 23 on a case-by-case basis.

- 1 Obviously, some of it may be classified or -- or other 2 reasons why the defense can't know, but we will certainly dig 3 into that and engage in the process if that is needed. 4 just never felt the need to engage in that process, because 5 ultimately, the defense -- defense counsel and the accused get 6 that mail. Or the accused at least get that mail and can 7 provide it to their defense counsel. 8 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, they get some of that mail. Ι 9 mean, some -- it sounds like -- and again, it's hard to argue 10 in -- I get that this is going to be a recurring theme in this 11 case, but it's hard to argue what is going through when 12 some -- we don't know, right? 13 DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: Correct. 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: Where some stuff isn't where -- the 15 defense isn't going to be aware of whether something came 16 through and it sounds like if the government wasn't tracking 17 whatever that process was for incoming, then, again, the 18 government isn't aware. And so if defense is making a -- and 19 I'm not saying that they have, but if they're making a showing 20 that this is discoverable material and once it's received by 21 JTF, it's in the government's possession, it seems like it 22 might be problematic to just ignore that.
 - UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

DMTC [MR. DYKSTRA]: And like I -- like I said, Your

23

- 1 Honor, if -- if defense counsel notify us or provide that
- 2 with -- with that information of document X was redacted, we
- 3 would like to know why it was redacted, we will certainly dig
- 4 into that process. But keep in mind that the ICRC
- 5 communications are a constant -- we're constantly turning this
- 6 stuff over.
- 7 So if we're -- if we're digging into -- if -- if you
- 8 want us to engage in the entire process, we are certainly
- 9 willing to do that. I will just say it's going to be -- it's
- 10 going to be a recurring kind of obligation as well because
- 11 this -- I think we turned over 19,000 pages of the -- of this
- 12 stuff, just what the accused wrote, because that's -- that's
- 13 what Judge Pohl determined was obligated under R.M.C. 703 --
- **14** or 701, I should say.
- 15 We're more -- we're willing to dig into that. I'll
- 16 just say it's -- it would be better if it was more -- if the
- 17 defense counsel provide a particularized, hey, this -- this
- 18 is -- we're interested in this and obviously because it's
- 19 redacted, if we disclose that to defense counsel, it cannot go
- 20 back to the accused because obviously it was redacted for a
- 21 reason.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: Understood. Okay. I understand your
- 23 position.

- **1** Ms. Radostitz, I'll let you -- if you have anything
- 2 further to say based on my questions.
- **3** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Yes, Your Honor. Just to say that
- 4 this kind of underscores my earlier argument, that they don't
- 5 understand what mitigation is and that what we're looking for
- 6 is -- I mean, I went and looked and it's in paragraphs F, G,
- 7 H, and I where we asked for all communication back and forth
- 8 facilitated by the ICRC. They only read that as communication
- 9 from our client to his family, but we did request
- 10 back-and-forth. So it is in the request.
- 11 And -- and that also underscores that this is -- we're
- 12 not litigating what was litigated by -- and decided by
- 13 Judge Pohl. That's why we had to file this, because it's
- 14 different. So thank you.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Understood. All right. I think I've
- 16 heard enough. I'll dig into some of the material that was
- 17 mentioned during the oral arguments and go from there.
- 18 All right. It's 11:43. I think still based on what
- 19 we mentioned last week, you know, I'd like to end at 12:00
- 20 today to make sure that the accused are able to have prayer
- 21 and lunch and then that's it for the open hearings today. We
- 22 are moving in then to having the ex parte briefing from team
- 23 Mohammad this afternoon at 1400.

1 Let's just do a little bit of housekeeping, then, 2 because I -- I don't see the point of starting an AE and then 3 cutting you off immediately. So what I see happening in the 4 rest of this week is -- all right. The AEs that are still pending based on what we've discussed in earlier sessions 5 6 was -- so the next AE would be AE 783, which is the motion to compel discovery in a form releasable to Mr. Mohammad. 7 8 Now, if I'm tracking correctly, I believe 9 Ms. Radostitz was going to argue that and I thought things 10 were falling into place where she could argue it this morning. 11 I know she's been excused and is leaving. 12 Ms. Radostitz, are you able to argue that from that 13 RHR or is this something we can slide to later in the week 14 perhaps or somebody else from the team able to argue this? 15 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Your Honor, we -- we have some 16 concerns about the RHR in terms of communications and security 17 issues which sort of back up behind discussing with you the 18 pending 811. I don't want to raise that -- that issue all 19 over again, but those are sort of tied up, so I think it would 20 kind of put us in an awkward position of maybe looking like 21 we're stepping on our own issues by agreeing to do this -- do 22 that at this time, and I apologize for that. 23 What I would suggest -- or just offer to you, however

- 1 you want to proceed, is I am -- we are prepared to do our
- 2 ex parte, although it may interfere with something that
- 3 Mr. Trivett had to do in terms of checking out some equipment.
- 4 We're happy to push that either as late in the day today as
- 5 will accommodate the commission or if you want to put it over
- **6** to tomorrow morning or another day, we can do that.
- 7 Unless anyone think that I'm trying to get out of
- 8 work, I have -- I have a motion on the -- on the calendar
- 9 todav as well.
- So if you want to take those AEs that we had teed up
- 11 for this morning and then see what we have left for the day,
- 12 I'm happy to -- to move that around.
- MJ [Col McCALL]: To go ahead and progress with the AEs
- **14** today ----
- 15 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Yes.
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- and then this afternoon, it sounds
- **17** like?
- 18 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Yes, sir. Either -- either the
- 19 ex parte either later today than we thought, beyond 2:00, or,
- 20 you know, first thing tomorrow morning or -- or Wednesday
- **21** afternoon -- Tuesday afternoon.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: That's fine with me.
- LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Okay.

- 1 MJ [Col McCALL]: I mean, this was the last one that
- **2** Ms. Radostitz was going to be arguing, correct?
- 3 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Correct.
- 4 MJ [Col McCALL]: Let's just go ahead and we'll move into
- 5 that and just see where we go. So we'll go ahead and hear
- 6 argument on -- it's AE 783. It's a motion to compel discovery
- 7 in a form releasable to Mr. Mohammad.
- **8** Ms. Radostitz.
- **9** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Thank you, Your Honor. I really
- 10 appreciate the willingness to move things around so I can
- 11 hopefully get on that flight tomorrow and hopefully it will
- **12** actually just go home ----
- 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: Right.
- **14** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: ---- rather than back and forth a
- **15** couple times ----
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: Those are a lot of ifs.
- 17 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: ---- like yesterday's.
- 18 So as you said, this is AE 783, discovery in a form
- 19 releasable to Mr. Mohammad. And it's sort of hard to know
- 20 where to start with the saga of the circumstances that created
- 21 the need to file this motion to require the government to
- 22 allow Mr. Mohammad to see and review all of the discovery, all
- 23 of the evidence the government has, the constitutional and

- 1 ethical obligation to provide to him.
- 2 So I'll start with this premise. We're just past the
- 3 20th anniversary of the attacks of September 11th, and
- 4 consistently in these proceedings, both inside the hearing
- 5 room and outside, the government has blamed the defense for
- 6 the delay. And it's -- it's frustrating to hear that all the
- 7 time, because the vast majority of the delay in this case has
- 8 been caused by the government's decision to spend more than
- 9 three years torturing Mr. Mohammad in black sites around the
- 10 world, and then another two years holding him here in
- 11 incommunicado detention without the services of an attorney.
- 12 And the vast majority of litigation has been around their
- 13 efforts to conceal the details of those decisions.
- 14 From the first day of his capture, Mr. Mohammad was --
- 15 has been willing to be tried. And as soon as the government
- 16 provides him the most basic of rights guaranteed to any
- 17 criminal defendant in the United States justice system, a fair
- 18 trial, that's what he's been asking for. From the very
- 19 beginning he said, "Take me to New York, give me a lawyer, and
- 20 I'll be happy to talk to you." But instead of doing that,
- 21 instead of taking him up on that offer, they -- the government
- **22** made a choice to do a -- to take a different path.
- Mr. Mohammad was captured at the beginning of March of

- 1 2003. United States law enforcement agents were present.
- 2 They could have immediately taken him, put him on the next
- 3 flight back to the U.S. and begun pretrial proceedings.
- 4 That's what happened with Ramzi Yousef who was arrested in
- 5 Pakistan for the Word Trade Center first bombing. He was
- 6 arrested in February of 1995. His trial started in 1997, and
- 7 he was sentenced the following year.
- 8 That's what happened with Richard Reid, the so-called
- 9 shoe bomber. He was arrested in December of 2001, tried,
- 10 convicted, and sentenced in 2002.
- 11 Zacarias Moussaoui, charged with conspiracy to commit
- 12 the very same acts that Mr. Mohammad is charged with. He was
- 13 charged in 2006, some back-and-forth because of intermediate
- 14 appeals, was tried ultimately in 2006 -- I'm sorry, he was
- 15 charged in 2002, tried in 2006, convicted and sentenced that
- **16** same year.
- 17 The government chose not to do that for Mr. Mohammad
- 18 and the codefendants here. So that's part of the delay.
- 19 That's a lot of the delay, and it's also a lot of the
- 20 arguments that we have about discovery.
- 21 I'm sorry. I'm trying to condense things a little bit
- 22 so that we can -- get us out of here.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that.

- **1** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: So this is not a discovery motion
- 2 that seeks to disclose to Mr. Mohammad classified information
- 3 that he doesn't already know about because of the actions of
- 4 the government. We're not asking for the blueprints to the
- 5 Pentagon or the FBI agency, either literally or figuratively.
- 6 We're not asking in this motion for the names of the covert
- 7 agents who participated in Mr. Mohammad's torture. That's
- 8 being litigated elsewhere.
- **9** What we're asking for is the ability to talk to our
- 10 client, with the evidence sitting in front of him, let him go
- 11 away and digest it, come back to us and provide further
- 12 details, and so that we can help build the case in his
- 13 defense. We're not able to do that because of the
- 14 classification that the government has done with the evidence
- 15 regarding the torture program, regarding other items that
- **16** we're requesting. Sorry.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, let me ask you this.
- **18** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Sure.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: So just to make sure I'm understanding.
- 20 And I did appreciate -- I thought this briefing actually was
- 21 useful, the -- between the motion, the response, and the
- 22 replies, I felt like it actually did boil down some of the --
- 23 what was actually in dispute.

1 So you're seeking 12 categories, correct ----2 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Yes. 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- of discoverable material that 4 you've already received, but it's been classified so you can 5 see it, you can't necessarily share it with your client, 6 correct? 7 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Correct. And I want to be clear. 8 Some of it we can show to our client but not give to our 9 client. So it's -- there's a category that's called display 10 only, and that means that I can review it with him if I'm in 11 the room with him. And that's something we litigated in the 12 783 series during COVID, that we couldn't do any of that 13 because of it. So ----14 MJ [Col McCALL]: Right. 15 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: So I just don't want to say no, we 16 can't show him anything ----17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure. I appreciate that distinction. 18 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: ---- because we can. 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: And this is, I mean, thousands of pages 20 of documents still ----21 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Yes.

MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- that we're talking about. All

22

23

right.

1 So I mean, in -- it seems like the -- there was a 2 little bit of a disagreement. But the defense is not 3 disputing that the government -- the case all seems clear 4 on -- the CIPA case law, that the government can classify --5 say certain documents is -- are classified. We will give it 6 to the defense counsel, but not allow the accused to see it. 7 And it -- it seemed like the defense's response, then, 8 is accepting that's the state of the law, but this is a death 9 penalty case. And that's the difference, in your view, is 10 that heightened level of due process. There should be maybe 11 some type of work-around. 12 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Right. Yes. So it is different 13 because death is different, capital cases are different. 14 it also, sort of the next phase is the government gets to make 15 the choice. They can choose to provide all the evidence to 16 Mr. Mohammad or they can choose not to. But if they choose 17 not to, there are consequences for that, and those are set out 18 in 505 in the rules and in 906P and Q [sic]. 19 So that's what we're saying, is that you want to use 20 this evidence -- and that's one of the things that's really 21 interesting is that in -- in the response to our motion the 22 government says -- and I want to quote -- I want to get my 23 glasses back on and quote so I don't misquote them:

- 1 "Prosecution has no intention of attempting to admit any
- 2 evidence during its case in chief that will" be -- "not be
- 3 provided to the accused."
- 4 And I read that to mean they're going to seek to
- 5 declassify anything that they want to present in evidence. If
- 6 they're going to do it later, why don't they do it now?
- 7 Because if they do it later and we say, oh, wow, we would have
- 8 liked to have been able to talk to Mr. Mohammad about that in
- 9 the middle of trial, we're going to be asking for a
- 10 continuance so that we can have the opportunity to do that,
- 11 and he says, oh, wait, that's not right. Go talk to this guy.
- 12 He'll tell you that that's not right. We now have to go do
- 13 investigation. So if they're going to declassify it later,
- **14** why don't they declassify it now?
- 15 When I was preparing for this, I realized that one of
- 16 the things that would have been helpful, and maybe we should
- 17 do this as a supplement, is to go through their list of
- 18 evidence that they seek to -- and talk about the evidence that
- 19 we're trying to go get copies of from Mr. Mohammad in that
- 20 overlap, that they want to put this in but there's really five
- 21 other pieces of that -- you know, so they want -- I'm making
- 22 this up. But say there is a document that they're saying now
- 23 that they're going to present at trial.

1 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. 2 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: It is -- they're going to declassify 3 it before trial. But they're only going to declassify that 4 document. We know that there's 12 other documents in that 5 same series that are relevant to the now-declassified, but are 6 classified still and we can't discuss them with Mr. Mohammad. 7 So we're going to then have this challenge that you 8 shouldn't be able to use this document if these six don't come 9 in, but they're not declassified, so how do we -- how do we 10 handle that? This motion is really trying to clear that up a 11 little bit so that we can have all the evidence, discuss it 12 with Mr. Mohammad, be able to get his input on it so that we 13 can go out and investigate as needed, and be prepared to rebut 14 the evidence at trial, if that's the appropriate manner. 15 The first six -- I'm sorry, the first -- yeah, the 16 first eight categories of information that we're seeking all 17 are about the torture program, about the RDI program. They 18 are -- they fall within the ten-category construct plus one, 19 because there was a -- there's some litigation in the AE 0013 20 series or 013 series, and so that is also about the rendition 21 program. 22 In those categories some of the information is display 23 only to Mr. Mohammad or even releasable to Mr. Mohammad, but

- 1 there's other information, for example, about where he was
- 2 held, that we can see where he was held but what we can't see,
- 3 what we can't show him is where Mr. al Baluchi was held, or
- 4 Mr. Binalshibh was held, because that is only -- that -- that
- 5 piece of discovery is only releasable to someone else.
- 6 And so we can't talk with him about that overlap and
- 7 what might have happened that we can then talk to the other
- 8 counsel in terms of how we can rebut some of the information
- 9 if it's not accurate.
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, all right. So let me ask you
- 11 this. And again, this may just be showing my ignorance on
- 12 this area as I'm continuing to get up to speed.
- So, you know, the government's response to the -- your
- 14 12-category request with thousands of pages was, if you can
- 15 give us a particularized request regarding a specific
- 16 document, we will look at that and determine whether or not we
- 17 can get that reclassified so that it can be provided to
- 18 Mr. Mohammad.
- 19 So it would seem -- and so I guess my question is
- 20 going to be: Have you tried this approach of doing a
- 21 particularized request for one document, if that is then
- 22 reclassified going back to the government and saying, here are
- 23 our -- in that category other documents that would have the

- 1 exact same -- fall in the exact same way, can you reclassify
- 2 those? And again, I don't know because I haven't dug enough
- 3 into the discovery that has gone on in this case to know if
- 4 that approach has been tried.
- **5** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: So we did ----
- 6 MJ [Col McCALL]: Because I have two extremes between the
- 7 defense and the government, and it seems like that would be a
- 8 normal process.
- **9** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: So we have done that with some of
- 10 this discovery and we just never heard back. So we asked for
- 11 specific items within these categories, we never heard back.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- **13** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: The -- the larger picture is it's
- 14 really not our job to figure out what is and isn't their
- 15 obligation. We try and we often say, hey, we got this and it
- 16 seems like it should be releasable to Mr. Mohammad but it's
- 17 not. Can you get it releasable? And sometimes they do. I
- 18 mean, there's been quite a few instances where we could not
- 19 move forward with something that we needed to do unless this
- 20 one piece of paper was declassified and we could talk about it
- **21** with Mr. Mohammad and the government was able to do that.
- But what we're saying is these are -- we narrowed this
- 23 down to categories that were very specific to information that

- 1 Mr. Mohammad would have experienced. Again, we're not asking
- 2 for classified information that he was not exposed to himself.
- 3 That's really, I think, the difference between the approach of
- 4 the government of we can't just give them everything. We're
- 5 not asking for everything. We're asking for classified
- 6 information that Mr. Mohammad is aware of only because the
- 7 government tortured him and put him in the torture program.
- 8 And so that's, I think, the difference between a
- 9 broader request for all discovery to be given to Mr. Mohammad
- 10 and these categories because they're very specific to him, so
- 11 that's the narrowing that we did.
- 12 [Pause for technical difficulty with VTC.]
- 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: I'm not sure if that was someone from
- **14** the RHF? Oh.
- **15** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: I think that may have been
- 16 Ms. Pradhan.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- **18** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Yes, sir. I apologize for the
- **19** interruption. We have a hot mic.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 21 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Okay.
- 22 So one other piece of this that I want to talk about
- 23 because one of the categories is in the MEA-STA, which is

- 1 statements, and those are statements of Mr. Mohammad, some of
- 2 which are not releasable to Mr. Mohammad. And I also -- I
- 3 think you already know this, but what the government calls a
- 4 statement of Mr. Mohammad is not really what anybody who's
- 5 practiced criminal law would call a statement of a defendant.
- 6 It is a summary by one person of something somebody else wrote
- 7 in a cable or maybe five different people wrote in a cable.
- 8 We don't know because we're not privy to that information.
- **9** But it's not something like if I have a robbery case
- 10 in Texas where I used to practice, I'd get a piece of paper
- 11 that said Mr. Jones said A, B, C, D, and Mr. Jones has signed
- 12 that at the bottom. That's not what this is. These are
- 13 statements that are -- they're gone through some process and
- 14 provided to us.
- 15 Some of those -- and not all of them, because some of
- 16 them have been releasable to Mr. Mohammad. Some of those we
- 17 can't talk to him about, even though they're his own
- 18 statements. And that seems to me something that even if
- 19 you're only going to do a narrow, that seems to be an area
- 20 that is ripe for -- for discovery.
- 21 And I think I want to say again what I said earlier,
- 22 which is that Mr. Mohammad cannot help us discern when
- 23 statements were made when they -- what was happening to him

- 1 because of the damage to him due to the torture. So I think
- 2 that one of the things that we have asked for in other
- 3 motions, and maybe Ms. Pradhan, because she's done a lot of
- 4 this litigation will address this, is we've tried to put
- 5 together a timeline of what was happening to Mr. Mohammad and
- 6 what statements he allegedly made and what happened next and
- 7 what happened next. Because of the way we get discovery, we
- 8 have not been able to do that.
- **9** And some of that also has to do with a motion that's
- 10 not on the calendar that has to do with the fact that we don't
- 11 have a -- we don't have a discovery -- an electronic discovery
- 12 tool. That's been litigated for the last three years. We
- 13 still don't have it. That would make -- maybe make it easier.
- 14 Our analysts are amazing and they do a great job of trying to
- 15 suss this out, but the opacity of the discovery makes it
- **16** almost impossible to do that.
- 17 Okay. So I think we already talked about the fact
- 18 that this is a choice that they can make. We hope that
- 19 they'll make the right choice. We hope that they'll make the
- 20 choice that they want to go forward with this trial rather
- 21 than suffer the consequences of not providing the information
- 22 that Mr. Mohammad is entitled to have. Thank you.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you. All right. It's 12:03.

