1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0911,

2 28 January 2019.]

3 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Good morning. This commission is4 called to order.

5 Trial Counsel, please identify who is here on behalf6 of the United States.

7 CP [BG MARTINS]: Good morning, Your Honor. Representing
8 the United States, Brigadier General Mark Martins, Mr. Robert
9 Swann, Mr. Clayton Trivett, Ms. Nicole Tate, Major Christopher
10 Dykstra. Also present in the courtroom are paralegals
11 Mr. Dale Cox, Mr. Rudy Gibbs; and with the Federal Bureau of
12 Investigation, Kim Waltz and Nicole Taylor.

Your Honor, these proceedings are being transmitted
via closed circuit television to locations in the continental
United States pursuant to the commission's order.

**16** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, General Martins.

17 Mr. Nevin, if you could please identify for the18 record who is here on behalf of Mr. Mohammad.

19 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: David Nevin, Lieutenant Colonel Poteet,
20 Ms. Radostitz, Mr. Sowards on behalf of Mr. Mohammad, who is
21 present.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Ms. Bormann.
DC [MR. MONTROSS]: For Mr. Bin'Attash, Ms. Cheryl

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Bormann, learned counsel; Major Matthew Seeger; and William
 Montross.

**3** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Mr. Harrington.

4 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, for Mr. Binalshibh, James
5 Harrington, Lieutenant Mishael Danielson, and Ms. Alaina
6 Wichner.

7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Mr. Connell.

**8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Good morning, Your Honor.

**9** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Good morning.

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: On behalf of Mr. al Baluchi is myself,
James Connell; Alka Pradhan; Ben Farley. Lieutenant Colonel
Thomas has previously been excused with the permission of the
court and the consent of the client. Captain Andreu is sick
in quarters.

**15** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Mr. Ruiz?

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, myself, Suzanne Lachelier, Major
Joseph Wilkinson, Lieutenant Colonel Jennifer Williams,
Lieutenant Dave Furry, Mr. Sean Gleason on behalf of

**19** Mr. al Hawsawi.

20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. I also note for the record21 that the chief defense counsel is present in the courtroom.

22 Mr. Connell, with respect to Captain Andreu, the23 commission is aware that he is unable to attend this morning,

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 and certainly excuses his presence for purposes until such
2 time as he can return and attend these proceedings. Is there
3 any issue with proceeding in his absence this morning?

LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Yes, sir. May I be heard?

5

4

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You may.

6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, as I represented to the military 7 commission, Captain Andreu is sick in guarters. 10 U.S.C. 8 Section 949c(b) sets forth the requirement of military defense 9 counsel which is implemented in Regulation for Trial by 10 Military Commission 9-1. The Rule for Military Commission 11 which is applicable is 805(c), which provides: As long as at 12 least one qualified counsel for each party is present, other 13 counsel for each party may be absent from a military 14 commission session with the permission of the military judge. 15 And the commentary provides: Ordinarily, no military 16 commission proceeding should take place if any defense or 17 assistant defense counsel is absent unless the accused 18 expressly consents to the absence. The military judge may, 19 however, proceed in the absence of one or more defense counsel 20 without the consent of the accused if the military judge finds 21 that, under the circumstances, a continuance is not warranted 22 and the accused's right to be adequately represented would not 23 be impaired.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 I have personally visited Captain Andreu this 2 morning. I am no doctor, but it is my view that he should not 3 leave the vicinity of appropriate facilities. I have 4 consulted with Mr. al Baluchi, who does not consent to 5 proceeding without military counsel. We do object to 6 proceeding without him and request a deferral to 1300. I will 7 provide, if -- if appropriately considered, I will provide 8 status updates on any schedule directed by the military 9 commission.

I will just add that we have taken Captain Andreu
electrolytes and appropriate medication and -- essentially,
flu symptoms, and there might be some opportunity for him to
recover today.

14

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Connell.

15 In light of what we have scheduled for this session 16 of court this morning, which is, in essence, AE 615, the 17 commission finds that it's not necessary to delay these 18 proceedings, as Mr. al Baluchi nor his counsel have an 19 interest in the equities of AE 615 sufficient to warrant such 20 a continuance. So I do believe that his -- the accused's 21 right to be adequately represented is sufficiently met by the 22 presence of his learned counsel, as well as the presence of 23 Ms. Pradhan and Mr. Farley.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 22095

So we will go ahead and proceed with at least taking
 up the issue in AE 615. I do believe that will probably take
 us, with recesses, to 1300; and at such time, hopefully,
 Captain Andreu can either join us or you can apprise the
 commission of his status.

6 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: I understand. Thank you, sir.

7

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you.

8 I will now advise the accused of their right to be 9 present and their right to waive said presence. Each of you 10 have the right to be present during all sessions of the 11 commission. If you request to absent yourself from any 12 session, such absence must be voluntary and of your own free 13 will. Your voluntary absence from any session of the 14 commission is an unequivocal waiver of the right to be present 15 during that session. Your absence from any session may 16 negatively affect the presentation of the defense in your 17 case. Your failure to meet with and cooperate with your 18 defense counsel may also negatively affect the presentation of 19 your case.