- 1 We'll go ahead and take a recess for lunch to allow for, you
- 2 know, prayer times, and we don't have quite as much
- 3 flexibility on when we break for lunch. So we'll be back on
- 4 the record at 1330. And again, we'll be -- change of plans.
- **5** We'll be in open session and continuing with this AE.
- **6** Once we get through with it, then we'll decide if
- 7 we're going to break for the day and move into the ex parte
- 8 briefings, but commission is in recess until 1330.
- 9 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1203, 13 September 2021.]
- 10 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1335,
- 11 13 September 2021.]
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission is called to order. The
- 13 parties are present, with the exception of, I believe, Mr. Ali
- **14** is in the restroom but coming back shortly. All right.
- **15** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Your Honor, I just wanted to correct
- 16 something that I had said in response to a question, I think,
- 17 from the commission. And that I said that all of the Bates
- 18 numbers that we've requested that are classified, Mr. Mohammad
- 19 was present for the experiences, and that's not entirely true.
- **20** MEA-2C is a OIG report. He wasn't present -- the information
- 21 is something I think that we need to talk to him about, but he
- 22 wasn't present. And the same would be true of 2G. It's about
- 23 training materials for the people who were involved in the RDI

- 1 program. Obviously, he wasn't there.
- 2 So I just feel like I overstated that and I didn't
- **3** want to overstate.
- **4** MJ [Col McCALL]: Appreciate the clarification.
- 5 All right. We'll move on.
- 6 Ms. Bormann, is there someone from your team that
- 7 wishes to be heard on this?
- **8** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: It would be me, and not right now, no.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. And we'll keep cycling back.
- 11 I see Mr. Bruck saying no.
- **12** Mr. Connell?
- 13 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, Your Honor. Ms. Pradhan will
- 14 argue from the RHR.
- **15** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Sir, are you able to hear me?
- MJ [Col McCALL]: I am.
- 17 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Thank you. And I apologize, again,
- 18 for the interruption earlier. We're still trying to figure
- **19** out the logistics here.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: Exactly. And that's fine.
- 21 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Thank you, sir. I wanted to rise to
- 22 give the military commission a little bit of further
- 23 background on Mr. Mohammad's request in 783 and really just

- 1 supplement a little bit of what Ms. Radostitz said, because
- 2 it's really intimately connected, as I think you're finding
- 3 out, Your Honor, to other long-running very large discovery
- 4 disputes.
- 5 So, you know, the government and some of the other
- 6 teams gave you a little bit of background last week and, with
- 7 your indulgence, I'll take a couple of minutes to do the same
- 8 and sort of place this in context ----
- 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: Ms. Pradhan, I'm getting the signal that
- 10 the interpreters are asking that you to speak a little bit
- 11 slower.
- 12 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Of course, sir. I think only I can
- 13 manage to raise the interpreters' ire from across the sea.
- **14** I'm very sorry. I'll slow down.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- 16 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: I also wanted to -- so I wanted to
- 17 start sort of at an order of magnitude a little bit higher
- 18 than AE 783 and then come down and I think answer with maybe a
- 19 bit of specificity a couple of the questions regarding the
- 20 authority for releasing this information and examples of
- 21 individualized requests that -- that you'd asked about, sir.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 23 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: So I just want to begin by giving a

- 1 bit of background on two of the larger long-running discovery
- 2 motions, and those are AE 534 and AE 562. Those are both up
- 3 on a motion for reconsideration, and so I'm not going to argue
- 4 any of the points in those motions at this point.
- 5 But just for a bit of background, following the
- 6 establishment of the ten-category construct in AE 397F, the
- 7 government in 2017 began to produce some of the documents in
- 8 these categories. What they call a -- and they may have
- 9 produced some earlier than that, but, you know, the 2A
- 10 chronology, the 2D profiles, things like that, began to
- **11** arrive, as I recall, in 2017.
- So, for example, what they call the 2A chronology for
- 13 all five defendants, actually Judge Pohl didn't seem to agree
- 14 with that because, despite its existence, he still exhorted
- 15 the government in 2018 to provide us with something that would
- 16 allow us to put together locations, code named, of course,
- 17 with dates and personnel, also code named, and the STA
- 18 discovery, the statements that these defendants,
- 19 Mr. al Baluchi and others, made at the black sites.
- 20 And then, of course, in I believe June 2017, we
- 21 received the 2D profiles which did not go through the 505
- 22 process, and some of the other categories that Mr. Mohammad
- 23 mentions in AE 783.

1 In September 2017, as you've heard, the government 2 also gave us what I think all parties are now calling the RDI 3 index as part of their effort at the time that turned into 4 AE 524, to stop our independent investigation into the RDI 5 program. The RDI index was at the time marked TOP SECRET. 6 And in AE 534, and AE 534B in particular, we went through as 7 categorical an analysis as possible at the time of all of the 8 discrepancies between the information listed in the RDI index 9 and the 397F information that had been produced by that time 10 by the government, and particularly the 2A -- the charts, the 11 chronologies, what they call the chronologies, and the 2D 12 profiles of the CIA personnel that the government unilaterally 13 put together and sent to us. 14 In AE 534, the relief requested there was all of the 15 original RDI documents, mostly the underlying -- the documents 16 underlying the STA and the CIA medical records that had been 17 stripped of information that would confirm whether the 18 government's summaries were wrong, whether the RDI index was 19 wrong, or whether the original documents themselves had 20 inaccuracies that had been translated into these derivative 21 documents. 22 That motion, of course, as I mentioned, is still

active, pending oral argument on a motion for reconsideration,

23

- 1 so I won't go into all of the recent developments on that.
- I do just briefly want to say on AE 562, that is a
- **3** motion asking for all original documents underlying the 2D
- 4 profiles, which are still classified at the Secret level and
- 5 those are the ones that were turned over by the government
- 6 outside of the 505 process. And in those, we argued that
- 7 there -- again, there were too many inconsistencies and later
- 8 actually we found out through a handful of UFI interviews, the
- 9 CIA personnel who have unique functional identifiers,
- 10 basically code names, that there were too many inaccuracies to
- 11 fully rely on the 2D profiles on their own. And AE 562,
- 12 again, is up for reconsideration on changed facts.
- So bringing this to 783. The crux of this issue as we
- 14 see it, sir, is the government really cannot tell us, rely on
- 15 your clients for information and then at the same time say,
- 16 you can't show your clients these important documents about
- 17 their torture.
- 18 Ms. Bormann noted on Friday that the government had
- 19 told us for, you know, all year -- nine years of pretrial
- 20 hearings that if we're missing any information, we can just
- 21 ask our clients. And she pointed out in some detail why it's
- 22 not really possible to rely solely on the memory of a tortured
- 23 detainee. And Mrs. Radostitz did so as well earlier.

1 Most recently I want to point out the government's 2 response in AE 827A makes that same argument again despite 3 sort of consistent argument and medical records to the 4 contrary. And they say in that, as an example, the defense 5 request -- this is at pages 11 and 12 of AE 827A: The 6 defense's request for additional discovery regarding, in that 7 case Mr. al Bayoumi, for the purpose of arming them with more 8 information is also rather ironic because they are in a unique 9 position of knowledge as to the inner sanctum of this 10 conspiracy. They are in the best position to provide 11 information to the commission to justify additional discovery. 12 So in that case, you know, as in these previous cases, 13 they're saying, right, we the government prosecuting this 14 capital case don't have to give you further discovery on a 15 credible theory that has now in that motion been moved forward 16 due to executive declassification of documents, as you'll 17 hear, sir, when 827 comes up for oral argument because you can 18 just ask your clients whom we've documented as psychologically 19 broken. Now, here's the thing. The defense has never said no, 20 we're not going to talk to our clients or get information from 21 22 That would be malpractice. What we have said and what

Ms. Bormann said and what Ms. Radostitz said and what

23

- 1 Mr. Connell and I and everyone else has said is that relying
- 2 on their fractured memories at this point would also be
- 3 malpractice.
- 4 You know, an imperfect analogy is the examples of
- **5** Drs. Mitchell and Jessen, who we took testimony from in
- 6 January 2020. Mr. Connell asked Dr. Mitchell, and I believe
- 7 this is in the unofficial transcript from January 21st, 2020,
- 8 at page 30228 [sic]. Mr. Connell asked Dr. Mitchell how he
- 9 had prepared for his testimony in 2020. This is 13 to 17
- 10 years after the events that we were asking about.
- And he said he'd had to review, quote, a mountain of
- 12 paper over about two months in order to be able to sit and
- 13 testify. And we also had documents available in front of him
- 14 the entire time for his reference throughout the course of his
- 15 testimony.
- 16 I asked Dr. Jessen the same question. And despite his
- 17 ability to review documents that have real locations on them
- 18 because, of course, he has, you know, knowledge of where the
- 19 real locations were, whereas we do not -- and that issue is
- 20 briefed in AE 525, our motion to obtain the real locations of
- 21 the black sites -- Dr. Jessen actually, even despite that
- 22 access, told us that he had initially met Mr. al Baluchi at a
- 23 location where we don't have a record of him being.

1 The point is that making these matches decades after 2 the events was always going to be incredibly difficult. 3 government's delay for nine years has not helped with that 4 But again, they always wanted to have it both ways. 5 They can't say first, we're not giving you more discovery 6 because you have your brain-injured client as a resource and 7 then say, second, we're not giving you even the flawed 8 documents you have in versions you can show your client, 9 trying to refresh whatever memory he has. 10 And this brings me, sir, to one of the questions you 11 asked Ms. Radostitz, which is about authority for releasing 12 this information. This is information about their own 13 torture, about people with code names who they spent time 14 with, were questioned by, were tortured by, places where those 15 events occurred, and conditions of confinement. And that is 16 all information that the U.S. Government, after the release of 17 the SSCI Report in -- or, excuse me, the redacted Executive 18 Summary of the SSCI Report in December 2014, said should be 19 declassified anyway, and that is, this prosecution filed AE 20 13RRR on the 30th of January 2015. 21 And if I may have access -- I'm not sure if this 22 works, but let's see. If I may have access to the document

23

camera, sir, from here.

- **1** MJ [Col McCALL]: You may. Hold on a second as we work
- 2 this out.
- **3** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Sure.
- **4** MJ [Col McCALL]: It looks like it's working.
- 5 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Excellent. I'm just trying to get the
- **6** zoom just right.
- 7 So ----
- **8** MJ [Col McCALL]: I can read it.
- **9** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: ---- this is page 5 of that document,
- 10 sir. And as you'll see at the top, this is a government
- 11 filing that says: "The following information is no longer
- **12** classified."
- ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Apologies, Your Honor, but we don't
- 14 have it on our cameras -- or on our screens.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Hold on for a second, Ms. Pradhan.
- **16** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Of course.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: The court reporters, I believe, are
- 18 trying to bring it up down here. We're getting IT support to
- 19 assist us.
- 20 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: No problem, sir. I'll stand by.
- 21 [Pause.]
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: While we're waiting to get that
- 23 resolved, just trying to make -- just trying to make sure that

- 1 on any of these documents that you're planning on showing,
- **2** have they been reviewed as required?
- 3 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: These are unclassified filings in the
- 4 record, sir. The only two documents I intend to show are
- **5** AE 013RRR and AE 013BBBB, both of which are unclassified and
- 6 on the military commission's website.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. That's fine. All right. And did
- 8 we -- it looks like I got the thumbs up that counsel can see
- 9 your document, so go ahead. Proceed.
- **10** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Thank you, sir.
- 11 So again, this is AE 013RRR. And this is a government
- 12 filing in which they said in January 2015, the following
- 13 information is no longer classified. And I'll move you down
- 14 to the bottom of the page and that last paragraph that says:
- 15 "Information regarding the conditions of confinement as
- 16 applied to the 119 individuals mentioned in Appendix 2 of the
- 17 SSCI Executive Summary acknowledged to have been in CIA
- **18** custody."
- 19 The following page has an additional paragraph,
- 20 additional two paragraphs, listing, as unclassified, the
- 21 treatment of the 119 individuals, including the application of
- 22 standard interrogation techniques. And then finally,
- 23 information regarding the conditions of confinement or

- 1 treatment during the transfer, the renditions, of those same
- 2 individuals which, of course, include the five defendants.
- Now, the government's motion eventually, after some
- 4 briefing, resulted in AE 013BBBB. And AE 013BBBB outlined
- 5 categories of information that still remain classified
- 6 pursuant to the release of the SSCI Report and guidance from
- 7 the original classification authority. And on page 5 of that
- 8 filing -- so the first several categories are -- cover
- **9** information that is marked CLASSIFIED and that has been
- 10 produced to the defense as classified.
- 11 Page 5 of that filing, I'll start at the top. So this
- 12 is information that remains classified, and that's information
- 13 that would reveal or tend to reveal details surrounding the
- 14 capture -- and I'll just put that on the record that that says
- 15 "capture" -- of an accused other than the location and the
- 16 date, information that would reveal, again, the real locations
- 17 of the -- of the black sites from capture until their transfer
- 18 to Guantanamo Bay in September 2006, the names, identities,
- 19 and physical descriptions of any persons associated with the
- 20 RDI program, which is one reason that we use unique functional
- 21 identifiers about those people that the government has
- 22 provided to us, and then documents or information obtained
- 23 from or related to a foreign government dealing with U.S.

- foreign policy. 2 So those three categories, the first three categories 3 are the ones that are relevant here. And, sir, I would submit
- 4 that when you look at the categories proposed to be
- 5 declassified by the government in January 2015 after the
- 6 release of the Executive Summary, and then the categories that
- 7 were outlined as still classified by then Judge Pohl in
- 8 July 2015, and you juxtapose that against the categories of
- information requested by Mr. Mohammad in AE 783, which 9
- 10 includes several of the categories of discovery required by
- 11 the government under AE 397F, all of that information
- 12 requested falls into the categories of information that should
- 13 not be classified anymore concerning conditions of
- 14 confinement, concerning the techniques used on Mr. al Baluchi
- 15 and the other defendants, including Mr. Mohammad, and
- 16 information -- excluding, of course, identifying information
- 17 about the personnel -- about how those techniques were
- 18 applied, right, which is included in conditions of
- 19 confinement, conditions of interrogations, all of those
- 20 categories.