20 Under certain circumstances, your attendance at a
 21 session can be compelled, regardless of your personal desire
 22 not to be present. Regardless of your voluntary waiver to
 23 attend a particular session of the commission, you have the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 right at any time to decide to attend any subsequent session.
2 If you decide not to attend the morning session but wish to
3 attend the afternoon session, you must notify the guard force
4 of your desires. Assuming there is enough time to arrange
5 transportation, you will then be allowed to attend the
6 afternoon session.

7 You will be informed of the time and date of each
8 commission session prior to the session to afford you the
9 opportunity to decide whether you wish to attend that session.

10 Mr. Mohammad, do you understand what I have just11 explained to you?

**12** ACC [MR. MOHAMMAD]: Yes.

13 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Bin'Attash, do you understand what14 I've just explained to you?

**15** ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: Yes.

16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Binalshibh, do you understand what17 I've just explained to you?

ACC [MR. BINALSHIBH]: [Speaking in English] As I told you
 19 last time, I cannot answer your questions because you are not
 20 qualified judge for this case. Thanks.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Harrington, Mr. Binalshibh's reply
 causes the commission some concern. Specifically, while
 counsel have and are free to challenge my qualifications to

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

preside over this commission, Mr. Binalshibh is not. So his
 unwillingness to recognize me as the presiding authority of
 this commission causes me some concern about his willingness
 to adhere to the rules of this commission and that, in turn,
 could potentially put everyone in this room safety in
 jeopardy.

7 So what I would propose at this point is that -- to 8 give you a brief opportunity to speak to your client. And I 9 understand certainly that he may be simply mimicking or 10 expressing what's been put into motions that are currently 11 pending with the D.C. Circuit; but nevertheless, I want to 12 ensure that he, at least, is recognizing the authority of the 13 military commission and the conduct of what transpires in this 14 room and will adhere to those. Otherwise, I may have to take 15 measures to ensure that everybody's safety in this room is 16 protected.

17 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, first of all, do you want me
18 to do it now? And, secondly, I do not understand what you
19 mean by everybody's safety with respect to what he said.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, Mr. Harrington, if
Mr. Binalshibh doesn't recognize my authority as the military
judge, then who's to say that he's going to recognize any
direction or command that I give in this commission? It's my

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 responsibility -- not just my duty, it's my responsibility to
2 ensure that folks in this commission, in this courtroom, are
3 safe.

4 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, we've been here since 2012 5 and, other than a couple of verbal statements that my client 6 has made, there has never been any demonstration of anything 7 that would cause anybody to be concerned about safety or 8 physical safety in this courtroom. He always abides by the 9 directions of the guard force and everybody else. And I'm not 10 quite sure -- the fact that somebody doesn't recognize the 11 legal authority of a court doesn't necessarily imply that 12 they're going to act out or do anything else about it. He's 13 never done that before. There's no basis for concluding that. 14 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, and I appreciate that. And as 15 such, I think I've, to date, largely adopted the 16 recommendations or, I guess, existing practice with respect to 17 the manner in which the accused are transported and handled in this commission, or shackling and things of that nature. 18

I don't believe, however, that up until last week -or last session of court, at least, that Mr. Binalshibh failed
to recognize the -- at least that the military judge had
authority over this commission. So I think that's a new
development, and that's my -- my concern is.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 22099

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Well, I'm glad to talk to him about
it, Judge. Do you want me to do it now or do you want me to
wait until you finish the other advice?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I'll go ahead -- let's go ahead and
finish the other advice, and then at that point in time we're
going to take a recess anyway so that we can transition the
courtroom. I'll give you an opportunity to speak to him at
that point in time and then address it again with
Mr. Binalshibh. Thank you.

10 All right. Mr. Ali, do you understand what I've just11 explained to you?

12 ACC [MR. AZIZ ALI]: Yes.

13 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Hawsawi, do you understand what I14 just explained to you?

**15** ACC [MR. AL HAWSAWI]: Yes.

16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: All right. On 26 January 2019, this 17 commission conducted an R.M.C. 802 conference here in 18 Guantanamo Bay with both trial and defense counsel. The 19 accused were absent. At this conference we discussed the 20 order of march for this week's session. I indicated that the 21 commission intended to start this morning's session with the 22 standard identification of the parties and advisement of 23 rights.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	After these introductory matters were completed, I
2	indicated that the commission would recess until 1000, at
3	which time we would take up AE 615. This recess would allow
4	the prosecution team to depart and for the special review team
5	to appear on behalf of the government via VTC.

6 After 615, I initially proposed we take up objections 7 to the commission's proposal to close the hearing for AE 616, 8 but upon the suggestion of Mr. Connell and with concurrence of 9 the prosecution, we instead agreed to take up AE 616 after a 10 hearing was conducted in accordance with M.C.R.E. 505(h). 11 Accordingly, we will take -- instead take up any unclassified 12 argument the parties are prepared to make on AE 614.

13 On Tuesday, we will conduct a hearing in accordance
14 with M.C.R.E. 505(h) to take up all pending 505(g) notices.
15 If necessary, and after an appropriate order is issued by this
16 commission, we will thereafter conduct a closed session solely
17 to address the issues in AE 616.