1

- 21 And so I think that those three documents together
- 22 might provide some assistance to the military commission in
- 23 assessing these different categories that Mr. -- of discovery

- 1 that Mr. Mohammad has requested be produced in releasable
- 2 formats to Mr. Mohammad and, of course, to the other
- 3 defendants.
- 4 Now, there have been times in the past couple of years
- 5 when, you know, Mr. al Baluchi has said someone did something
- 6 to me at, say, Location Number 2, which is known publicly as
- 7 COBALT. And that's from the SSCI Report.
- 8 So we look at, for example, the RDI index for COBALT
- **9** for that period of time when he was there. And there are,
- 10 say, a dozen or so unique functional identifiers, CIA
- 11 personnel, associated with that period of time. We then go to
- 12 the 2D or 2G profiles for those UFIs. Some of them confirmed
- 13 that they were there and some of them don't list COBALT as
- 14 being in their -- as them having been there.
- 15 The STA discovery, as we represented to you before,
- 16 sir, are stripped of that context, and we've discussed that
- 17 numerous times at this point.
- So we really can't take the 2D profiles, right, which
- 19 are still classified, in to Mr. al Baluchi and try to jog his
- 20 fractured memory regarding who some of these code-named people
- 21 were, what their attitudes were, what their general background
- 22 was, when and how and in which places they applied these
- 23 techniques because when and how and who makes a difference to

- 1 creating a narrative which we still represent -- maintain we
- 2 don't have.
- 3 So it's sort of a dead end for us at that point. We
- 4 often can't confirm Mr. al Baluchi's account, even if it is
- 5 plausible. And if we do confirm a part of it, we can't build
- 6 enough details around it to form that independent narrative.
- 7 Now, in the briefing Mr. Mohammad points out that the
- 8 government has demonstrated their ability to easily have
- **9** documents remarked or even declassified. And a really good
- 10 example of that is the CIA OIG's report that we received based
- 11 on Mr. al Baluchi's allegations of torture at the black sites.
- 12 That was initially produced to us at the Secret level and we
- 13 could not share it with Mr. al Baluchi.
- 14 It's an extraordinarily important document as far as
- 15 discovery -- RDI discovery goes or has gone because it's the
- 16 closest we have to a narrative, albeit a very, very limited
- 17 CIA narrative, formed by the CIA's cables and attestations
- 18 from some of the UFI personnel who we've been denied access
- 19 to, of what happened to Mr. al Baluchi in a very limited way
- 20 at the black sites.
- In the course of witness testimony on suppression in
- 22 January 2020, I asked the government, and they may recall
- 23 this, if they would consider asking for remarking of the bulk

- 1 of the document. It's about an, I think, an 89-page document
- 2 and I asked if they would consider remarking the bulk of it
- 3 precisely because the bulk of it dealt with conditions of
- 4 confinement and applications of both standard and enhanced
- 5 interrogation techniques, including descriptions of personnel
- 6 and attitudes and behavior and backgrounds of personnel and
- 7 all of that.
- 8 I want to give the government great credit here,
- 9 actually, because they did take that part that I'd requested
- 10 and they came back pretty fast, as I recall -- they can
- 11 correct me, of course, but as I recall, it was within a day or
- 12 two -- with a remarked copy that's now FOUO that is in the
- 13 record at AE 628RRRRR Attachment C.
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: So Ms. Pradhan, let me ask you a
- **15** question, then, so ----
- **16** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Yes, sir.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- and then you can get back to --
- 18 because this is -- your presentation has been useful for me.
- 19 So my question then is: That seems to go to exactly
- 20 the government's position in their response that they said,
- 21 defense, you're coming in asking for these 12 categories,
- 22 thousands of pages. We're willing to look at almost a
- 23 case-by-case basis if you can give particularized reasons on a

- 1 more limited pieces of -- of discovery. And it -- you know,
- 2 and then here you're giving an example of one where you went
- 3 to them with that particularization and they came back quickly
- 4 with it reclassified.
- 5 Why is it too onerous on defense to come back and
- 6 break down this 12-category -- this large chunk that you're
- 7 asking for in more digestible pieces where, with some
- 8 particularization, that the government could then respond to?
- **9** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Absolutely, sir. And the answer to
- 10 your question lies in the nature of these documents in each
- 11 category. The OIG report was a single, you know,
- 12 80-some-page report that I could hand to the government and
- 13 say, look, I think these pages probably still need to stay
- 14 classified; could you please look at these particular pages?
- **15** It was one single document.
- And I will say I have done that, given them sort of
- 17 particularized documents. I think at the same time as the OIG
- 18 report, I handed them a few pages of the JDM discovery that I
- 19 also asked them -- you know, requested remarking on, and they
- 20 were able to do that for me as well.
- The problem, sir, comes when you start looking at the
- 22 categories under 397F of 2D profiles for dozens of people.
- 23 2J -- you know, 2F, and I, and J, sort of information for each

- 1 individual, and having to figure out which individuals are
- 2 most important to your client at this point and which are not.
- 3 And I will tell you, sir, you know, if the government's
- 4 proposal is that we take every page of the 2D profiles or the
- 5 2F and 2G and say, oh, this is important, this needs to be
- 6 releasable to Mr. al Baluchi, but this page isn't as
- 7 important, that's really a perfect example of perpetuating the
- 8 delay that everyone has been talking about.
- **9** And let me explain why. We know that the documents
- 10 pertaining directly to our clients that are perhaps listed in
- **11** the RDI ----
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Ms. Pradhan, I got another message that
- 13 the interpreters are requesting if you could go a little bit
- 14 slower.
- **15** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Of course.
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: They're saying that the audio is not
- 17 that clear. I don't see anyone that close to you. If you're
- 18 comfortable, I'm -- I'll authorize you to remove your mask. I
- 19 can hear you, but I want to make sure that the interpreters
- 20 are able to properly interpret what you're saying for the
- 21 accused.
- 22 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Of course, sir. And I'll represent
- 23 that there are, I believe, four other individuals here with me

1 who are all more than 25 feet away behind plexiglas. 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okav. 3 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: So we know, sir, that the documents 4 pertaining directly to our clients that are perhaps listed in 5 the RDI indices need to be releasable to our clients, but we 6 also know now and are still discovering that documents not 7 pertaining to them on their face may be just as important as 8 we've shown, for example, in AE 628, which is Mr. al Baluchi's 9 motion to suppress the LHM statements where we trace one 10 detainee's torture and interrogation by certain personnel and 11 link them to another's and another's and another's showing how 12 torture is embedded in all of the interrogation results and 13 statements. 14 And we also know that CIA personnel that don't seem 15 significant from their descriptions in the 2D profiles of 16 perhaps their contacts with Mr. al Baluchi or Mr. Mohammad or 17 any of the other defendants may turn out to be enormously 18 important years later. I've learned that personally from 19 interviewing a handful of the UFI personnel, the ones that the 20 government gave us access to, as well as receiving new

discovery over time, and we are still receiving discovery

for -- a good example again, of that, is the PRG discovery

that we started receiving a couple of years ago and

21

22

23

- 1 that discovery which is classified, of course, and is not
- 2 included in this request in 783, but that discovery highlights
- 3 certain black site personnel who, I'll be honest, I had
- 4 dismissed earlier as not being significant, as -- and that PRG
- 5 highlights the rules and responsibilities that actually are
- 6 very, very important to the defense.
- 7 And so this is -- this is sort of an ongoing process
- 8 as we get more information as we continue to discuss --
- 9 conduct investigation, we continue to learn more about what --
- 10 which of these documents is important.
- 11 And so given the government's relative ease and --
- 12 yes, I don't want to minimize the amount of information this
- 13 is. It is a large amount of information, but it also goes to
- 14 the very heart of the defense and it is something that we have
- 15 been asking for for a very, very long time.
- And so every time the government comes back and says,
- 17 well, give me -- you know, pick out your top three pages or
- 18 ten pages, it just slows the process down when they could be
- 19 reviewing -- they know better than we do how much there is.
- 20 They could be reviewing this themselves and producing to us
- 21 what we know to be relevant either directly or derivatively.
- You've heard many times that we don't know what we
- 23 don't know. And so, no, we cannot rely on our clients'

- 1 memories. But, you know, those fractured memories are one
- 2 resource that may lead to bigger pieces of the puzzle or at
- 3 least to asking more important questions. And if the
- 4 government is going to work with us in good faith, I think
- 5 they need to stop fighting a commonsense understanding of
- 6 that.
- 7 You've heard in other discovery motions, and
- 8 doubtless, sir, you will continue to hear that we -- you know,
- 9 we're asking, in many cases, for original or less redacted
- 10 documents with information that we need with dates, with UFI
- 11 personnel, with cable numbers left on them. But the other
- 12 part of that is give us versions of the RDI discovery that we
- 13 can show our clients which should be either declassified at
- 14 this point or, you know, certainly now six years after the
- 15 release of the SSCI Report, information pertaining to their
- 16 conditions of confinement and their torture should be
- **17** declassified.
- And that might actually give us better opportunities
- 19 to shape the -- for example, the stipulations that the
- 20 government gave us two years ago. Mr. Trivett, I remember, I
- 21 think on Friday talked about how they're waiting on our edits.
- 22 Well, we've started, sir. Our team started, but we can't
- 23 complete it. We need more information, more witness

- 1 testimony, more ways in which to work with our very ill
- 2 clients. And this is one way for us to actually accomplish
- 3 that, to get facts that, as they say, are tethered to reality
- 4 that we might then be able to -- to help shape those
- 5 stipulations.
- **6** And so, you know, subject to your questions, sir. I
- 7 just wanted to give you that bit of context. We've all sat in
- 8 this RDI discovery for a very long time for the purpose of big
- 9 motion series like the ones I mentioned, 424, 525, 534,
- 10 et cetera. And, you know, it's been extremely difficult to
- 11 draw the connections that we need to move forward.
- 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Thank you. No questions.
- **13** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Thank you, sir.
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. I will turn it over to the
- 15 Hawsawi defense team. Obviously, you have until 1 October to
- **16** file something, but did you have any questions -- any
- 17 argument?
- 18 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: We'll reserve until the presence of
- **19** learned counsel. Thank you, Judge.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: That's what I thought.
- 21 All right. I'll then go to the government.
- 22 ATC [Maj HALL]: Good morning, Your Honor.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: Good morning.

- 1 ATC [Mai HALL]: Or afternoon. Sorry. So the -- it 2 sounds like from your questions you were actually tracking the 3 actual issue at issue with these motions. So I would say that 4 generally the prosecution would rest on its briefs. Just to 5 respond to a couple of the points that we heard in oral 6 argument, to start with, you know, this is one of the problems 7 with these motions to compel, and you'll probably see this as 8 we go forward, but it tends to devolve from what the actual 9 issue of the motion is to a larger argument about discovery or 10 about the rules and law around -- surrounding classified 11 information and classified litigation.
- But what this seems to all boil down to, from what I

 can tell, is an argument that the CIPA law, the rules around

 classified information and disclosure or discovery shouldn't

 be -- it just shouldn't be the law.
- But it is the law. And as we, you know, showed pretty clearly in our written response, when you provide classified information in discovery to cleared defense counsel, that satisfies the obligation for the government in discovery.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: Let me -- let me stop you there and just 21 ask a follow-up question.
- So I get that. I look at the CIPA case law. It seems very straight forward as far as this area, that the government

- 1 can prevent classified information that might be normally
- 2 discoverable from being shown -- or given by the defense
- **3** counsel to the accused. So what about in a death penalty
- 4 case? I mean, so the case law doesn't seem to address that
- 5 and the government obviously -- if there is a heightened
- 6 standard, heightened due process, I mean, what is the
- 7 government's position on how you're going to accomplish that
- **8** in a case like this?
- 9 ATC [Maj HALL]: So a couple of things, I guess. First of
- **10** all, the idea that there's going to be evidence presented in
- 11 this case from the prosecution that the accused has not seen
- 12 or has not had is wrong. There is not going to be any
- 13 evidence of that. We've already -- we're already 99 percent,
- 14 if not more, complete with either declassifying or providing
- 15 the evidence the prosecution is going to use affirmatively in
- **16** a "Display To" or "Releasable To" format.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 18 ATC [Maj HALL]: You can go down through, I believe it's
- 19 AE 683 -- yeah, 683 is the prosecution's exhibit list and, you
- 20 know, there's not very much, honestly, that's classified
- 21 anyway. But to the extent that anything in there is, it is or
- 22 it will be provided, so we've covered that.
- As far as discovery goes, the stuff that the

1 prosecution -- which is basically all of this in these 2 motions, nothing that the prosecution is going to be using. 3 We're talking about discovery. There's no -- so I guess it's 4 just -- it's an issue of do the -- do the rules of evidence, 5 do the rules of discovery, do the rules of, you know -- the 6 military rules and the federal rules of discovery practice 7 change because it's a death penalty case? 8 And there's no CIPA -- the only CIPA case that was in 9 the death penalty case was the Tsarnaev case that just 10 happened in the First Circuit. That's at the Supreme Court 11 right now. But the First Circuit touched on it. It wasn't a 12 very large part of that case. 13 But there is no indication in the Tsarnaev case that 14 CIPA somehow is invalidated because it's a death penalty case. 15 They use the process, the court actually -- you may have seen 16 reference to it in the 833 briefing we filed, but the court --17 the First Circuit actually pointed out the usefulness of the 18 CIPA process because, unlike in normal discovery practice, 19 even in a death penalty case, where the government makes the 20 determination of what's discoverable and the defense doesn't

see, you know, what goes on behind the scenes necessarily ----

MJ [Col McCALL]: Major Hall, if you can speak -- I

haven't gotten a signal yet, but I'm anticipating that the

21

22

23

- 1 interpreters may have trouble with your speed.
- 2 ATC [Maj HALL]: Yes, sir.
- 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- 4 ATC [Maj HALL]: So the court in that case did say the
- 5 benefit is, in the CIPA context, the court gets to look at the
- 6 original classified information, look at the summaries or
- 7 substitutions, and then make a determination. So there is an
- 8 additional set of eyes, you know, on the original information,
- **9** which is not the case in a normal discovery context.
- 10 So I would just say it's not a very well-developed
- 11 area in terms of is CIPA applicable in a death penalty case.
- 12 But what we do see is, you know, generally speaking in death
- 13 penalty cases the rules of evidence, the rules of discovery
- 14 don't change. The meaning doesn't change. It might be
- 15 broader because of -- mitigation might be a broader, you know,
- 16 situation, but the rule of -- the words -- you know, the word
- 17 "relevance" doesn't lose its meaning, for example. And then
- 18 the $\underline{\mathsf{Tsarnaev}}$ is probably the only position.
- 19 So I would say in order to carry the burden on a
- 20 motion such as this, there's no support to say that we can't
- 21 do CIPA in a death penalty case, which it does seem like kind
- 22 of is what we have devolved to here in this argument on this
- 23 motion.

1 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. So -- and I get that, you 2 know, the government's position is that the evidence that the 3 government intends to use, they're going to get declassified 4 and -- so it's not an issue for this topic, but I mean, 5 doesn't that lead exactly to the defense's argument that 6 that's only one -- almost a smaller piece of the pie, that 7 typically it is going to be a broader area that the defense is 8 going to have to look into to try to build this mitigation defense? And so walk me through that. 9 10 So, I mean, it seems -- and again, I'm not prejudging 11 this, but I -- just to get the government's position. 12 when the government controls the keys to the evidence and they're able and willing, apparently, to declassify their own 13 14 evidence that they plan on using -- and again, I understand 15 that it's -- it's not exactly an apples-to-apples comparison 16 as what we're looking at. But for the government to be able 17 to do that for their case and then the defense getting the 18 stiff arm, again, it -- when we're already in a position of looking at a -- and trying to make sure that there is a 19 20 heightened level of due process for the accused based on what 21 they're facing, you know, walk me through how the commission 22 is supposed to make sure that the defense is -- has adequate 23 substitutes.

- 1 ATC [Maj HALL]: Yes, sir. Okay. So a couple points. I
- 2 would say that defense is not getting the stiff arm. They
- 3 have all of the information we're talking about. The counsel
- 4 has it. The counsel can do all of their investigation. They
- 5 can discuss with their clients their experiences.
- I know we've heard argument that that's not as useful
- 7 as maybe the government suggests that it is. I would dispute
- 8 that. You -- we have in the record a filing from Mr. Ali
- 9 detailing, in very extensive detail, his experiences. That's
- 10 in the record and it's from -- from him. So it isn't
- 11 impossible.
- 12 But even to put that aside, the adequate substitute
- 13 piece, you know, that's why you're having these ex parte
- 14 presentations with the defense. That's why you'll have the
- 15 one with the government, to see why it is that -- you know, to
- 16 say that the government can just declassify a document if it
- 17 wants to, that's not true. It -- if it was, we wouldn't have
- 18 any classified documents and we wouldn't be doing this.
- **19** MJ [Col McCALL]: Understood.
- 20 ATC [Maj HALL]: There are things that remain classified
- 21 no matter what the prosecution would like to do. When we
- 22 provide it at a classified level to cleared defense counsel, I
- 23 mean, that's why the rule is what it is. That's why the <u>In re</u>

- 1 Terrorist Bombings case, you know, had to make that -- that
- 2 decision that that satisfies the discovery obligation.
- 3 Now, if there's something -- again, and you -- you're
- 4 tracking this. So if there's something more specific that can
- **5** be resolved, we can resolve it, and, you know, that -- that's
- 6 something that we can work with.
- 7 The 534, the example that Ms. Pradhan gave, the 534 AE
- 8 series, you know, there is a ruling in that. There's a motion
- 9 to reconsider, but there's a ruling that's standing, 534M,
- 10 that basically said if there's problems with this -- the
- 11 example was the chronology. And that's one of the points I
- 12 wanted to make. You know, we heard earlier that the defense
- 13 can't make a chronology about where their accused was and what
- 14 happened. That's wrong. Yes, they can, and we've given them
- 15 this RDI index that shows in detail where they were and -- and
- **16** when.
- 17 There may be discrepancies, and that's -- it's going
- 18 to happen when there are so many documents documenting one
- 19 event that happened one time, but from different people at
- 20 different times, it's not going to always come out to be
- 21 100 percent, because it's just in the nature of it. However,
- 22 if something can be verified, we would verify it.
- 23 So 534M orders the parties to confer and try to hash

- 1 out if there is an inconsistency before filing a motion to
- 2 compel. It doesn't, unfortunately, happen as much as maybe it
- 3 could, and this, I think, is a good example. The narrowing
- 4 that happened here wasn't much of a narrowing in -- in
- 5 reality. The government could, in theory, try to go back
- 6 through and look at everything that's been given over at a
- 7 classified level and see if there's a difference, but that
- 8 would take an enormous amount of time and resources.
- 9 And, you know, we turned these over in -- starting in
- **10** 2017. That was after the SSCI declass decision was already
- 11 made, so these already were made with that knowledge, so
- 12 they've already been -- that's already been considered and
- 13 they're still classified as the original classification
- 14 authority has determined. So, you know, they just are
- 15 classified properly under the current standards.
- 16 So maybe something could change in 2021 compared to
- 17 2017 and '18, unlikely that it will be very much, and the bang
- 18 for your buck -- you know, that's why we say -- that's why we
- 19 offer give us something more specific that we can use.
- 20 Otherwise, you know, it is just a never-ending churn.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 22 ATC [Maj HALL]: So -- and then specifically to your point
- 23 about how do we know if it's an adequate summary. Like I

- 1 said, that's the point of the 505 process. You're hearing
- 2 attacks and challenges to the existence of CIPA or the 505
- 3 process generally. But unfortunately, you know, or
- 4 fortunately, depending on which side of the room you're
- 5 sitting on, that's the process and that's how it is supposed
- 6 to work and that is how it has worked in federal courts for 40
- 7 years.
- 8 The adequacy is something that you would determine and
- 9 then the government tries to make sure to meet your standards,
- 10 you know, every time we go forth. But I would say that three
- 11 judges now have looked at this material and have all found the
- 12 information that the defense has to be adequate, the summaries
- 13 or the classified information that has gone over with a
- 14 redaction or -- you know, one way or the other. If it
- 15 couldn't get down to a "Display To" or "Releasable To" level,
- 16 that's because the nature of the document didn't allow it.
- 17 But the defense has it and the commission has ruled, if it's
- 18 gone through the process, the commission has ruled it's an
- 19 adequate substitute. So we've -- we've covered this ground in
- **20** a lot of ways already. So I think that covers most of the
- **21** points, actually.
- 22 One second, Your Honor.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure.