As of now, Wednesday is set aside to receive
testimony as was ordered by the commission in AE 350RRR,
whether that be in an open session, closed session, or a
combination thereof.

22 On Thursday and Friday we will take up unclassified23 and classified argument on the following motion series:

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 133RR, 118, 574G, 599, 600, 601, and 575. The parties have 2 indicated that, in light of recent filings, AE 538 and AE 561 3 are no longer ripe and so will be deferred to a later session. 4 In response to the proposed order of march, 5 Mr. Connell pointed out that there needs to be sufficient time 6 following the M.C.R.E. 505(h) hearing and the issuance of any 7 corresponding order closing the commission to allow for the 8 public to intervene. Brigadier General Martins indicated the 9 commission has previously ruled on this subject, which I 10 believe is a reference to the commission's order in AE 081A. 11 Do counsel for either side have any additions or 12 corrections to the commission's summary of the R.M.C. 802 13 conference? Trial Counsel? 14 CP [BG MARTINS]: The government does not, Your Honor. 15 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Nevin? 16 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, Your Honor. On behalf of 17 Mr. Mohammad, the record should reflect that you said that you 18 were going to hear argument from us on the 615 issues even 19 though you had already decided them. 20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: That is correct. And that is set 21 forth in the commission's ruling in AE 613E and 615P. 22 Ms. Bormann? 23 DC [MR. MONTROSS]: No additions, Your Honor.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Harrington? 2 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: No changes, Judge. 3 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Connell? 4 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I believe the military 5 commission's summary adequately -- or accurately summarizes 6 the 802 conference. I will note, however, that the proposed 7 order of march does not allow for the possibility of open 8 argument on 616. 9 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. I think that we can adequately 10 take that up during the -- tomorrow's 505(h) hearing. 11 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Thank you, sir. 12 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You're welcome. 13 Mr. Ruiz? 14 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: That's accurate, yes, Your Honor, thank 15 you. 16 MJ [Co] PARRELLA]: Thank you. At this time the 17 commission will stand in recess until 1000. 18 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0928, 28 January 2019.] 19 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1007, 20 28 January 2019.] 21 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: This commission is called back to 22 order. All parties who were present when the commission 23 recessed are again present with the following exceptions: The

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

prosecution team has departed the courtroom. We have joined
 with us members of the special review team by VTC. And if you
 can hear me, if you can please introduce who is present on
 your end.

5 SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: Yes, Your Honor. Jocelyn
6 Ballantine, I'm from the United States District Attorney's
7 Office for the District of Columbia.

8 SRT [MR. SHANKER]: Vijay Shanker with the Criminal
9 Division of the Department of Justice.

10 SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: And we're joined by Supervisory11 Special Agent John Stofer from the FBI.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. And with respect to the
defense teams, it appears Mr. Hawsawi is absent. Are there
any other changes to who was present previously?

15

That is a negative response.

16 Okay. Before we take up the issue in AE 615,
17 Mr. Harrington, I want to come back to an issue before we
18 recessed. Have you had an opportunity to speak with your
19 client and do you have an update for the commission?
20 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I don't think you can take that
21 issue up without the main prosecution being here.
22 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. We can go ahead and take this

23 issue up first. It did appear -- have you had an opportunity

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 to speak to --

**2** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I have, Judge, yes.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. All right. We will take that up then. What I'm going to ask then is that when we recess and the prosecution comes back, I'm going to require that Mr. Binalshibh remain so that I can go through that colloquy with him before he returns, if he does choose to absent himself.

**9** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: We understand.

**10** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Okay.

The purpose of this session is to take up the issues addressed in AE 613 and AE 615. As was previously noted, the commission issued a ruling on 25 January 2019 that has been simultaneously marked as AE 613E and 615P. Although the commission has ruled on the issue of a potential conflict, it -- I did indicate in my ruling that I would afford the parties an opportunity to be heard.

I think, given the nature of this potential conflict,
what I will do is I will allow Mr. Bin'Attash's team to first
speak unless you want to defer to another team.

LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge, as you are aware, I am sick. I
have the flu. So I've asked Mr. Nevin and Mr. Harrington to
precede me and I will do what I can to finish up.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. I understand.

2

Mr. Nevin?

3 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thanks, Your Honor. And I will say on 4 behalf of Mr. Mohammad, our view is that there is a -- at 5 least a potential conflict of interest here that's raised by 6 the declaration of the Bin'Attash team member, or now former 7 team member, and that it's not -- that potential for conflict, 8 at least, is not resolved by the findings that the military 9 commission made -- or the military judge made in 615P and 10 613E; and that this prohibits us from going forward, other 11 than addressing this issue of conflict, which we believe 12 Holloway and the other cases require us to bring to your 13 attention and ask for you to resolve.

So let me just do that, and I'll do this so let me just do that, and I'll do this sepeditiously because I know that you've already ruled on this. But I want the record to be clear about where we're coming from and why.

We have, first of all, the declaration of the team member -- or the now former team member of the Bin'Attash team. And what we know is that this person is in the neighborhood of Fort Hood, Texas, for, at least in his mind, other purposes, as -- in the process of transiting to another station. And he's called by someone from Army

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

counterintelligence, quote/unquote, who said -- this is a
 person who says he's from Army counterintelligence, and he
 lies to this person.

4 He tells them, you have to come here and be 5 questioned about your transfer to, my recollection is, Korea. 6 That's not why they were bringing him in. What follows is an 7 instance of "rough surveillance," is the term that I think is 8 commonly used. The team member sees somebody out in front of 9 his house nakedly taking pictures. He gets in -- the team 10 member gets in his own vehicle; the person taking the pictures 11 takes off; the team member follows him. The person pulls 12 over, gets out of his vehicle, and dashes back between two 13 houses and disappears.

14 After that, the team member finds that he's being 15 followed by a different car in traffic. And after making some 16 intermediate stops, he realizes he has to go in the other 17 direction so he makes a U-turn. The vehicle that's following 18 him also makes a U-turn. This is not surreptitious 19 observation without the person being aware of it. It's being 20 done in such a way to make him acutely aware of the fact that 21 he is -- that he's being scrutinized.

So he's searched at the gate of the Army base in away that's unusual and not typically done, involving some five

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 people, including someone from civilian law enforcement. And 2 finally then our -- or next, let's say, "finally" is not the 3 right word yet -- he's interrogated by two people who identify 4 themselves as FBI agents for two and a half hours. Thev require his signature on a couple of documents. This is not 5 6 the first time we've seen this kind of thing. And they want 7 to talk to him about his time on the Bin'Attash case. That's 8 a quote from paragraph 22.

9 And they keep ingratiating or attempting to 10 ingratiate themselves with him. They attempt to suggest to 11 him that they have common beliefs and experiences in an effort 12 to get him to provide them with information and to cooperate 13 with them. They demonstrate that they're aware of specific 14 procedures on the Bin'Attash team, information that they could 15 not have had from just observing from the outside, suggesting 16 that they have someone else that has provided them information 17 from the inside, either from Mr. Bin'Attash's team or from 18 some other team. And they're also aware of this team member's 19 personal activities, his interests, his tastes, where he goes 20 on the Internet, this kind of thing.

So this questioning that lasts for two and a half
hours focuses not just on Mr. Bin'Attash but -- and his team,
but also on the other teams. And I'm quoting now -- or not

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

quoting but referring to paragraph 31 of the declaration, that
 80 to 90 percent of the questioning relates to Bin'Attash, his
 attitudes, and whether his co-defendants are in the same or
 different position or circumstances. And at paragraph 32, you
 hear that they also asked about the other defense teams and
 the other defendants.

So in addition to all of this, they require him to
come back and take a polygraph on the second day. Two
different people administer the polygraph. One of them says
that he is from another government agency, and that is just
euphemistic speak, particularly in the context of this case,
for the CIA.

13 And I will say that the person that originally called 14 this team member and asked him to come in said that he was 15 from Army Counterintelligence. And when the team member goes 16 in for the second day to do the polygraph, he goes to a place 17 where there's a sign that says Military Counterintelligence. 18 So as we count it, we have probably three, possibly four 19 different agencies involved. That would be the FBI, the CIA, 20 and Military or Army Counterintelligence. And probably that's 21 one, last one, but it has -- given the two separate 22 designations, it's possibly four different agencies involved. 23 Now, we've also -- we know that you also met with the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

special prosecutor in chambers in a secret meeting, by which I
 mean one that we were excluded from, despite us asking you for
 permission to be there.

4 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: So by "secret," you mean ex parte?
5 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: That's -- yes.

**6** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay.

7 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes. Because that's correct. I mean,
8 it was ex parte, and it was not secret in the sense that we
9 were not aware of it because you advised us of that, that you
10 were doing that. So, right, exactly. Ex parte.

11 And we asked you for permission to be present, but we 12 are aware also that -- our understanding is that the SRT did 13 not ask for permission to make this presentation to you; that 14 they took the position that the pleading they filed was 15 sufficient for you to decide the case. And your order 16 directing the ex parte meeting recites that they have said 17 that. And you think -- you say, I believe -- and you say, in 18 an excess of caution, that you're going to conduct this robust 19 investigation two days hence. And I believe you issue that 20 order on the 22nd and the meeting is to occur -- the ex parte 21 meeting is to occur on the 24th.

And so I'm given to understand, after reading theorder that you issued on Friday, that you did, indeed, have

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the meeting. You have said that the only exhibit that was
2 offered was the declaration -- the same declaration that was
3 provided to us. And it's not clear to me -- at this point
4 there are two declarations at issue, and I'm not sure exactly
5 which one that refers to. But I gather there was no other
6 documentary evidence that took place in that meeting.

7 So I do have this question: Did someone testify8 before you in that meeting?

9 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: What I will tell you, Mr. Nevin, and I
10 think it's set forth in the commission's ruling, that in
11 addition to the information that was garnered during the
12 ex parte presentation, the commission did receive ex parte
13 pleadings in AE 613 as well as 613A. And as part of my
14 ruling, I've directed the SRT to redact, as appropriate, those
15 pleadings and to provide them to all the defense teams.