1 [Pause.] 2 ATC [Maj HALL]: A couple follow-up points. 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure. 4 ATC [Maj HALL]: So in addition to the Tsarnaev case, the 5 Moussaoui case and the In re Terrorist Bombings cases were 6 both death penalty cases to begin with. And again, no 7 indication that both of those cases were full of CIPA practice 8 or classified information litigation. No indication that 9 because it's a death penalty case, these rules wouldn't be 10 followed. They followed those rules. 11 Just to kind of reiterate, on the review or the --12 something -- you know, a category of something may have been 13 declassified or is no longer classified, you know, in the same 14 way that it was earlier. We -- if we go back and look at a 15 document that has, you know, perhaps something that 16 Ms. Pradhan highlighted is no longer classified, that 17 doesn't -- that does not mean that the document becomes 18 unclassified and it does not mean that the information that is 19 in there they don't already -- they do already have that. 20 So if it's an unclassified piece of information, it 21 can then be treated as unclassified. To the extent that we 22 need to make that specific, you know, we could -- could do 23 that, but generally it doesn't change the classification of

- 1 the document because there's lots of things in a document --
- 2 in a given document that make it classified.
- 3 And then just regarding, again, giving the defense
- 4 what they can use and provide and talk about with their
- 5 client, the stip of fact -- the proposed stipulations of fact
- 6 that we have given to the defense, each accused has one of
- 7 those from the government. We worked very hard to get those
- 8 down to the FOUO level so they could be shared with their
- 9 client and also, you know, used in an open setting so that the
- 10 defense, you know, could talk about it, and they have. They
- 11 have done that. Maybe not necessarily with the stipulations
- 12 but with the underlying information that went into those
- 13 stipulations, so it hasn't been for nothing.
- 14 Subject to any other questions, sir, that's all I
- **15** have.
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, all right. Let's ask about -- and
- 17 I'm trying not to get -- we've already gotten far afield from
- 18 the actual, like, narrow scope of this motion, but I feel like
- 19 this will be useful for me for these other motions that -- as
- 20 was mentioned, there's quite a few of them pending.
- 21 So for the stip of fact, going back to, you know, what
- 22 I've heard from defense, and it makes sense that we don't know
- 23 what we don't know. And so if -- if I'm having to stand in

1 the shoes of the defense to make sure that the 505 process is 2 working properly and that any kind of substitution and summary 3 is -- summary and substitution is -- is working, I mean, how 4 is the commission able to do that, you know, for the stip of 5 fact? So are these stip of facts all -- having not seen the 6 document yet, is this -- does it show exactly where it comes 7 from in the various summaries and substitutions? I guess ----8 ATC [Maj HALL]: It doesn't have, like, a footnote to 9 everywhere it came from, no, sir. It's more of a -- just a 10 document on its own, kind of a chronological description. 11 it does come from -- directly from all of the discovery. 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. 13 ATC [Maj HALL]: Which the discovery, again, which was 14 viewed -- the originals were viewed by the commission and 15 approved, you know. Generally speaking, if you're going to 16 take a statement about one event that happened in one place, 17 the original might say some administrative data, might say 18 some names of people and some names of places, but the actual 19 thing that happens to the detainee is almost verbatim in --20 from the original into the substitute. 21 That's, I think, what the commission has generally 22 been seeking, is to provide what happened to them, not, you

know, what the administrative data was or what the location

23

- 1 was because we've all -- that has been settled, you know.
- 2 We're not -- that's classified. It's not going to be
- 3 something that's going to be given over, so it becomes pretty
- 4 formulaic in some ways when the commission starts looking at
- 5 those types of things.
- **6** So there -- I guess there are some footnotes in -- in
- 7 the stipulations that goes to the substitute discovery.
- 8 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. All right. Thank you.
- **9** Back to team Mohammad.
- **10** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 11 So I really appreciated my colleague, Ms. Pradhan's,
- 12 addition to what our argument was. And one of the questions
- 13 that you asked her was why can't we just identify within this
- 14 tranche that we want this one and that one. And one of the
- 15 reasons is work product, is that what that system would
- 16 require us to do is to tell the government what our -- what --
- 17 you know, we've got 25 documents, one of them we think is
- 18 really important, so we're going to tell them we want all 25
- 19 because we don't want them to know which one is most
- 20 important.
- I know that's not necessarily something that you want
- 22 to be concerned with, but it is part of our theory of defense,
- 23 is that we're not always going to tell them ahead of time what

- 1 it is that we think is important. And that's ----
- 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, and -- so let me ask you about
- 3 that.
- **4** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Sure.
- 5 MJ [Col McCALL]: And this is, again, as I'm trying to
- 6 work my way around some of these unique issues, but -- so
- 7 I'm -- as the commission, I'm getting the ex parte briefings
- 8 from the defense teams on the defense theories of the case,
- 9 which is useful as I try to stand in your shoes through this
- **10** 505 process.
- 11 But just during the normal discovery process, there's
- 12 a -- understanding that the defense has no burden, but the
- 13 defense at a certain point has to show their cards if they're
- 14 trying to make the -- that basic, you know, show of relevance,
- 15 you know, materiality. So it's -- address that.
- **16** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Sure. And we do do that in -- all
- 17 the time. And we do that in our motion to compel because if
- 18 it's not relevant, we can't ask you to compel it anyway. So
- 19 we've already shown that. None of this -- none of the
- 20 discovery that we're requesting does the government believe is
- 21 not relevant. They wouldn't have given it to us in the first
- 22 place if it wasn't relevant. So the relevance and materiality
- 23 are not ----

1 MJ [Col McCALL]: Sure. For this motion. 2 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Exactly. And so it -- obviously, we 3 do have to give that broad strokes, but I don't have to --4 when I'm making a motion to compel, I don't have to say this 5 is going to help prove this exact fact. I can say this is the 6 theory and here is the evidence to support that theory. 7 think maybe that -- I don't know if I'm making too fine of a 8 point on that. 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: No, it makes sense. 10 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Okay. 11 MJ [Col McCALL]: Certain categories ----12 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Exactly. 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- in the ----14 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: And that's what we did here, is we 15 narrowed it down to those categories that help us do as 16 Ms. Pradhan very carefully said. How do we go back and forth 17 between the discovery that we have that we can't share with 18 Mr. Mohammad and discuss with him evidence that we can? 19 the stipulation is a perfect example. We were told that the 20 stipulations by themselves have all been declassified. 21 those things in the footnotes, they weren't declassified. 22 So if my client says this isn't true, and I look at 23 the classified document, I can't say, well, yes, it is.

- 1 Here's why. It's in this document. I can't show that to him.
- 2 So that's one of the challenges with -- with that mix of
- 3 classified and declassified.
- 4 And the other thing I'd like to draw your attention to
- 5 is in the record at AE 658, which is the government's
- 6 overarching classification guidance that they put together
- 7 before the beginnings of Mr. Ali's -- or Mr. al Baluchi's
- 8 suppression motion. Because the government asserts that we --
- 9 the -- that the lawyers know everything, it's just certain
- 10 things we can't tell our client, and that's not true either.
- 11 There are major -- there are major categories of
- 12 information that they have invoked the national security
- 13 privilege around. They will not tell us. They will never
- 14 tell us. We don't -- we cannot talk about -- there are some
- 15 things we do know, but we can't talk about them in open or
- 16 closed session. So there is still evidence that's being
- 17 completely hidden from both us and our clients. The
- **18** government did ----
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: Let me ask you about that.
- **20** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Sure.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: So for those areas, I mean, you're not
- 22 without a remedy, correct? I mean, obviously it's a severe
- 23 remedy, but the remedy if, honestly, the government is

- **1** invoking a certain level of national security information
- 2 privilege and the defense can show that, no kidding, you need
- 3 this for your defense, I mean, there are remedies as far as
- 4 limiting the government on what they can seek as far as a
- **5** sentence, other ----
- **6** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: Exactly.
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- other remedies, right?
- 8 ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: And actually, that was the next
- 9 point I was going to make, is that the Moussaoui case, which
- 10 is the only death penalty case other than Tsarnaev and is in
- 11 this area, the -- what Judge Brinkema did was she said you --
- 12 you can invoke the national security privilege but you can't
- 13 have the death penalty. She was reversed on appeal, but she
- 14 wasn't reversed on the sanction itself. She was reversed
- 15 because she didn't follow the process to get to that sanction.
- 16 And then the case went to trial and he didn't get the death
- 17 penalty, so it became a nonissue on appeal.
- 18 But the one capital case that we know of that involves
- 19 the 9/11 attacks, the judge looked at the CIPA provisions,
- 20 looked at the evidence the government chose to not provide to
- 21 Mr. Moussaoui, because at that time he was representing
- 22 himself, and she said you can't have the death penalty. And
- 23 so that may be where you'll come to eventually down the road.

- 1 I don't -- I think that that could be avoided, but the
- 2 government's making that choice. That's not a choice that we
- 3 can make.
- **4** MJ [Col McCALL]: Right.
- **5** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: I think -- unless you have other
- 6 questions, that ----
- 7 MJ [Col McCALL]: No other questions. Thank you.
- **8** ADC [MS. RADOSTITZ]: All right. Thank you.
- 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: And rolling back through the teams.
- **10** Yeah, Mr. Bruck?
- 11 LDC [MR. BRUCK]: I just had one thing I wanted to mention
- 12 when I heard the Tsarnaev case invoked for the proposition
- 13 that death isn't all that different. I was the trial lawyer,
- 14 one of them, in the Tsarnaev case. And I'd like to be able to
- 15 tell you exactly how CIPA came up in that case, but, frankly,
- 16 after six years, it played such a trivial role and involved so
- 17 little of the evidence that I can't even remember what it was
- 18 about.
- 19 Tsarnaev does not stand for the proposition that CIPA
- 20 fits comfortably in -- with the special requirements of a
- **21** death penalty case. I'm going to go back, hit the books
- 22 tonight and find out so that I have a more informed
- 23 recollection of that. But I just didn't want to see Tsarnaev

- 1 cited for that proposition, because it just doesn't stand for
- 2 that.
- **3** MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 4 LDC [MR. BRUCK]: Thank you.
- **5** MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that.
- 6 Ms. Bormann?
- 7 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I wanted to follow up on the question
- 8 that you had of Ms. Radostitz about possible remedies
- 9 available. And this is in the nature of sort of informing the
- 10 new military judge of what you're in the middle of.
- 11 But -- so as a result of AE 524 and then Judge Pohl's
- 12 ruling, which was then reversed by Judge Parrella, then Judge
- 13 Cohen came on board ----
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: And this was tossing the letterhead
- 15 memoranda?
- 16 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yes.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right.
- 18 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: What happened was exactly sort of what
- 19 you're -- what you envision. So Protective Order #4 invoked
- 20 national security privilege over the entire investigative
- 21 function of the defendants with respect to CIA personnel, RDI
- 22 black sites, et cetera.
- When Judge Parrella reversed Judge Pohl, bringing the

- 1 LHM statements back into play, and then Judge Cohen took over,
- 2 what Judge Cohen said was, okay, I envision this giant hearing
- 3 where we're not just going to discuss the voluntariness of the
- 4 statements, which is what Judge Parrella had ordered the
- 5 defendants file, and Mr. Bin'Attash did file, but I'm going to
- 6 allow defense counsel to solicit for the record how they're
- 7 prevented by national security privilege from actually making
- 8 a case.
- **9** And so when we began the hearing, witnesses you will
- 10 never see, they -- there were really sort of formalized
- 11 invocations of national security privilege and records made of
- 12 that very thing. So Mr. Connell, for instance, would be
- 13 questioning a witness who was involved in the taking of
- 14 Mr. al Baluchi's statements at some point. And Mr. Connell
- 15 would say, now, I don't want you to answer this. We've worked
- 16 out a protocol here. But I'm going to ask you something and I
- 17 want you to stop because I expect that Mr. Ryan or Mr. Trivett
- 18 will invoke national security privilege, and then I'll be able
- 19 to make it for the record.
- 20 So there's already a record sort of being made of that
- 21 but we've only -- the tip of the iceberg. That will, I think,
- **22** be explored at length later on during witness testimony.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: And I'm tracking that, those -- those

- **1** hearings. And I -- yeah, I'm tracking that that's the issue
- 2 in those. It's sort of a wide scope to those witnesses on
- 3 what exactly they're testifying about ----
- **4** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yeah.
- **5** MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- in regards to the suppression
- 6 motion, but then also ----
- 7 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Whether or not the defense has
- 8 actually been provided enough information ----
- **9** MJ [Col McCALL]: Right.
- **10** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: ---- under all of the protective
- 11 orders, under the classification scheme, under the
- 12 M.C.R.E. 505 process, to actually even begin to have an
- 13 understanding of what happened to their clients. So that's
- **14** where we are.
- **15** MJ [Col McCALL]: Right. All right.
- 16 And then Ms. Pradhan?
- 17 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Just a few points to add to those that
- **18** my colleagues have made.
- The government seemed to be -- if I understand them
- 20 correctly, the government seemed to say at several points
- 21 that, you know, information released in -- after the release
- 22 of the SSCI Report was, you know, still classified when it was
- 23 marked and produced to the defense, and it was still properly

- 1 classified in 2017.
- 2 And, you know, of course we're not necessarily
- 3 disputing that at the time that they produced this to us that
- 4 some of it was still considered to be classified, and some of
- 5 it may still be considered to be classified.
- **6** But they have, over time, been able to provide us,
- 7 right, and there's a difference between declassifying
- 8 information, and it's not always a clear-cut difference.
- 9 Because the difference between declassifying information and
- 10 providing information that is releasable, you know, in forms
- 11 that are releasable to our clients. It's not always clear to
- 12 us where that line is.
- But -- but they have been able to provide the example
- 14 I gave you of the CIA OIG report. I think the government
- 15 said, you know, we can classify little bits of it, but that
- 16 doesn't necessarily declassify the entire document. That's
- 17 sometimes true.
- 18 INT: Your Honor, we're having a problem hearing counsel.
- 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. I believe that the interpreters
- 20 have -- I can hear you, but the interpreters apparently are
- 21 having a hard time. If you could try to speak up.
- 22 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Yes, sir. Sorry about that. I'll try
- 23 to speak more directly into the microphone, if that would

- 1 help.
- 2 So of course, it's certainly true that when we ask for
- 3 little bits of information to be declassified, it doesn't
- 4 necessarily change the classification of the overall document.
- 5 But I think, again, the OIG report is a really good example of
- 6 that because the bulk of the document, it -- it's not that
- 7 certain paragraphs were marked UNCLASSIFIED, it's that the
- 8 bulk of the document came back remarked UNCLASSIFIED//FOUO,
- **9** which, you know, when you look at that example and some of the
- 10 examples of the JDM and other individual items that we have
- 11 given the government to -- to remark or, you know, to -- in a
- 12 request to remark does speak to the passage of time on this
- 13 case and the change in what the OCA considers to be classified
- **14** and unclassified.
- 15 And I know Ms. Radostitz pointed out the
- 16 classification guidance that we were given prior to the taking
- 17 of testimony on the suppression motions. And that, in and of
- 18 itself, those numerous iterations of classification guidance
- 19 were moving targets on what the OCA considered to be
- 20 classified and unclassified.
- 21 So I would just say again, sir, you know, we pointed
- 22 out the protective orders that date back to 2015 that, of
- 23 course, govern in this case, but I would also request the

1 military commission to look at the many iterations of that 2 classification guidance that we were given sometimes, you 3 know, ten minutes before witness testimony was to begin over 4 the course of a very short period of months between 2019 and 5 2020 as an illustration of how quickly things can change in 6 this -- in this -- on this issue of classification. 7 At the same time, the government's ability -- and I 8 think he -- this may go to one of the questions you asked the government. The government's ability to selectively 9 10 declassify information has, you know, often been wielded to 11 the detriment of the defense. And one example I can give you 12 in an unclassified session is better briefed in AE 692 in 13 which the government declassified the opinion of the former Camp VII commander regarding the operational control of 14 15 Camp VII, but classified our cross-examination questions in 16 open session on that point to the former Camp VII commander. 17 You can imagine, sir, without my going into detail, 18 what the impression is to the public, what the result is when 19 that sort of selective declassification happens and our 20 ability to really provide, not just a full defense but, you 21 know, in some cases it goes to a public trial issue. 22 A couple of other points. The government, you know,

puts great faith in the 505 process and I think we've briefed

23

1 elsewhere, you know, some of the issues and spoken to you 2 about some of the issues with the 505 process and its opacity 3 to us. But I want to point out that at least one of the 4 categories, one of the major categories that I talked about 5 earlier, the 2D profiles, never went through the 505 process. 6 These are -- you know, at the time that they were produced to us, we considered them to be really, really 7 8 useful, frankly, and we were very grateful to receive them 9 because they were profiles of the UFI personnel that sort of 10 connected them to certain locations and certain actions taken 11 with respect to the defendants. We thought they were 12 enormously useful and then, of course, you know, we can still 13 consult them, but we found -- and this, again, is briefed in 14 AE 562, which we'll go into in some detail on when we argue 15 that, but then we found that there were a large number of 16 discrepancies. 17 And when the government says they can -- we can come 18 talk to them about discrepancies -- and I know that this is 19 contained in AE 534M and AE 562, I believe it's R, in the 20 rulings from Judge Parrella, when they say that we can come 21 and talk to them about the discrepancies, sir, we're not 22 talking about a handful of discrepancies. And this is fully 23 briefed in 534 and 562. We're talking about dozens, in