I do believe you're correctly summarizing what's in my ruling, that during the course of the ex parte presentation, I received a declaration; but since the SRT subsequently provided that to all the defense teams, there was no reason for me to order that one to be redacted and provided.

22 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah, no. I -- my question was whether
23 somebody testified in the sense of providing -- being sworn

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** and giving testimony under oath.

2 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well -- so this is your opportunity, 3 Mr. Nevin, to make oral argument to me. I'm not going to go 4 any further into the details of the ex parte presentation 5 other than what I've set forth in my findings of fact. The commission, I think as you're aware, has a duty to conduct an 6 7 inquiry in these sorts of situations and has an interest to 8 ensure that the defense teams are conflict-free so that we 9 don't find ourselves back here relitigating those same issues. 10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay. Well, I mean, I take it the 11 military commission won't answer my question. And I ask it 12 because the military commission -- or the military judge, you, 13 and I had a colloquy and some follow-on pleadings previously 14 about the issue of proffers. And I understood that you didn't 15 accept proffers, or that under the circumstances that were 16 presented in our situation you weren't going to accept my 17 proffer.

And after that you accepted the government's proffer about 579, Ms. Haspel. And I gather you've accepted a proffer in this setting as well. And I think that's unfair and inappropriate. And if there's testimony, I'll stand corrected. But I hear you that you're not going to answer the question.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 So here's what -- here's where we get left after 2 looking at the declaration of the team member, and also 3 reading what we've been given by the special review team, and 4 also reading your orders and findings. And these things, 5 comparing all of these materials together, leave us with a 6 variety of unanswered questions. And, for example, you hold 7 in 615P and 613E at paragraph 3.c. that the ongoing 8 investigation pertains only to the Bin'Attash team. And I 9 refer the military judge to the declaration of the team member 10 this morning, and I point out to you that they asked two -- at 11 least two questions, and probably more, about the other 12 defense teams.

And when you say -- or when the special review team says there is no investigation of any other team, I have to ask: What is up with those questions about the other defense teams? Those, on their face, are an investigation of our team and of the other teams. There's not any other reason for them to be asking those questions.

19

Now, this is why I ask you ----

20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Of course that assumes, Mr. Nevin,
 21 that everything in that declaration is correct, would it not?
 22 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, it does assume that.

**23** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And so again, I'm asking you, or I asked
 you just a little while ago: Did somebody tell you something
 different? And if they did, then I stand ready to be filled
 in.

5 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, before the commission gets into 6 what is an ex parte presentation, why don't we give -- once 7 the defense teams have had an opportunity to talk, certainly 8 the -- the special review team will have an opportunity, and 9 perhaps that will answer some of the questions.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay. Sure. And I -- you've also -- I
noted that you've given them two weeks to redact these two 613
and 613A, and I have a request for you in a few minutes about
that.

But, yeah, I would say I take that to be true. I don't know why that person would have written that in that declaration if it weren't true. And your statement that -your flat statement that there was no investigation of anybody else is contradicted by that. And if you -- if you were told something that leads you to that, I'd be happy to know it. But at this point for me, it's an unanswered question.

So you also say at -- in 615P and 613E at
paragraph 2.h., you say, no evidence exists to suggest that
the FBI investigation is in retaliation for any actions taken

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 by Defense Teams. And I have to assume that by that you mean
2 no evidence was shown to you. But I don't know how it can be
3 true, or how you can know that there is no evidence that
4 exists to that effect.

5 I mean, there is -- and I'll say -- I want to say a 6 word to you before I stop about the context of this, but I 7 think there's plenty to suggest that this is part of an 8 ongoing process that began in 2009 and leads up to the present 9 that is specifically designed to retaliate against the defense 10 teams for defending our clients.

11 And if there was -- if there were witnesses who 12 testified that establish clearly that there was no evidence or 13 that the -- no evidence exists, I would be very happy to know 14 it. But it's an unanswered question for me at this point. 15 And you find that -- in AE 615P and 613E at paragraph 2.e. 16 that no current member of any defense team assigned to this 17 case is under investigation by the FBI or any other government 18 agency. And again, I have an indication, as I said earlier, 19 that there were three agencies involved; that there was the 20 FBI, there was the CIA, and there was Army or Military 21 Counterintelligence.

Now, I know you've directed them to prepare a
declaration by February the 8th from another military agency,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

which I -- I'm guessing refers to this counterintelligence
 group or -- whether it's Army or military. And I don't see
 anything in there from the CIA, with reference to the CIA. I
 don't know who that other government agency was that
 participated in the polygraph, and that is another unanswered
 question for me and for my team.

7 And I have to ask -- certainly one unanswered 8 question for me is why the rough surveillance. If you're 9 really trying to just find out what sort of surreptitious, 10 suspicious, dangerous things this team member is doing, then 11 surely these agencies have some higher degree of 12 sophistication than to be parked out in front of his house 13 taking pictures of it with a cell phone and making U-turns in 14 a white van and following him in traffic. This is what we 15 used to call -- in the old days, it was called "rough 16 surveillance," and that's how I referred to it. It's not 17 designed to acquire information; it's designed to intimidate.

As I will tell you in a second, we have a long history in this case of people who leave our defense teams, and sometimes people who haven't even left our defense teams, being recruited to serve as moles or spies on the defense team. And they've been successful at doing it. They did it and this is -- was litigated in 292 previously

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** and I'll say another word about it in just a minute.

But you also found that by filing 613 and 613A, that
the government had fully satisfied the obligation of 292QQ
(Amended Order) to give you -- to give the military judge
immediate notice if an investigation like this takes place.

6 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, I think there's a distinction.7 Sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Nevin.

**8** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Sure.

9 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I think the wording was that they 10 complied with 292QQ, not necessarily that they fully 11 satisfied. And that might be an artificial distinction, but I 12 just want to clarify the record. That's what I think I said. 13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay. Well, then you get my point then. 14 Because that was my point. They say that the investigation --15 that the full investigation is opened on November 20th. And 16 my recollection from our prior round of litigating this in 292 17 is that a full investigation very possibly follows a 18 preliminary investigation, which implies at some point before 19 November 20th of 2018 they're conducting this investigation. 20 And they don't get around to giving that notice in AE 613 21 until December the 3rd; at a minimum, 13 days after the full 22 investigation is opened. And I -- that's in our minds an 23 unanswered question. Why is that?

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 And I will also direct your attention to the fact 2 that when AE 613 is filed, it's filed -- it's supported by an 3 unclassified or a -- I guess the term would be open, a 4 non-ex parte notice, that 613 itself, a secret ex parte 5 pleading, has been filed. But that notice is signed by 6 Mr. Trivett. It's not signed by the special trial counsel, 7 and I suspect that that was done -- and we'll see when we 8 see -- on February the 8th, I guess, we'll see who signed 613, 9 who gave that notice to you in 613. But I suspect that 10 Mr. Trivett signed the declaration, because to -- for the 11 special trial counsel to have signed it would have put 12 everybody on notice that this was happening again. And that, 13 at least, bought them another month or so before it became --14 before this came to a head. Could I be wrong about that? 0f 15 course, I could. But we have those unanswered questions.

16 And so we -- we see the pleading of the special trial 17 counsel filed in response to your direction that they -- to 18 your requirement for an expedited briefing schedule. And we 19 see there arguments that we've seen before. We see the 20 argument that a conflict only exists when we -- when you have 21 the same agency investigating the lawyer as is investigating 22 the defendant and the -- and even suggesting that it requires 23 that it be the same prosecutor. And I will say the cases

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

don't say that, at least not uniformly. You do have to
 consider the context of each of those cases very carefully.
 And in our pleading, 615I, I believe we laid some of this out,
 and I do direct your attention to that.

5 But this is a case in which the entirety -- at one 6 point, probably not anymore, but the entirety of the FBI was 7 enlisted in the investigation of this case, said to have been 8 the largest in the history of the country. And we are dealing 9 with a situation here where the proposed executioners of our 10 client are the very same people who are conducting this --11 this treatment of this former team member. And that is --12 that is a -- particularly in the context of what's gone on in 13 the last ten years, which I'll speak to briefly in just a 14 moment, that is not lost on defense counsel. That's something 15 that's very clear to me and very clear to the other people on 16 our team.

I call your attention to the fact that most of those cases are retrospective in nature. That is to say, after a conviction on an appeal or on a post-conviction action or a habeas action, clients are saying, my lawyer was under investigation all during the trial and I'm entitled to a new trial because of that.

```
23
```

And it's out of that context that you see the cases

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 that say the lawyers didn't know that they were under
2 investigation and, therefore, there can't have been any harm.
3 And that was an issue the first time around in 292, because
4 our linguist was hauled in by the FBI and didn't tell us. And
5 Judge Pohl made that point. I disagreed with it, but I'm
6 familiar with that issue.

7 But I just want to say to you, in this situation 8 we're dealing with it prospectively. We're dealing with it in 9 realtime, you might say, as opposed to looking back later and 10 saying, please undo everything that's been done because of 11 this thing that we now have found out about or that has 12 arisen. And it's an opportunity for the military judge to 13 deal with this now and get to the bottom of it and do it right 14 so that the record is not tainted by this.

15 There's the argument that there is no conflict; there 16 can't be a conflict here because the person who was involved 17 is not an attorney. And, I mean, I was personally astonished 18 to see that argument being presented at this late date because 19 Judge Pohl specifically ruled that -- that that's not the 20 case, that a conflict can arise out of something occurring 21 with any one of the team members in whom the client has an 22 obligation -- or the -- has a requirement to be in a 23 relationship of trust.