- 1 sometimes -- in some cases with respect to the RDI index,
- 2 hundreds of discrepancies that we are unable to resolve.
- 3 And again, several of those tranches of evidence were
- 4 outside of the 505 process, so it's not as if the military
- 5 commission has approved these sort of flawed summaries that
- 6 were given to us.
- 7 And the last point that I just wanted to make is that
- 8 the government -- the government stated that the stipulation
- **9** of facts that we are meant to add to is shareable with the
- 10 clients. And that's -- that's true, right? And then we took
- 11 a look at, you know, do they have -- does it have footnotes?
- 12 Does it not have footnotes? It does contain some footnotes.
- 13 But when the stipulation of facts says something like
- 14 A2Z, right, a UFI did X to Mr. al Baluchi in X location,
- 15 right, Mr. al Baluchi didn't know that individual as A2Z,
- 16 right? He didn't know that person's real name at all. What
- 17 we have to provide for Mr. al Baluchi to be able to give us
- 18 context on that is some sort of context around that
- 19 individual. What other sites were they at that Mr. al Baluchi
- 20 may have been at? What was perhaps, you know, a little bit of
- 21 their training? What was their role?
- That's the information that's contained in those
- 23 categories that Mr. Mohammad asks for in 783 to be releasable

- 1 to Mr. Mohammad and to the other defendants. And this goes
- 2 back to my point that I made in response to your -- your
- 3 question earlier, sir, about why we can't just pick and choose
- 4 what we want released, and that's because one UFI usually
- 5 leads us down the road to several others that we realize,
- 6 either through discovery or from Mr. al Baluchi or from
- 7 outside investigation, had a far greater role than we ever
- **8** knew initially.
- **9** And if we go back over months and years, it's just an
- 10 interminable process. We've seen their ability to do this
- 11 quickly with small amounts of information -- or relatively
- 12 small amounts of information. And if they would just -- you
- 13 know, if -- if they could start that process, instead of
- 14 spending months and years fighting about it, it would be, I
- 15 think, enormously useful to the defense and enormously useful
- 16 in moving these proceedings.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you.
- 18 All right. I believe I've heard enough on -- on this
- 19 motion. We've been going for a while now. Give the
- 20 interpreters a chance to have a break. My plan is to go ahead
- 21 and take a recess for 20 minutes, so that would bring us to
- 22 1505, and then we'll go on to the next AE. Seeing as how
- 23 we're all here, we'll just press and we'll take up the next

- **1** one, which is -- at least start on it, which is AE 775. And
- 2 then we'll see how far we get. If we don't finish it, we'll
- 3 handle it later in the week.
- 4 At the end of the session, though, I'll -- I'll go
- 5 through a little bit of the housekeeping on rescheduling the
- 6 Mohammad defense team's exparte briefing. I want to talk to
- 7 Ms. Bormann about when we can do their ex parte briefing. And
- 8 then we'll go from there.
- 9 I still plan on having a classified closed hearing
- 10 tomorrow morning, but we may have some time tomorrow afternoon
- 11 as well. But for now, court -- the commission is in recess
- **12** until 1505.
- 13 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1445, 13 September 2021.]
- 14 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1507,
- 15 13 September 2021.]
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: The commission is called to order. The
- 17 parties are again present.
- 18 All right. We'll move into ----
- **19** ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Judge?
- **20** MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- AE 775.
- 21 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Judge, sorry. If I may. I
- 22 apologize.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: Oh, yes.

- 1 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Suzanne Lachelier for
- **2** Mr. al Hawsawi.
- 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yes, I'm sorry.
- 4 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: I can do it from here. Just real
- 5 quick, I wanted to note the docket, when we informed
- **6** Mr. al Hawsawi of the docket today, his impression was today
- 7 was -- this afternoon would be a closed session. That's what
- 8 the SJA thought, that's what your docket had put out, that's
- 9 what we had informed him. And although I told him it was a
- 10 fluid situation, you know, I just wanted you to be aware that
- 11 when everything shifts around, it makes the voluntariness more
- 12 questionable because it's very difficult to know at this point
- 13 whether he would have wanted to be present or not.
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that. And I'll say I'm
- 15 trying to be flexible on that, but I do believe it was -- it
- 16 was on the docket that we were going to handle these
- 17 motions -- these AEs this morning, if at -- if possible. So
- 18 even though they shifted to this afternoon, I feel comfortable
- 19 that he's waived being present for those motions.
- 20 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: We didn't object at lunchtime only
- 21 because we thought we were just coming back for the one motion
- 22 and we didn't want to have him disturbed to come all the way
- 23 back for a 20-minute session. Understood, Judge.

MJ [Col McCALL]: Understood. I feel comfortable 1 2 proceeding. 3 All right. So we'll move into Mr. Mohammad's motion 4 to compel all information regarding the substance and 5 circumstances of Mr. Mohammad's interrogation in January 2007 6 at Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Mr. Sowards? 7 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Thank you, Your Honor. Good 8 afternoon. Gary Sowards appearing on behalf of Mr. Mohammad, 9 who is present. And thank you for that summary of the -- of 10 the motion by reading the title. And for those watching in 11 the gallery, what we're asking the military judge to compel 12 the government to give us is any witness accounts, 13 observations, or documentation of the substance and 14 circumstances of his interrogation in November 2007. 15 And I think, Your Honor, up until this point in the 16 afternoon, and from -- continuing from this morning, you may 17 have an idea of what I was talking about during our voir dire 18 conversation to say that in this case, torture is only always 19 in the room. And it -- it is the collision between the 20 torture, the incidence of torture in this case, and the 21 government's resistance to disclosure of the information 22 which, as Ms. Pradhan and Ms. Radostitz explained to you a 23 little earlier, are a large accounting of the time that has

- 1 taken to litigate this case.
- 2 And it sort of branches off in different directions
- 3 and has different permutations and all of that, but it all
- 4 comes back to this -- this question of torture.
- 5 And I recall that also during our voir dire you had
- 6 mentioned that in the context of your criminal practice as
- 7 both a prosecutor and a defense attorney, that it was fairly
- 8 reasonable and to be expected that something that would be
- 9 turned over would be a defendant's -- a criminal defendant's
- 10 statements, and then generally, the notes would follow. And
- 11 then generally after that, there would be some litigation
- 12 about the voluntariness of the statement.
- And then you made the observation that a lot of that
- 14 has gone by the wayside with the advent of videotaping and
- 15 recording. And then you further explained -- or when I asked
- 16 you about it, you said that nevertheless, there's some
- 17 situations where when you get evidence of what happened before
- 18 and what happened after the videotaping, that can also change
- 19 the perceptions of what's recorded.
- 20 And I remind the -- or invite the commission to be
- 21 reminded of that because in this case, unfortunately, we do
- 22 not have any -- at least of which we're aware, we do not have
- 23 any videotapes of any interrogations, any statement taking,

- 1 any interviews; most significantly, any torture. And while
- 2 the government spent -- gave over \$80,000,000 to the two
- 3 principal torturers, none of that money was spent on any kind
- 4 of recording devices to document this for purposes of
- 5 litigation.
- **6** And so what we are coming down to and in the middle of
- 7 right now is the litigation to test the admissibility of the
- 8 so-called letterhead memorandums, which you referred to
- 9 earlier. And again, just to bring up to speed the folks who
- 10 may be watching this for the first time, including visiting
- 11 family members, what we're talking about is that after
- 12 Mr. Mohammad was taken into the black sites in early March of
- 13 2003 and held incommunicado and tortured until his release
- 14 approximately three and a half years later in 2006, the
- 15 government then decided that they wanted to get incriminating
- 16 statements that they could use to introduce in a criminal
- 17 prosecution.
- And so they devised a plan to have FBI agents whom
- 19 they would represent to the world had at that -- up to that
- 20 point been wholly divorced from and not involved in any of the
- 21 CIA torture program in general, or Mr. Mohammad's torture in
- 22 particular, they would have those FBI agents go to Guantanamo
- 23 and sit down with Mr. Mohammad and ask him questions that

- 1 would elicit incriminating statements to his involvement in
- 2 9/11, and so that's what they did.
- 3 And unfortunately, what we got out of that, and what
- 4 they want to introduce into -- into the trial and what we're
- 5 litigating in the suppression motion is still not a client's
- 6 or a defendant's statement. What they want to introduce, as
- 7 the name suggests, is a letterhead memorandum. And that's
- 8 kind of a fancy way of saying someone has written a memo, or a
- 9 summary, in this case Francis Pellegrino, FBI Special Agent,
- 10 he or someone assisting him, we think probably under CIA
- 11 supervision, has authored a memo of his experiences going down
- 12 to Guantanamo and sitting with Mr. Mohammad during several
- 13 days between January 12th and 16th, 2007, while they asked him
- 14 basically to endorse their -- their view, their understanding
- 15 of Mr. Mohammad's involvement in the attacks of 9/11.
- 16 Neither Special Agent Pellegrino, nor anyone else, has
- 17 actually provided us with a statement that Mr. Mohammad made,
- 18 but what they have is this -- this summary of it.
- And if I may just take a moment to step to the side
- 20 and talk about a couple of quick -- quick points that were
- 21 raised earlier today about the interplay between CIPA and the
- 22 classified information and some of these restrictions, which
- 23 really I don't think are all -- totally necessary per se to

- 1 this issue because we're asking for pretty much
- 2 straightforward discovery that would be available under 701 or
- 3 any kind of a prosecution, but always kind of lurking in
- 4 the -- in the wings is this notion of the government's
- 5 interest in classified information, protecting national
- 6 security, and, therefore, their reliance, almost reflexive
- 7 reliance, on summaries and memoranda rather than giving us
- 8 access to what really happened.
- **9** And you asked -- you were speaking with counsel for
- 10 the government earlier in response to Ms. Radostitz's motion
- 11 and talking about -- I thought very -- a very pertinent
- 12 question was the role of CIPA in death penalty cases. And I
- 13 think Mr. Bruck was able to give you some guidance on that,
- 14 the limited information we know to date, because it is the
- 15 case that there is no indication that says the United States
- 16 Supreme Court or the Eighth Amendment, certainly, or the
- 17 Sixth Amendment, would tolerate in a capital case withholding
- 18 from a defendant whose life is on the line information about
- 19 what he personally experienced in government custody when they
- 20 extracted a statement from him and the actual words he used.
- 21 That's where we find ourselves today. We do not have
- 22 access, for the most part, to the actual words that were used.
- 23 We have -- we have memoranda given to us. But I think the

- 1 other thing is, going forward in this case, is the question,
- 2 while a very, very good one about how does CIPA-like national
- 3 security regulations and laws and procedures, how must those
- 4 be modified to protect the interests at stake in a death
- **5** penalty case.
- **6** The other question is: Has CIPA or any other
- 7 government privilege litigation -- provisions, been allowed to
- 8 limit the investigation of a pervasive program of
- 9 government-sponsored torture, which is the violation of
- 10 domestic and international law? And when I talk about
- 11 government-sponsored torture, that is not to be provocative or
- 12 to insult the government here in -- in court because I
- 13 understand they're not responsible for this. They just have
- **14** the job of trying to represent the court -- the government in
- 15 going forward with this prosecution.
- 16 But it has in large part -- first of all, the torture
- 17 itself has been acknowledged by two sitting U.S. presidents
- 18 and it has been documented by a select committee of the
- 19 United States Senate on Intelligence for which we have only
- **20** the Executive Summary.
- 21 And last Friday, I believe it was, Mr. Trivett was
- 22 explaining to you the notion of the forthcoming disclosure of
- 23 information that the government has given us, which I -- if I

- 1 recall correctly, he estimated at approximately 600,000 pages
- 2 of discovery, only 20,000 pages of which relate to the torture
- 3 program, the government torture program. And what I was
- 4 struck by was, even if it had been 600,000 pages, the full
- **5** 600,000 pages had related to the government torture program,
- 6 that would have been only 10 percent of what we know are the
- 7 documents underlying the Senate Select Committee's
- 8 investigation and documentation of what happened, particularly
- 9 to Mr. Mohammad.
- And while that is -- is significant -- or the
- 11 significance of that is, going forward, as the government
- 12 proffers a stipulation, which we probably will not accept,
- 13 because there are many instances -- and I'll talk in a moment
- 14 about Mr. Mohammad's limitations of what he can and cannot
- **15** recall ----
- 16 TC [MR. SWANN]: Your Honor?
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Stop for a second. Mr. Swann.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: I'm going to object. I'm going to object
- 19 on relevance grounds. This motion is to be confined to a
- 20 certain area. That's our objection.
- 21 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Yeah. Thank you.
- 22 MJ [Col McCALL]: Objection overruled. I'll let you
- 23 continue.

1 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Sure. 2 The minor amount of evidence that we -- that we have, 3 we are not going to be able to litigate with them or -- or 4 oppose them when they say you must accept a proposed stipulation or some other view of the evidence because we're 5 6 telling you this is what it is and this is all we're giving 7 you to counter that. That's in part why we're -- why we're 8 trying to get that -- that information. 9 I was struck also by, and this is to explain why we're 10 asking for the additional information which really isn't --11 categorically, it's not that much. It is very limited. There 12 is a lot of it, and the government hasn't given it to us. 13 the counsel for the government, in response to your questions 14 about the chronology having some discrepancies in it that 15 Ms. Pradhan pointed out, the spirit of the comments were, 16 sure, and anytime anybody undertakes to do a summary or 17 anytime anybody undertakes to do a chronology, there's going 18 to be some discrepancies. And, you know, that's just --19 that's just the nature of the beast. But that is the 20 difference between a party who is affected by the information 21 and has a motive and an interest in making sure it's accurate 22 and thoroughly digging into it, versus someone on the other 23 side who is providing them with that, quote/unquote, summary.

1 And I -- and I can imagine anybody who -- again, such 2 as Your Honor's an experienced practitioner in both 3 prosecution and defense, if you heard a defense attorney say, 4 gee, there was lot of evidence in this case, so I asked the 5 prosecutor if they would loan me a paralegal to give me a 6 summary of it. You know, the obvious conflict and the obvious 7 question about the advisability of that, you know, speaks for 8 itself. 9 But then turning to -- to this particular case, this 10 particular motion, what it focuses on is the issue before the commission in the suppression motion to determine whether the 11 12 government can meet its burden to show that whatever may be 13 documented in this memorandum, this summary of the interviews 14 of Mr. Mohammad during January 12th through 16th of 2007, 15 whether it can be said those are so attenuated, so removed, 16 from what happened to him in the black sites that they can be 17 deemed voluntary and usable. 18 And what we talk about frequently -- and as I said, 19 torture being always in the room, is we refer to torture. And 20 Lieutenant Berg mentioned to you some of the specifics of 21 Mr. Mohammad's torture last Friday. And I'm not going to 22 repeat all of those, but just -- just to take one or two 23 examples, what he said was at -- at one point -- and this is

- 1 shortly after Mr. Mohammad's arrest, almost immediately after
- 2 his arrest, he was sexually assaulted, anally raped, and then,
- 3 among other things, forced to remain shackled by his wrists
- 4 and suspended from the ceiling of his cell naked, in his own
- **5** excrement and urine, for approximately one week.
- 6 That was -- that was, in part, to deprive him of
- 7 sleep. And during that time he was doused frequently with
- 8 cold water and subjected to loud heavy metal music to keep him
- **9** awake, keep him from falling asleep.
- 10 It occurred to me that, you know, we say things like
- 11 that and they just become almost routine in the case, the sort
- 12 of torture mentioned in the 9/11 Commission report and all of
- 13 that. And I was thinking as -- as Lieutenant Berg was saying
- 14 that is that -- that was on Friday. And the first part of
- 15 this contingent who are here for the hearings these two weeks
- 16 had come down to Guantanamo the Saturday before. A long trip,
- 17 got up early in the morning, went out to Andrews, did all
- 18 that, all that drill.
- And I was just thinking that, you know, if instead of
- 20 being able to fly down and, you know, have the sack lunch and
- 21 get a nap and all that on the plane, somebody had shackled us
- 22 to the floor of the plane after, you know, anesthetizing us
- 23 and flown us someplace, and then when we came to they did all

- 1 of those things to us, including the anal rape and suspending
- 2 from the ceiling. And then by the following Friday, when
- 3 Lieutenant Berg was making that argument we were still hanging
- 4 from the ceiling of some dank, dungeon-like cell, very
- 5 different experience. Very different sort of notion about
- 6 what these facts mean when we really stop to think about them.
- 7 And so after that happened to Mr. Mohammad, that and
- 8 so much more that we won't go into, for the very intense
- 9 period of several, several weeks during which his --
- 10 his captors -- because he had been arrested with his children,
- 11 and he could hear them crying in the next room at this foreign
- 12 police station with -- with American agents around. He was
- 13 being told by his principal torturer that if he didn't give
- 14 him the answers he wanted, he was going to slit his son's
- 15 throat.
- 16 And that's where Mr. Mohammad was for the entire -- I
- 17 mean, where his mental state was for the entire three and a
- 18 half years. No one ever came and told him don't worry. In
- 19 the meantime, we've released your kids. No contact with his
- 20 family. No nothing. And so suddenly in September of 2006,
- 21 they say come along, we're going to Guantanamo.
- 22 And then the other thing to consider is that everyone
- 23 knows, no one disputes, that the events to which Mr. Mohammad