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 So -- and I think -- I'm sure that by this point, it 2 almost does -- or should go without saying that this is a 3 capital case and all of this has to be scrutinized with a 4 heightened degree of sensitivity. And the United States 5 Supreme Court cases are clear on that point. And so that 6 fact, you might say, turns the volume up on this problem, and 7 is even, you know, an even stronger reason for the military 8 commission to take this not only seriously but also carefully. 9 So that context of -- of my client's state of mind as 10 he sits there is really important because -- given the 11 treatment that he received. And as you know, and as we set 12 out in our moving papers, he's subjected to three and a half 13 years of torture and incommunicado detention. And important 14 for this context is that he was specifically told -- and I 15 believe all the men were -- that you will never be free of us. 16 It was a program that was designed to induce learned 17 helplessness. And the thrust of the program was we control 18 you and we will always control you. 19 And when we have these kinds of incidents arising, 20 they speak to that. They raise that in our client's mind. 21 And it is extremely corrosive of the attorney-client

22 relationship and that is -- that's an issue that I think -- I
23 submit to you should always be in your mind as you think about

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 how to proceed in this because it's always in our minds. And
2 it would be -- I have to say, it would be -- it would be -- we
3 would be a walking violation of the Sixth Amendment if that
4 weren't always in our mind, if we weren't always paying
5 attention to that issue.

6 So the context of this -- and I think -- I don't know 7 that I've had occasion to say this to you, but the context of 8 this is that this is, as I count it, the ninth time that I 9 personally -- and I'm just -- I will speak to you personally. 10 I'm here on behalf of Mr. Mohammad and on behalf of my team as 11 well, but I feel it very personally.

12 This begins for me in 2009 when I was investigated 13 for three years by the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Northern 14 District of Illinois for -- I gather, for violation of the 15 Intelligence Identities Protection Act. And I hired counsel 16 and waited while that investigation went forward for three 17 years. And in January of 2012, a probable cause affidavit in 18 a criminal case recited that I was indeed -- I and others were 19 indeed subject to this investigation and that -- but that a 20 finding had been made that we'd done nothing wrong. And --21 but I can tell you that knowing that the United States is 22 investigating you in this way has a particularly chilling 23 effect.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 I mentioned to you just a minute ago that our team 2 translator was hauled in by the FBI in 2012, told that some 3 questions needed to be asked having to do with his or her 4 security clearance application or reinvestigation. That was a 5 They wanted to ask that person questions about the lie. 6 operations of MCDO. It wasn't called MCDO then, but they 7 wanted to ask questions about the defense teams. They told 8 that person -- after interviewing him or her, they told that 9 person not to tell the defense team about the contact that --10 that they were having. And that didn't come out until later 11 when we ended up litigating 292.

12 Then in February of 2014, the government accused 13 us -- and again, me in particular, but my team members as 14 well -- of violating the commission rules, the communication 15 rules within the commission. And you can find the litigation 16 on this subject in AE 018Y and the subsequent pleadings.

But these again allege specific violations that were -- and I will say they were not investigated; the allegations were not investigated before they were made, they were simply made in a public pleading. And when -- once the investigation -- once we took a careful look at the situation, it became clear that we hadn't done anything wrong. On the contrary, we'd followed all the rules.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

But that was the -- that is the way this goes
 forward. It's make an allegation first, no matter how
 serious, and then wait to see later what happens, whether we
 can stand behind it or not, whether anything has really been
 done wrong or not.

Next, in -- two months later, in -- or three months
later, in April of 2014, we have the infiltration of the Ramzi
Binalshibh team. And we have a plant on Mr. Binalshibh's
team. An amazing development, I might say, for the FBI
actually to have recruited a mole to be inside of a defense
team, and yet that turned out to be exactly true.

12 Then in July of 2015, suddenly our translator has his 13 security clearance withdrawn. No explanation for why, no 14 explanation for what might happen next or when it could --15 might be restored. And we have -- the pleadings that follow 16 in that are the AE 406 series. And ultimately, after about a 17 year, his clearance was restored. Again, without any 18 explanation why or what the problem was or what the situation 19 was. Next, five months later -- sorry, a year later, in 2016, 20 in the AE 460 series, we were accused of improperly accessing 21 a secret computer system.

And again, it was an incorrect allegation. It wasnot an improper access. I gather the whole matter has been

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 dropped, although there's never been a specific statement to
2 that effect. But, you know, there was an allegation used in
3 the specific terms of the criminal statute in 18 U.S. Code
4 referring to unauthorized access. That allegation was made
5 and laid against us and proceeded to be litigated extensively
6 in the 460 series. And whether it's gone away or not now, I
7 don't know.

8 And the next after that occurs in October of 2017 9 when I and others on my team are accused of willfully spilling 10 classified information. I'm talking about the AE 532 series. 11 You understand what it means to willfully spill classified 12 information. And there was an allegation to that effect about 13 us without so much as asking us how that pleading came to be 14 filed and whether we had anything to do with filing it, which 15 we didn't.

16 There it is. Make the allegation now, let everybody 17 twist slowly in the wind, and then later on it goes away or it 18 doesn't. We had testimony from the same man -- Mr. Purtill, I 19 believe his name is -- who has provided a declaration to you. 20 We had testimony in that case about what exactly was going on 21 with that. I believe that's the seventh.

And then finally, I -- apart from the one we're
dealing with now, which is, in my view, is the ninth. The

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 eighth situation was when General Martins stands here and 2 tells us that we would be subject to criminal prosecution, at 3 least potentially, for investigating the case, for approaching 4 CIA agents who participated in the torture of our client and 5 asking them questions about that. And instead, the government 6 demanding that we not do that, that we not do our jobs, and 7 that it all take place through Protective Order #4, which I 8 know you're familiar with. But I direct your attention to the 9 proposition that if we had done our job and gone forward to do 10 our job, the government was saying you would be subject to 11 criminal prosecution for that.