- 1 were subjected are clinically known to produce traumatic
- 2 stress and post-traumatic stress, significant form of trauma.
- 3 And the only way -- the only hope that someone can recover,
- 4 can relieve themselves of that lingering effect, what they
- 5 call the sequelae of the trauma, is essentially three things.
- 6 One is to get to a place of safety, true place of
- 7 safety. The other is to have the opportunity to express your
- 8 narrative and talk to others. Not the oppressors, not the
- 9 torturers, but talk to others about what happened to you. And
- 10 then the third is return -- is to be able to return to your
- 11 community, the people with whom you feel safe.
- And obviously, from the time of Mr. Mohammad's capture
- 13 until the time he arrived in Guantanamo in 2006 and to this
- 14 very day, none of those have been available to him. Foremost,
- 15 the sense of safety, because he's in the custody of the same
- 16 government that did this to him. He is, as we discussed,
- 17 barred by classification and other restrictions, barred by
- 18 having any kind of narrative or -- or speaking to anybody in
- 19 the outside world. Severe restrictions there. And then
- 20 there's also the very tight limitation on resuming any kind of
- 21 contact with the community, with a -- with a greater
- 22 structure.
- 23 And so that is -- that is the situation that he found

- 1 himself in when the FBI agents approached him. And what we
- 2 have asked the government is to tell us, in addition to just
- **3** giving us this letterhead memorandum, that an agent -- with
- 4 all due respect to Frank Pellegrino, I've only met the
- 5 gentleman a couple times and he's been very cordial and very
- 6 professional. But all we know is what he has summarized and
- 7 all we know is what he has jotted down in his notes.
- 8 Those are the -- those are the things they've turned
- 9 over to us. And they've also said that you have the logs of
- 10 some daily interaction between guards and Mr. Mohammad, you
- 11 know, jotting down when he went to the doctor or, you know, if
- 12 he asked for an aspirin or something like that. There's some
- 13 daily log entries. And then we have the names of some people,
- 14 if they'll talk to us, who have provided medical services for
- **15** him.
- 16 But what we're asking for and what we think we're
- 17 entitled to are the percipient witnesses who know how those
- 18 interrogations went, know what the circumstances were under
- 19 which they were conducted and -- and leading up to them, and
- 20 the substance -- the actual substance. Not the summaries, not
- 21 the impressions, but actually what was asked and what was
- **22** said.
- 23 And what we know is that the government in AE 630Y,

- 1 their opposition to the suppression motion, what actually they 2 have indicated is this is how they're going to try to carry 3 their burden, is that what they're going to do is they're 4 going to base their defense on the details of taking the 5 statement. The substance of the statement, not the summary of 6 the -- of the memoranda, but they're going to base it on the details of the manner in which to take -- the statement was 7 8 taken, including a purported change in the identity of the 9 auestioners. 10 And this was written at a time when they were sponsoring the narrative that the FBI had nothing to do with
- 11 12 the government CIA torture program. We've -- we've learned 13 quite a bit since then, that -- that that's not the case. 14 We also -- we also know that the government, again 15 quoting AE 630Y at page 9, we know that the government had 16 detailed, no doubt at, you know, regular taxpayer-sponsored, 17 individuals at least -- at least 22 special FBI agents, 7 FBI 18 analysts, and the original JAG -- Navy JAG camp commander of 19 the original camp where the -- where Mr. Mohammad and his 20 codefendants were held. Allowed all of them to either -- to 21 view and/or listen in to these interrogations over the course 22 of the interrogations from what they described as a remote 23 So either video with sound or at least audio transfer. room.

1 And I won't bother reading all of the names, but they 2 appear at page 6 of our reply. And again, citing 630Y at 3 page 9. 4 And interestingly, these individuals, we don't know 5 why they were invited or allowed to listen in to this what 6 must have been a fairly Top Secret classified proceeding being 7 conducted on Guantanamo, whether they were there or up in the 8 National Capital Region or someplace else, but somehow they 9 had access to this very, very highly classified event and, at 10 the same time, were told not to take any notes. 11 And the government says, in a typical euphemistic way, 12 they were told not to take any notes, write anything down 13 about what they were seeing, quote, to ensure recordkeeping 14 consistency in documenting the interrogation. Of course, what 15 that means from a litigation perspective is the government 16 didn't want a counter narrative or counter information. But 17 as we point out in the reply brief, you know, anytime you get 18 22 FBI agents observing something, it's unlikely that they 19 don't do something to document what they saw and their 20 impressions, whether it's after-action memos, whether it's 21 e-mails to friends, whether -- you know, I don't know if 22 Instagram was around then or TikTok. But there's probably 23 something going on where they are recording their impressions

1 and certainly likely that they, you know, they saw something 2 and it will be -- it will be relevant. 3 Third, what we also know, and this is, again, at --4 inviting the commission's attention to AE 630Y, the government 5 pleading at pages 12 through 13. At least two of the 6 prosecutors in this case, Mr. Trivett and Mr. Swann, 7 participated in investigating strategy discussions -- or 8 decisions, I'm sorry, made prior to the interviews occurring and under which the FBI and CITF agents would be operating and 9 10 they were on hand in the event the special agents conducting 11 the interrogations had any questions about how to proceed. 12 And as we have explained in our main suppression 13 motion, part of the planning and the strategy decisions led to 14 a protocol by which Mr. Mohammad and the other people being 15 interviewed would be kept in the dark about their ability to 16 have counsel present and the other aspects that make a Miranda 17 warning, an indicator that the subsequent statement is in any 18 way voluntary. So critical, critical information, relevance 19 and materiality to whether there is an attenuation between the 20 horrific torture that had been discontinued in September and 21 the interrogations that were being commenced in January. 22 Fourth is they have provided us -- it's true, they

have provided us with some so-called DIMS records, which are

23

- 1 sort of these daily, you know, routine reports of activities,
- **2** comings and goings, whatever. But we also know that those may
- 3 very well be incomplete because just in June of this year, we
- 4 had an incident in which Mr. Mohammad's legal mail was
- 5 inappropriately seized from his cell. Interestingly, because
- 6 it reported some of the techniques of his torture. And it was
- 7 seized by the guard force out at Camp V and sent up to the SJA
- 8 or somebody and was supposed to be forwarded to me, which
- 9 didn't happen.
- 10 And when Mr. Mohammad reported this to me, I contacted
- 11 the prosecution for their assistance, because I understood
- 12 this to violate the protective order that the commission --
- 13 the commission has in place. And the first response from the
- 14 prosecution was nothing like that had happened. The only
- 15 thing that had happened was that there had been a cell search
- 16 of Mr. Mohammad's cell that day, and nothing had been seized.
- I spoke to Mr. Mohammad, I got from him the pseudonym,
- 18 you know, code names for the various guard force members who
- 19 were involved in it, including the officer in charge, SJA, and
- 20 some others, and sent those back to Mr. Trivett in this case
- 21 who was helpful to run down the information. Oh, and lo and
- 22 behold it turned out, yeah, they had seized the letter.
- 23 And when Mr. Mohammad asked the -- asked the watch

- 1 commander how come this information apparently had not been
- 2 reported in his DIMS as it should have been, which presumably
- 3 is what the JTF or the prosecution consulted to see whether
- **4** what had happened had happened, so why wasn't it reported?
- 5 The watch commander kind of shrugged and said, "Well, I guess
- **6** we forgot to write it down."
- 7 So those sources of information, particularly
- 8 something happening, you know, across the island in the form
- 9 of -- of these high-profile, high-powered interrogations, is
- 10 not the best indicia that we have all the information that is
- **11** available or that is in existence.
- 12 And then the other -- the other complaint that the
- 13 prosecution makes -- and this is on page 5 of their -- their
- 14 response, AE 775 filed 20 March 2020, is to tell the
- 15 commission -- and this is, I must say, with all due respect,
- 16 I'm sorry to have to say it, this is a familiar refrain you
- 17 will hear, which is we have given them everything. You know,
- 18 sort of the disappointed parent sort of attitude. We have
- 19 given them everything. We just don't know what to do, why
- 20 they're never happy, why they're never satisfied.
- 21 And what we the prosecution think they're up to is
- 22 they just don't want to go to trial. They don't want to
- 23 comply. As they say in this case, they want to use this --

- 1 utilize this motion to compel evidence they already possess as 2 a means to articulate a refusal to accept this court's order 3 providing an orderly process and pathway to bring this case to 4 trial. 5 And they refer to their statement in AE 676, a 6 government pleading filed 1 November 2019 which, honest to 7 goodness, assures the commission they have complied with all 8 of their obligations in this regard. And unfortunately, it 9 was in June of this year -- this year, 2021 -- that the 10 prosecution revealed that sometime in the past, we still don't 11 know guite when, some military judge had looked at the 12 summaries of statements they were giving us and noted that 13 they had taken upon themselves to remove disclaimers that had 14 been entered apparently contemporaneous with the reporting of 15 the statement way back when in -- sometime between 2003/2006, 16 which indicated the government interrogators, or the people 17 preparing the statement, had reason to question the 18 reliability or accuracy of the reported statement. 19 So we were getting statements that said on 20 such-and-such a date Mr. Mohammad said, acknowledged, 21 confessed, denied, whatever, the following. But -- and then
 - UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

for reasons known only to those interrogators, maybe it's

because they were torturing him, maybe it -- you know, for a

22

23

- 1 lot of reasons. They said, But, you know, we have to
- 2 acknowledge this may not be accurate. Maybe they had heard,
- 3 you know, denials the day before. Whatever.
- 4 Well, they put those disclaimers on there. And the
- 5 government, for whatever reason -- you know, we can imagine
- 6 from a tactical perspective what that might be -- had
- 7 eliminated those when they gave us the summaries. And so in
- 8 the characteristic nonchalant fashion in which they often
- 9 report these things, they said, oh, by the way, one of the
- 10 military judges mentioned to us that we probably shouldn't
- 11 have, you know, taken these off; should have told you about
- 12 those.
- 13 But rather than go back and tell you which statements
- 14 we took those off of, just assume that the interrogators
- 15 doubted everything. Okay, you can represent to the commission
- 16 that nobody believed anything this guy said. And, of course,
- 17 you know, as anyone who's practiced criminal law and has dealt
- 18 with statements and inconsistent statements and a series of
- 19 statements would know, it is of enormous significance when the
- 20 interrogator, when the government officials say this is a
- 21 statement we think we believe, and this is a statement we know
- 22 we don't believe because of what we did to extract it. And
- 23 what those statements may be, we don't know. How -- how it

- 1 would help to compare them, we don't know. You know, we'll be
- 2 working with -- with the government and, you know, maybe have
- 3 to involve you in it.
- 4 But the point today, as I stand here, is that when
- 5 they were complaining in March of 2020, before the whole world
- 6 changed, that they can't understand why we're asking for more
- 7 information, they'd given it to us all, and gosh darn it,
- 8 didn't you see our November 2019 representation as officers of
- 9 the court, to the military commission, to exactly that effect,
- 10 why are you asking us for more information? Now you see why.
- 11 And so finally, the -- what I would suggest is even if
- 12 they believe in good faith that they have given us everything,
- 13 which we know they haven't, they could not have because of the
- 14 30 people who listened in and haven't been pulled to see if
- 15 they have everything in their e-mails or other documents.
- **16** That's just as a start.
- But even if they thought in good faith they had, if
- 18 you were to issue an order saying, well, you know, just for
- 19 good measure, give them everything, give them everything, that
- 20 is all witness observations that document the substance and
- 21 circumstances of those statements. And if they don't have
- 22 anything and they come back and they report to you they don't
- 23 have anything or they're, you know, resisting an order to show

- 1 cause because they don't have anything, then fine, no harm.
- 2 But the idea, it's not that you're ordering them to do a
- 3 futile act. What you're ordering them to do is to make a
- 4 good-faith effort to search their files, particularly in light
- 5 of this sequence of events, just to make sure that we have
- **6** what we should have.
- 7 Thank you, sir.
- 8 MJ [Col McCALL]: Ms. Bormann, does anyone from your team
- **9** wish to be heard? I see a negative response.
- 10 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Not at this point, Judge. Thank you.
- 11 MJ [Col McCALL]: Mr. Bruck? And Mr. Connell?
- 12 Negatives from both. And I'll just throw it out to
- **13** Ms. Lachelier at ----
- 14 ADC [MS. LACHELIER]: Same. Same as before, Judge.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. Government? Mr. Swann, as
- 16 you've noticed with my approach to these motions, as I'm
- 17 getting up to speed on this case, I've given fairly wide range
- 18 for counsel's argument. I'll extend that same courtesy to
- **19** you.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: Your Honor, counsel may believe that
- 21 torture is always in this courtroom, but in January of 2007,
- 22 it was not. Now, Mr. Sowards seemingly thinks that we're
- 23 going to just settle on a couple pieces of paper in order to

- 1 explain what Mr. Mohammad said in January of 2007. Actually,
- 2 that interview was conducted over several days. It started
- 3 out on the 12th, it went to the 13th, it went to the 14th.
- 4 Mr. Mohammad had stomach problems and asked that he not have
- 5 to come that day, but came back on the 16th. He subsequently
- 6 went back in November to at least one of these same agents and
- 7 then confessed to the killing of Daniel Pearl.
- 8 Now, we're not going to offer any evidence in this
- **9** case regarding Daniel Pearl. He is not on the charge sheet.
- 10 And all that motion was addressed or withdrawn last week. The
- 11 reason it should have been withdrawn or never filed is because
- 12 we're obligated to provide every statement that these accused
- 13 have ever made regarding the offenses that appear on the
- 14 charge sheet. That's in 701. It has to be on the charge
- 15 sheet.
- Now, we've provided all statements that they have made
- 17 during the RDI program because the judge, Judge Pohl, directed
- 18 that we provide all statements across the board, and we have.
- Now, in this instance, we'll say the following: One,
- 20 Dr. Mitchell's testimony is -- from the witness stand over ten
- 21 days, he says that Mr. Mohammad had a rough three weeks. And
- 22 the defense has all that information provided to them. They
- 23 also say -- they said that Mr. Mohammad was -- was anally

- 1 sodomized or raped or something. He was rectally hydrated,
- 2 because when he was first picked up he wouldn't drink enough
- 3 water and they were concerned about him.
- 4 Now, his first words out of his mouth were the
- 5 following: One, we can do it the easy way or we can do it the
- 6 hard way. Do you -- and we're not interested in what you did
- 7 with respect to the September 11th attacks. We want to know
- 8 what you have planned. And Mr. Mohammad at that point in time
- **9** then said: Soon, you will see.
- 10 Our nation had just suffered an attack that killed
- 11 nearly 3,000 men, women, and children. Now, he's fond of
- 12 saying that he can't make contact with his children. There
- 13 are eight of them, and that's the exact number he killed by
- 14 happenstance.
- 15 So let me go into what happened on the interview, 12th
- **16** to the 16th of January. You will hear testimony from Frank
- 17 Pellegrino, a Special Agent of the Federal Bureau of
- 18 Investigation, a man, quite frankly, who knows everything
- 19 about Mohammad. He knows everything about Ramzi Yousef, his
- 20 -- excuse me. He is the -- his nephew. He's his nephew.
- 21 Mr. Mohammad -- Frank actually was called to a foreign
- 22 country because they were looking for that man for his
- 23 participation in a Bojinka plot. Bojinka plot is a made-up

- 1 name that characterizes it. But he provided assistance to
- 2 Ramzi Yousef during the early part of the 19 -- well, 1990s.
- 3 They got word that he was hanging out in the United Arab
- 4 Emirates -- or Qatar. Excuse me, Qatar. And Frank was sent
- 5 there to pick him up just as soon as the indictment came into
- 6 the open, sitting on the tarmac, ready to take him back to New
- 7 York. But Mr. Mohammad disappeared. He was a water engineer
- 8 of some sort in that country at that point in time. Frank
- **9** Pellegrino was unable to pick up Khalid Shaikh Mohammad that
- **10** day.
- 11 And to this day, he still believes, as that -- that if
- 12 he had had an opportunity to get him that day, the
- 13 September 11th attacks would never have happened. But
- 14 Mr. Pellegrino will testify what occurred during those four
- **15** days in January.
- Now, counsel has indicated that I was present. Never
- 17 in the room, although I did witness Mr. Mohammad come into
- 18 the -- his interview area. I wanted to see what a terrorist
- **19** looked like. And, quite frankly, I was disappointed.
- 20 Frank Pellegrino sat down with him for four days and
- 21 talked to him about this plot. So you have -- we have given
- 22 them the interview notes from that document.
- The type of subjects that were talked about that day

- 1 were an extensive background. What was the turning point in
- 2 Mr. Mohammad's life that caused him to turn to terrorism? The
- 3 September 11th attacks, how he selected the hijackers, how he
- 4 sent them to various training locations.
- 5 Talked about al Mihdhar and al Hazmi reported to KSM
- 6 that they were asked a lot of questions when traveling to the
- 7 West Coast from Thailand. So it was decided people would
- 8 travel then from the United Arab Emirates.
- 9 Talked about the money that he had gotten back from
- 10 one of the other individuals in this case and how he had gone
- 11 to an ATM machine in Pakistan and withdrew the last remaining
- 12 funds from that account so, you know, we don't want to leave a
- 13 dollar around that al Qaeda can't possibly make use of.
- 14 Talked about his involvement with Atta and RBS.
- **15** Talked about the specific dates about when the 9/11 attack
- 16 would be taking place. What he did post-September 11th, the
- 17 shoe bomber, Richard Reid and another individual, because
- 18 there's more than one shoe bomber, another individual who we
- 19 expect to testify in this case.
- Talked about his involvement with al Marri. al Marri
- 21 was a man in the United States who was going to school in the
- 22 midwest somewhere and he was involved in terrorist activities.
- 23 One of these individuals brought al Marri his computer and

- 1 sent it to him. When that individual was picked up in a
- 2 round-up, al Marri still had the notes that he had received
- 3 from certain individuals, phone numbers and things of that
- 4 nature. What involvement he may have had in the anthrax
- 5 attacks. What involvement he's had with Hambali and the
- 6 others that are part of JI. How he trained Jubara, another
- 7 terrorist who engaged in that attack.
- 8 He talked about Majid Khan, and Mr. Khan is about
- 9 ready to face his involvement. He talked about Jose Padilla.
- 10 He talked about the Heathrow Airport. That was a plot that he
- 11 and at least one other individual in this room had involvement
- 12 in. This is the so-called Canary Wharf attacks.
- 13 He talked about the Djerba bombing, where his
- 14 involvement was in that. He talked about Iyman Faris, a truck
- 15 driver in the United States who pled guilty and received a
- **16** 25-year sentence.
- 17 Then he talked about Bojinka, how he got involved,
- 18 where he met Walid Khan. He talked about his arrest and his
- 19 brother-in-law. He talked about other miscellaneous things
- 20 such as his involvement with al Qaeda and what happened after
- 21 the embassy bombings, and what did he do? That's all laid out
- 22 in these. And his other travel throughout the world.
- 23 He talked about the passport that began -- it began

- 1 from a series of events that led to his capture and his
- 2 identification. And I'll let Mr. Pellegrino show you that
- 3 photograph or that passport when the time comes.
- 4 He talked about what it means to perform bay'at. He
- 5 talked about the "Crippled Sheikh" video. The "Crippled
- 6 Sheikh" is a video where bin Laden in November of -- would
- 7 have been October/November of 2001 talks about the ownership
- 8 of the 9/11 attacks. The Crippled Sheikh is a crippled sheikh
- 9 that Mr. Mohammad found wandering the road with his son and he
- 10 brought him to a location, not sure the Crippled Sheikh even
- 11 knew what was going on, but he sat there and talked to him,
- 12 and it was the royalty of al Qaeda in that room, to include
- 13 Mr. Mohammad, who was greeted as he come -- as Zubaydah and
- 14 bin Laden come through the door and says to him, Abu Hamza,
- 15 father of Hamza, his first born.
- 16 That is the extent of that interview, a host of
- 17 subjects that he was talked to about. And Frank Pellegrino
- 18 will talk to us about that from the witness stand. This is
- 19 not a piece of paper that's going to go in front of the
- 20 members. The testimony of the witnesses on that issue would
- 21 do that.
- Now, they make much to do about the fact that I was
- 23 somehow located near where all of these interviews were

- 1 conducted. I was. I was in charge of a group of -- well, I
- 2 wasn't in charge of the FBI, but I was kind of the master of
- 3 making sure interviews were conducted on time. We interviewed
- 4 all 14 of the high-value detainees that the President had sent
- 5 to Guantanamo. And that extended over a 45-day period I was
- 6 down there, okay?
- 7 I -- like I said, the only time I ever saw Mohammad
- 8 was he was coming into the room where he was being
- 9 interviewed. Mr. Trivett was there with me. And Mr. Trivett
- 10 and I both decided that none of us were going to go into that
- 11 interview room because we had the best of the best of the best
- 12 Federal Bureau of investigative agents that this land has.
- 13 They conducted the interviews. One set of notes was the
- 14 directive. They have that information.
- 15 They wanted -- again, it can be found at
- **16** MEA-LHM-00001430, which dictates or sets out how these
- 17 interviews were going to be conducted. The interview with
- 18 respect to Mr. Mohammad is MEA-LHM-1 through page 32.
- 19 There's more than 150 years of experience on this side
- 20 of the room. All of us have been prosecutors, defense counsel
- 21 on occasion, a judge on occasion for a number of years. We
- 22 understand our obligations and we understand them all too
- 23 well. For if we make a mistake, none of us will want to have

- 1 to try the case over again.
- I have authenticated the first 32,000 or so records in
- 3 this case -- the record of trial in this case. It fell to me
- 4 because every time I turned around a judge was leaving and
- 5 it's the trial counsel's responsibility. So I have looked at
- 6 all that record and I am confident that there are no appellate
- 7 issues that we're going to have to worry about at some later
- 8 point in time.
- **9** I heard a little bit about KSM's kids. There were two
- 10 children that were picked up in a raid that scarfed up --
- 11 well, Mr. Binalshibh is not here with us right now. There
- 12 were two children that were picked up in a raid that scarfed
- 13 up Khalid Shaikh Mohammad -- when I said the first time there
- 14 were two children that were picked up in a raid, two of his
- 15 children were picked up in a raid in which Mr. Binalshibh was
- 16 captured, and then two more of his children were picked up in
- 17 a raid in which he was captured along with Hawsawi.
- 18 Who told the accused, the world's worst terrorist,
- 19 that he should bring kids with him every time he's wandering
- 20 out through the country of Afghanistan and Pakistan? Because
- 21 he's the world's number one man at that point in time. They
- 22 were picked up, they were treated well. We have resolved that
- 23 issue in another filing in this case, and the judge ruled in

1 our favor. 2 Scintilla of trauma, that's a bunch of buzzwords that 3 the defense has used. The first time I heard it is when we 4 litigated the issue in AE 254, that female guards could not touch the accused on his arm or his shoulder. That stopped us 5 6 for about a year, until we finally got testimony -- or got the 7 testimony, because of other issues that were ongoing. 8 Mr. Nevin stood up here and it's a scintilla of trauma that these individuals have to suffer through because they were 9 10 being touched in an appropriate -- in their words, in an 11 inappropriate way. And there is no evidence of that at all. 12 I ask that you take a look at 254, the female guards 13 Read the judge's order and you'll see exactly the 14 words I've described that Mr. Nevin used. 15 Now, one thing I have learned today, based on what I 16 have heard, the chances of Mr. Mohammad ever taking that 17 witness stand: About slim to none. Should he, we'll be ready 18 for it. But, that said, I'll get back to the motion. 19 They want the LHM. They have it, all of it. They 20 want all interview notes. They have them, all of them. The 21 other people sitting in the room, not everyone could hear 22 those interviews. Given the nature of what was going on at

that point in time, these interviews were TS//SCI. Only a

23

- 1 couple of people at any one time could listen and hear through
- 2 microphone. There were a couple of guards in the room. Those
- 3 guards couldn't hear what was being said because they didn't
- 4 have the requisite clearance or so.
- **5** Everyone was said: Don't take notes. Now, we do
- 6 know, and we have provided this information to the defense,
- 7 that a couple of those individuals wrote an e-mail back to
- 8 their -- their boss or something. We have turned those over.
- 9 Nobody else has any notes regarding this case.
- Now, one of the things I noticed in here is that they
- 11 want medical records. I'll help them out right now. All the
- 12 medical records concerning the time period from October of '06
- 13 through and past the date of these interviews -- and I've just
- 14 got written down here 21 January '07, because that got us
- 15 through the entire period -- are found at MEA-0008607 to 8673.
- 16 These have been provided to the defense for well over two
- 17 years in an unredacted form. We've gone through several
- 18 iterations in the 523 series where we ultimately decided,
- 19 having obtained a protective order from -- from Judge Parrella
- 20 at that time, that we were just going to turn over the -- all
- 21 of these records. If they had a true name in there, if it was
- 22 the original record and a true name, the defense got -- got
- 23 the information.

1 And we have updated that thing, what, through last 2 week I think now. I think there's like 43 pages of true names 3 and time periods and all. Sure, there are names that we have 4 never been able to connect. The judge ordered us to provide 5 all known names. And we have spent thousands and thousands of 6 hours trying to figure all this out. 7 But they have all the -- they have -- the original 8 records are all in true name for the most part. They have If they'd like me, I could tell them right now what 9 10 medications he was on, but I suspect they don't. So I'll -- I 11 just encourage them to go back and take a look at that 12 information for them. 13 Now, we've already heard testimony in this case, about 14 600 pages or so, from the testimony of Special Agent Mike 15 Butsch regarding the interview process that was conducted with 16 Ramzi Binalshibh. 160 pages or so of that is 17 cross-examination by Mr. Harrington. They have all of that 18 information. They will have an equal opportunity to talk to 19 the Special Agent Pellegrino when the time comes. And we --20 all we need you to do is set the time and we'll have the

There is nothing else. This stuff about DIMS, they

have all the DIMS records. Now, there's a couple of times

special agent down here to testify.

21

22

23

- 1 over the years where we've had to go back and we missed a day
- 2 or two about DIMS, but they have those records for that period
- 3 of time. They have had an opportunity to talk to the Camp VII
- 4 first commander. He was on the witness stand, told them what
- 5 he viewed, both to the extent that he was in the room because
- 6 it was in and out, and that's the testimony. He testified --
- 7 he testified about what he told them in the morning in
- 8 getting -- in going over to these interviews.
- **9** He testified, as did -- as did Mike Butsch regarding
- 10 Binalshibh, that they had a choice to make each and every day.
- 11 They didn't have to come. And as you can clearly see from the
- 12 period with respect to Mr. Mohammad, he decided he'd stay home
- 13 a day, but he came back willingly the next and came back
- 14 willingly back in November.
- 15 That's -- I -- I know I'm not testifying. They'll be
- **16** getting an opportunity to hear from the very people
- 17 themselves.
- 18 So when I say we have nothing more to give them, we
- 19 gave them roughly about 77 pages, I think, of what we refer to
- 20 as Camp VII 10- and 30-day reports. When they first arrived
- 21 on Guantanamo because of the -- well, the heightened interest
- 22 in their presence here, the SOUTHCOM commander directed every
- 23 ten days I want to know a report on what's going on with the

- 1 high-value detainees. He got the report. After about three
- 2 of these reports, they -- they were convinced that 30-day
- 3 reports after that would be sufficient.
- 4 And they have those reports, I believe, because they
- 5 ceased at some point in time into 2008, long -- about a year
- 6 after or more when these individuals were interviewed. So
- 7 they have all that information.
- 8 And subject to your questions.
- **9** MJ [Col McCALL]: No questions.
- **10** Mr. Sowards?
- 11 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 12 First, I just wanted to address the Daniel Pearl
- 13 reference. I think it's important to talk about that since,
- 14 of course, it had nothing to do with the motion that -- that
- 15 we made today about circumstances and substance of the
- **16** January 7th interrogation.
- 17 But the commission should know, because I know there
- 18 is a lot to read and I'll just invite your attention to the
- 19 examination that Mr. Nevin conducted of James Mitchell, where
- 20 he established pretty clearly that the time at which -- in the
- 21 black sites where they got Mr. Mohammad to reference his
- 22 involvement in Daniel Pearl's unfortunate death, was after
- 23 they had softened him up with questions trying to get him to

- 1 admit it and he declined. And then after a fairly arduous
- 2 course of torture, they talked to him about if he wanted
- 3 things to improve for himself and, ironically enough, in light
- 4 of the comments Mr. Swann made about the gentile treatment of
- **5** Mr. Mohammad's children, because it was Dr. Mitchell who
- **6** threatened to slit their throats.
- 7 Dr. Mitchell and -- it was a female interrogator said,
- 8 well, you know, if you could give us something really big, if
- **9** you disclose something, if you can admit something, you know,
- 10 that we could really, really use, we might be able to see our
- 11 way clear of letting you write to your family. And so he
- 12 called them back in and he said, you know, "I was responsible
- **13** for killing Daniel Pearl."
- 14 Oh, that's very interesting. Thank you very much.
- And then he said, "Can I write to my family now?" And
- 16 they said, "Well, we'll have to think about that. We'll give
- 17 it some time." That's the genesis of that.
- 18 And we can talk about independent verification, all
- 19 that kind of stuff, but with due respect to Mr. Swann, I know
- 20 what then became sort of a mantra with every other witness
- 21 after that, including the camp commander, is of the purported
- 22 admission of being involved in -- in Mr. Pearl's death became
- 23 kind of a point of reference that, you know, sometimes when we

- 1 have police officers on the stand and they have some bad fact
- 2 they can't wait to get in, no matter what you ask them, it
- 3 relates to that. So a lot of witnesses -- Mitchell, the camp
- 4 commander, different people -- you know, you would say, "When
- **5** was the first time you met Mr. Mohammad?"
- 6 And they would say, "Oh, I think it was about three
- 7 weeks before he admitted killing Daniel Pearl."
- 8 So this kind of was a way to always get this in and
- 9 they hoped that the media picks it up and it does what it
- 10 does.
- 11 But turning the -- or inviting the commission's
- 12 attention back to the motion, the motion that we're asking --
- 13 or what we're asking in the motion is for the witnesses who,
- 14 as Mr. Swann admits, there were numerous of them there,
- 15 including Mr. Trivett, to give us all information they have
- 16 which would document, not just the substance if they can do
- 17 that, but the circumstances of his interrogation.
- And what Mr. Swann has not disavowed, what we have in
- 19 our reply and he and I talked about it, he had an opportunity
- 20 to disavow it, is that he and Mr. Trivett met with prosecutors
- 21 to basically design the format and the style and the purpose
- 22 of the interrogation. And the purpose of the interrogation,
- 23 which the record to date also shows, was to get statements

- 1 from these men to use in this prosecution. And so the
- 2 question is what were -- is there documentation? There may
- 3 be. We don't know, but you give us the documentation you have
- 4 of the circumstances of this interrogation, how you designed
- 5 it, who you selected, what they were instructed, and that will
- 6 go to show how they were doing everything they could to make
- 7 sure there was no attenuation of their experiences in black
- 8 sites. There was no forthright full explanation that you as a
- 9 defendant have no need to talk to us. If you want to have an
- 10 attorney present, you can have one. All of those -- those
- 11 sorts of things.
- Not only do they do that, but the agents were
- 13 instructed, perhaps at Mr. Trivett and Mr. Swann's urging, we
- 14 don't know, but if they don't have the documentation, they
- 15 know who do, to give evasive, incomplete, and misleading
- 16 answers so that when the defendants, in this case
- 17 Mr. Mohammad, said, "Am I being charged with something?"
- 18 Well, this is a military commission and there are no charges
- 19 pending right now.
- The FBI knew that they had been sent in there to get
- 21 statements to use in the prosecution. They've admitted such.
- 22 They've given memos at least to that extent. We would like to
- 23 know what went into this -- planning the circumstances. Other

- 1 instances of the circumstances, we don't know -- and again, if
- 2 Mr. Swann, after you order -- order them to disclose this, if
- 3 he doesn't have any information that a photographic
- 4 documentation or otherwise of the condition of the -- of the
- 5 cells, the dress of the people, how many people were in the
- 6 room, what they looked like, how they may have reflected or
- 7 echoed the situation, the black sites, then he doesn't have
- 8 it. But that is all relevant to the connection between --
- 9 between Mr. Mohammad's black site experiences and torture and
- 10 what was going on in Guantanamo.
- 11 And I understand that -- and I'm sorry to upset
- 12 Mr. Swann. I know this is a case that, you know, is very,
- 13 very important to him and he feels very aggrieved by what
- 14 happened and we know that sometimes we get too close to the
- 15 issues in a case. But at this point, Mr. Mohammad is presumed
- 16 innocent. And the question is not what they got him to say or
- 17 what Mr. Swann thinks may be true about his conduct. The
- 18 limited purpose of the motion to suppress, which this
- 19 discovery motion is in service of, is to find out whether what
- **20** he said was involuntarily compelled.
- 21 And if I may just -- as I was thinking of, and
- 22 Mr. Swann talked about this, that in our -- in our papers we
- 23 had cited the case of Chambers v. Florida, which is 309 U.S.

- 1 227, and the portion we had was at 238 to 239. And that was a
- 2 situation oddly similar in some ways to what we have here.
- 3 Although, as we mentioned, you have to go back to the first
- 4 half of the last century in America to find a case anywhere
- 5 near this and it isn't all that near.
- **6** But the United States Supreme Court was faced with a
- 7 situation they described as a group of codefendants who were
- 8 held for a protected -- protracted period of time. In this
- 9 case, one week. One week. Quote, without friends, advisors,
- 10 or counselors, and under circumstances calculated to break the
- 11 strong nerves and the stoutest resistance. And the
- 12 United States Supreme Court said, the very circumstances
- 13 surrounding their confinement and their questioning without
- 14 any formal charges having been brought, exactly what was going
- 15 on in this case, were such as to fill the defendants with
- **16** terror and frightful misgivings.
- 17 And the question is: Does that terror and do those
- 18 frightful misgivings dissipate by anything that happened
- 19 between the black sites and January of 2007? What can they
- 20 show to dissipate the terror and the frightful feelings? And
- 21 more importantly to us, what haven't they disclosed to us
- 22 which would indicate that there was no dissipation of the
- 23 terror and the frightful feelings precisely because of the,

- 1 quote, circumstances surrounding their confinement.
- **2** Because as the United States Supreme Court said, to
- **3** permit human lives to be forfeited upon confessions thus
- 4 obtained would make of the constitutional requirement of due
- 5 process of law a meaningless symbol.
- 6 And when I listened to Mr. Swann, and I did listen to
- 7 him carefully and, as I say, I'm -- didn't mean to say
- 8 anything to so upset him, but I noted that when he was telling
- 9 you what Mr. Mohammad had purportedly said to Agent
- 10 Pellegrino, he kept looking down at -- I don't know, I guess
- 11 it was the letterhead memorandum. And I couldn't tell if what
- 12 Mr. Swann was saying was he was essentially representing to
- 13 you the substance of the statement from his memory of having
- 14 been there and seen the terrorists come in because he always
- 15 wanted to see a terrorist, I didn't quite catch whether he
- **16** left there and so had -- had no recollection of the
- 17 interrogation, or whether he was summarizing for you the
- 18 summary of the letterhead memorandum.
- 19 But in either event, all he was telling the commission
- 20 was what purportedly was said at the time. He said nothing
- 21 about why we would know -- we would think that it was
- 22 voluntary. And of course, the issue at this stage isn't is it
- 23 voluntary or what did he say. The question is: Are we

- 1 entitled to the information in the government's possession
- 2 that will help us refute, that the terror and the frightful
- **3** feelings could have been dissipated under these circumstances?
- 4 He mentions that he was master of a group conducting
- 5 these interviews, so he's in a very good position to know who
- 6 else was doing the interviews and who else we should be
- 7 contacting to see if they do have documentations, notes,
- 8 observations that would help us.
- 9 I'm not going to -- I thought it would be helpful for
- 10 dramatic effect, maybe, I don't know, to read the names that
- 11 are on page 6 of our reply. I won't do that. But you see
- 12 this block of names. It's 30 names of FBI people. And again,
- 13 if you see what we're up against in trying to get a straight
- 14 answer out of people when they -- when they manipulate this
- 15 discovery, what he said to the commission was, yeah, there
- 16 were all these people in the room, they're all over the place,
- 17 but they didn't have the clearance to hear. So even though a
- 18 guard or two guards were in the room, they couldn't hear what
- 19 was being said.
- 20 And then to all these people who couldn't hear what
- 21 was being said, we told them not to take any notes. Well, why
- 22 would you not take -- why would you be told not to take notes
- 23 if you couldn't hear anything?

- **1** So again, it just -- there's enough ambiguity here
- 2 that we see that we have at least 30 potential percipient
- 3 witnesses who, at least at a beginning, should be -- should be
- 4 contacted to see what they have.
- 5 And then finally, when he was -- the complaint
- 6 about -- about the DIMS, we're not saying that -- that we want
- 7 more of the DIMS. What we're pointing out, it was a -- it was
- 8 their suggestion, their suggestion ----
- 9 MJ [Col McCALL]: I understood that point.
- 10 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: --- that they discharge.
- 11 And then finally, Mr. Swann says nothing to you about
- 12 the fact that -- that they acknowledged in June that as to
- 13 statements generally, and we don't know if it includes these,
- 14 statements generally that they have been stripping out
- 15 disclaimers that go to their unreliability.
- 16 Thank you, Your Honor.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: Mr. Swann, I just have a follow-up
- 18 question for you, if you don't mind.
- 19 So you heard from Mr. Sowards as he's kind of focused
- 20 in on -- it looks like there's -- as he's focused in on, you
- 21 know, the heart of what defense wants out of this motion, what
- 22 they are -- they are concerned they still have not received
- 23 from the government going to the circumstances of the

- 1 interview, some of these surrounding -- like the planning of
- 2 how the interview or interrogation, if you will, was set up.
- 3 Is there anything more that the government is in possession
- 4 of? And if so, I mean ----
- 5 TC [MR. SWANN]: They have a document which talks about
- 6 exactly how to do that. It talks about the situation that --
- 7 with respect to a couple of individuals in this room, they had
- 8 been to Guantanamo one time before to there. So we had to
- 9 modify the -- the rights advisement, so to speak, to them, in
- 10 saying that, now, you might recognize this room with some
- 11 earlier point in time. Therefore, we were -- we had the
- 12 agents caution them to make sure they included that particular
- 13 piece. Didn't apply to Mr. Mohammad. He had never been to
- 14 Guantanamo before.
- 15 Yeah, they have all those documents. It's a -- you
- **16** know, they keep talking about how I mastered it. I -- I
- 17 marshalled people, you know. I just got -- kept the wheels
- 18 running. The National Security Division of the Department of
- 19 Justice was the one and -- receiving guidance -- or giving
- 20 guidance to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. So, yes,
- 21 those -- they were involved in assisting or actually telling
- 22 the FBI where to be at a certain time and place.
- There's nothing more. They've heard testimony from

- 1 Mike Butsch, 600 pages, as I have said. He testified about
- 2 all of this. And he just answered questions and questions and
- 3 questions and questions about all of this. Yeah.
- 4 The Camp VII commander, went and got him. The FBI
- 5 told me who they wanted to talk to. I went and got the
- 6 individual, put them in there, told them they didn't have to
- 7 come. If they came, they sat -- they came into the room, sat
- 8 down. And when you hear Special Agent Pellegrino testify,
- 9 you'll understand the setting and all of that and what people
- 10 were wearing and -- and the normal thing that you would expect
- 11 to see in a court-martial concerning how a statement was taken
- 12 from an accused.
- 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. All right. Thank you.
- 14 Mr. Sowards, I have more for you as well, just if --
- 15 so -- and you referenced this initially in your argument and
- 16 then it seems like it's the government's position that, I
- 17 mean, you have everything is their position. And I guess, you
- 18 know, as the commission, if I'm looking at a case like this
- 19 where, you know, you're trying to gather the evidence for a
- 20 motion to suppress -- I mean, obviously the government, as the
- 21 proponent of the letterhead memoranda, you know, at that stage
- 22 when the question of voluntariness and looking at all those
- 23 totality of the circumstances, I mean, any intentional

- 1 opaqueness of this program to gather these statements, I mean,
- 2 that's going to be on -- the government is going to have to
- **3** overcome that.
- 4 So it seems like if -- if they're saying that you have
- 5 what you have and that leaves questions of -- like, again,
- 6 that this is somewhat of a -- maybe possibly intentionally an
- 7 opaque process of gathering the information in the letterhead
- 8 memorandums, I mean, doesn't that give you enough on your
- 9 motion? I mean, that puts it on the government. They're
- 10 saying there's nothing more.
- 11 What would be the purpose of the commission stepping
- 12 in and granting a motion to compel when there's -- the
- 13 government says there's nothing else?
- 14 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Well, the -- because when the
- 15 government -- the government said there was nothing else in
- 16 November of 2019. The government said there was nothing else
- 17 in March of 2020. And then in June of 2021, they said, oh,
- 18 there is something else. And we don't -- we still don't know
- 19 what that something else is. That is to statements generally
- 20 that they altered.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right.
- 22 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: And the only reason we found out about
- 23 it is because a military judge, who -- by the way, we don't

- 1 know whether it was Watkins, whether it was Cohen, Parrella,
- 2 if it goes back to, you know, whomever, but they finally got
- 3 around to saying, oh, yeah, we actually did alter that stuff.
- 4 So all I'm saying is, it's not a matter of calling
- 5 someone dishonest. It's just we are not going to rest
- **6** Mr. Mohammad's life on the assurances that we, quote, have
- 7 everything else when we know there is something else.
- **8** Mr. Swann has not addressed the 20 FBI agents who were
- 9 in the room and listened to this stuff. He says now, in this
- 10 very kind of nonchalant aw-shucks way, he was just kind of
- 11 moving people around, like he was a carhop or something.
- 12 Again, I would invite the commission's attention to AE
- 13 630Y 12 to 13, where they acknowledge that the prosecutors in
- 14 this case, because they were preparing for this case, quote,
- 15 it's their language, participated in investigative strategy
- 16 sessions made prior to the interviews occurring.
- 17 So there -- there cannot be but a ton of information
- 18 among the participants in that as to how they design those
- 19 interviewing sessions and for what purpose. And when he says
- 20 maybe there were some disclaimers or there were -- or
- 21 modifications of the setting, you may recognize this room,
- 22 what he's talking about is Guantanamo was a black site.
- 23 People were tortured there. People who were being interviewed

1 had previously been tortured there. That's what other people 2 knew. And when he says -- and I apologize actually -- if I --3 through my mask, it's sequelae, not scintilla, a sequelae of 4 trauma and torture. It's the stuff you carry with you all the 5 time when you have been tortured. And when you see something 6 which is -- reminds you of it, you not only remember it, you 7 relive it. Your body reacts as if you were being tortured. 8 And so when you're sitting in the room and the nice 9 people across the way from you are Francis Pellegrino and 10 perhaps a couple of muscular guys who don't say anything, the 11 implication that -- that Dr. Mitchell left with these 12 gentlemen, that if you don't say what we need you to say, 13 we're going back to hard times doesn't have to be any more 14 explicit. 15 In fact, Dr. Mitchell -- it was either Dr. Mitchell or 16 Jessen, talked about how they would condition them through the 17 torture and through the use of walling, through the use of a 18 towel wrapped around their neck, slamming them against the 19 wall, which we think may be the source of -- of Mr. Mohammad's 20 clinically measured brain damage. All they have to do after 21 they -- they do that repeatedly for an intense period of time, 22 is reach over and pick up a rolled-up towel. All they have to 23 Sometimes they just have to have it resting on the desk

- 1 when the person is brought into the room, and that's enough of
- 2 a trigger.
- 3 So all of these things are, you know -- are nuanced
- 4 and their -- and their, you know, assorted views. They're
- 5 kind of a mosaic of putting this stuff together. But with due
- **6** respect, you can't -- no one can say they don't have any more.
- 7 They clearly do. They clearly do.
- **8** MJ [Col McCALL]: All right.
- **9** LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: You know, so we don't know who they
- 10 met with, we don't know who they consulted with. We know they
- 11 designed it. We know they worked with DOJ. We know there are
- 12 documents. We know it's all there, and we know we have at
- 13 least 30 named witnesses in their own pleading.
- 14 And the interpreter would like me to sit down or slow
- 15 down. So thank you, sir.
- 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Sowards.
- 17 Mr. Swann, it looks like you had something more?
- TC [MR. SWANN]: Yeah. When I say there's no more,
- 19 there's no more. But if he wants to prepare a statement, or a
- 20 request and I'll -- and we'll send it to these 30 people.
- 21 We've already done this. That's what discovery is, where you
- 22 go out and find is there anything that you kept notes or
- 23 anything. And that's where we came across a couple of e-mails

- 1 that we gave them in discovery. Because in talking to one of
- 2 the individuals, he did send an e-mail back, and we provided
- 3 that to the defense.
- 4 I know this, and I trust you know it, too, is that
- 5 whatever Mr. Sowards says up here and I say up here about the
- 6 circumstances of his treatment or how he was treated in that
- 7 interview room, none of that is evidence. He talks a lot
- 8 about that. But the evidence in this case will come from that
- 9 stand, or something they offer in evidence to you, a written
- 10 document of some sort. But that's where it all begins.
- 11 So when Frank Pellegrino testifies, sir, you'll have
- 12 the opportunity to question the special agent as well, and we
- 13 encourage you do that.
- 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: Thank you, Mr. Swann.
- 15 All right. I think that's as far as we can get today.
- **16** It's almost 1630. So just going through the order of march
- 17 for the rest of the week, what I'd like to do is we'll have
- 18 that closed session for classified oral arguments tomorrow
- 19 starting at 0900, so that will be a closed session. Being
- 20 somewhat new to this bifurcated style of, you know, we've
- 21 already heard much of the unclass argument, I assume the
- 22 classified portions would be shorter. Hard to say, though,
- 23 so -- I see a lot of nodding. I still --

- 1 Yes, Ms. Bormann?
- 2 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I'm sorry. I just wanted to advise
- 3 you that after today's session and after last Thursday or
- 4 Friday, we pulled some old 505 notices. We realized that they
- 5 weren't in the record because of your previous trial conduct
- 6 order and we're filing them, an old 505 notice that was
- 7 actually ordered to be filed by Judge Cohen and then I think
- 8 your order did away with it because he never acted on it
- 9 because it was in March of 2020.
- 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 11 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: So we're refiling that and it goes to
- 12 a couple of the closed hearings.
- MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay.
- 14 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: When you guys -- it should land with
- 15 the trial judiciary like if it's not already filed, it should
- 16 be in your inbox in the next five or ten minutes.
- 17 MJ [Col McCALL]: This would be necessary for some of the
- **18** AEs that we've already handled?
- 19 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yes. And that's why -- 697 and also
- **20** 785.
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: Well, let's ----
- 22 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: So I just want to let you know.
- 23 MJ [Col McCALL]: I appreciate that. Let's do this. So

- 1 we obviously have Mr. Mohammad's defense team, their ex parte
- 2 briefing that we're looking at doing. I'll ask this. And,
- 3 Mr. Sowards -- I see, Mr. Sowards, you're consulting with your
- 4 client, but just in regard to your ex parte presentation on
- 5 your defense theory, do you expect that briefing to contain
- **6** any classified information?
- 7 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: No, sir.
- 8 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. Fair enough. And do you have an
- 9 estimate on how long you think that -- that briefing might
- **10** take?
- 11 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: I was -- with Mr. Trivett I was
- 12 ballparking it at no more than two hours.
- 13 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. All right. And then Ms. Bormann,
- 14 I believe you had asked to do your presentation on Thursday or
- 15 Friday. Are you able to do it earlier like, say, tomorrow?
- **16** If not, that's fine.
- 17 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I'm sorry, we won't be ready tomorrow,
- 18 but anytime Thursday or Friday we could do it. I anticipate
- 19 either a morning or an afternoon, no more than three hours.
- 20 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. We will push off the classified
- 21 hearing for tomorrow morning. We'll just go ahead and jump to
- 22 the -- Mr. Mohammad's defense team's ex parte briefing. We'll
- 23 do that tomorrow morning at 0900.

- 1 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Yes. That's fine, Your Honor.
- 2 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. So we'll do that. For the rest
- 3 of the parties, you can have the day to meet with your
- 4 clients. I know there's plenty of work to do on this case, so
- 5 we'll not have any open hearings tomorrow.
- 6 What we'll do is Wednesday, it's -- we're still
- 7 looking at -- Mr. Trivett, were you -- Wednesday, I believe,
- 8 you thought we could do the logistics briefing; is that
- **9** correct?
- 10 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. Wednesday for the logistics
- 11 briefing. And I think everyone who is going to be presenting
- 12 the ex parte, to the extent that you rule that we can, would
- 13 recommend -- or would request that it have to be on Thursday
- 14 for that one.
- 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: Okay. All right. And the length of
- **16** that briefing would be?
- **17** MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Long.
- 18 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. All right.
- 19 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Excuse me, Your Honor. Also, if it's
- **20** not ----
- 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: It's not a decided issue yet.
- 22 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: No, no. If it's not horribly
- 23 inconvenient for your staff, if you wanted to do this even at

- **1** 8:30, we could do that.
- **2** MJ [Col McCALL]: We'll do it at 0900.
- 3 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: All right.
- **4** MJ [Col McCALL]: Yeah. My understanding is, yeah,
- 5 there's just some difficulties if we try to go too early in
- 6 the morning, even -- so I'm just going to leave it at that. I
- 7 know we still have a few AEs we haven't gotten to. I'll look
- 8 at when we think we can get to those. I'll touch base with my
- 9 team. And again, I don't want to be overly optimistic, given
- 10 the complexities on this case, and try to set things that are
- 11 almost a nonstarter. So we'll just leave off that -- I'm
- 12 giving the parties a chance to talk with their clients, have
- 13 some time off tomorrow while I get this ex parte briefing. We
- 14 look at doing the logistics briefing on Wednesday. After I've
- 15 reviewed the replies tonight, should have a decision on
- **16** whether or not I'm going to -- I feel comfortable going
- 17 forward with -- one, whether I want argument on that motion
- 18 and, two, whether I feel comfortable going forward with that
- 19 ex parte briefing on the 505 process, the summaries and
- 20 substitutions.
- 21 And then we will do, Ms. Bormann, your briefing. I'll
- 22 figure out when I think we can work it in on Thursday or
- 23 Friday. It sounds like Thursday may be busy.

1 Anything else to take up, just housekeeping while 2 we're discussing this? Mr. Connell? 3 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I just want to make sure I know 4 where I need to be and when. On behalf of Mr. al Baluchi, I 5 believe we will be at Wednesday's logistics meeting ----6 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yes. 7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: ---- and then I should not plan 8 anything else for Friday because I'm sure we'll be doing 9 something on Friday; is that accurate? 10 MJ [Col McCALL]: That's accurate. 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir. 12 MJ [Col McCALL]: 0900 on Wednesday, we'll plan on doing 13 that logistics briefing. 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir. 15 MJ [Col McCALL]: All right. Anything else, Ms. Bormann? LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Yeah, just a clarification. So with 16 17 respect to a closed session, you're going to figure out when 18 we can squeeze that in at some point later in the week? 19 MJ [Col McCALL]: Exactly. 20 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Great. Okay. Thanks. 21 MJ [Col McCALL]: And then Mr. Nevin? Well, I mean --

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Your Honor, I was just going to say that

22

23

v'all can ----

1 I heard counsel refer to us having withdrawn AE 770, which is 2 a motion to compel information related to Mr. Pearl. 3 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yeah, I believe you had just waived oral 4 argument ----5 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: Correct. 6 MJ [Col McCALL]: ---- is that correct? 7 CDC [MR. NEVIN]: We withdrew 768, so ----8 MJ [Col McCALL]: Yeah. I should have clarified that on 9 the record, but that's my understanding. 10 All right. And Mr. Sowards? 11 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Yes. And if you're going to get to 12 it, I apologize. But for the housekeeping, I just -- we had 13 asked for Mr. Mohammad to be able to attend our ex parte. 14 MJ [Col McCALL]: That's fine. 15 LDC [MR. SOWARDS]: Okay. Thank you. 16 MJ [Col McCALL]: Definitely. All right. The commission 17 is recessed for the evening. 18 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1635, 13 September 2021.] 19 [END OF PAGE] 20 21 22

23