12 So this is the environment that we are operating in, 13 and it's not the environment that is supposed to exist in a 14 genuine criminal case. You're not supposed to -- counsel are 15 not supposed to be under constant false -- you know, Your 16 Honor, I understand nobody is immune from investigation if 17 they've done something wrong. That's fine. I -- neither in this case nor out on the street in the world are you -- is a 18 19 person immune, and I'm not asking to be immune.

But I'm telling you about ten years of repeated shots across our bow that were false, that were specifically designed to intimidate us and to make us stand back from the fence. And it's gone on long enough. It's gone on too long.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And when we come to you in this situation, we are coming from
 that context.

And I appreciate your hearing me out so that you can understand the context as well. So when I tell you there are unanswered questions about this, I mean this seriously. The existence of unanswered questions means something. In the real world, genuine questions that are raised by pleadings and allegations and declarations get resolved one way or the other.

10 And I'm happy to have you come to the conclusion and 11 demonstrate to us, sufficient for us to make our own decision 12 about it for our own ethical responsibilities with our -- with 13 our Bar associations, to be confident that we're not under a 14 conflict. I don't want to be under investigation. I don't 15 want to have anybody looking at me, but I have unmistakable 16 indication here that someone is. And until they do, our 17 decision is that we're not going to take further action. Now, 18 maybe that will get resolved by the redacted pleadings that 19 you have directed them to provide us in 613 and 613A.

So here's my request for you: First of all, stop
these proceedings until we get those redacted -- at least
until we get those redacted pleadings. Now, I know you gave
them two weeks. You gave them two days to make a robust

## UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

presentation to you, quote/unquote. It seems to me that they
 ought to be able in two days also to prepare redacted
 pleadings and send them around. I don't know why we have to
 wait until the 8th.

5 And the declaration from the other military agency, 6 whatever it is, that shouldn't take very long either. I think 7 you could probably direct these folks here on the VTC to turn 8 this over to us by the end of the day today or tomorrow or 9 something to that effect, and maybe this is something we could 10 resolve really quickly. I'd submit to you that it doesn't 11 need to wait -- it doesn't need to wait until the 8th of 12 February.

And I would say to you what about the CIA? Why aren't we hearing anything about what their involvement is, whether they have an investigation, why they were present, why someone from another government agency was present or whether that was just another lie, which I recognize is a possibility. But under the circumstances, I think it's something that needs to be addressed.

And I guess I would say in one sense, maybe more
broadly, tell us what this is about. I'm telling you I'm not
claiming that I have a right to be free from being
investigated or that my team doesn't or that anybody else

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 doesn't. But I have a Top Secret security clearance with
2 Secure Compartmented Information and all the tickets as we
3 recite to you on other occasions. Really, I can't be trusted
4 to know some of the basic details about how this started and
5 what it was about sufficient to make my own decision about
6 whether this is yet another false alarm or whether this is
7 something more serious?

8 And I will tell the military judge that we filed a 9 request for discovery with the SRT asking them, in so many 10 words, give us everything you have that relates to this and 11 tell us everything you know about this. And they haven't 12 answered it: the time hasn't run for them to do so. I believe 13 you could direct them to answer that request for discovery 14 right away and provide that information to us immediately and 15 we can wait in place. I mean, we can -- we don't have to go 16 back until whenever it is we're going back, Saturday. We can 17 wait until later in the week and have that material.

And I really -- there's another thing that underlies all of this, and that is my belief that this -- these were not -- I recited nine separate instances where somebody stuck their head up out of the water and appeared briefly in the form of an investigation. I don't believe that those are nine unrelated incidents. I think they're all part of a continuing

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

effort to intimidate the defense teams. And I think that I
 would be a little bit off my rocker not to think otherwise.

3 So I think what I -- what the military judge should 4 direct the SRT to do would be to state whether any other team 5 member, current or former, at any time during the pendency of 6 this case has ever been investigated, questioned, or 7 communicated with on matters related to or occurring during 8 service on one of the teams. I think we should -- we're 9 entitled to a clear statement of what's been going on under 10 the scenes, under the water, where we're not able to see it.

But until we have enough that we can sort out our
present situation for ourselves in a principled way, we will
decline to make argument or examine witnesses or otherwise
participate substantively in the proceedings.

15 So that's what I -- that's what I came to say to you.16 And pending your questions, I'll sit down.

17 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: No questions at this time, Mr. Nevin.18 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thank you.

**19** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you.

20 Mr. Harrington?

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Thank you, Judge. Judge, I'm not
quite sure why I'm standing here because of the due process
implications of a court rendering a detailed and complicated

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 decision and then saying, I will give you an opportunity to be
2 heard on it afterwards. I don't know if this is supposed to
3 be treated as a motion for reconsideration or you haven't
4 really settled on your order. I assume that you have. But I
5 think it's distressing in the context of this case where the
6 military commissions have been under attack, in the legal
7 community and around the world, since they started.

8 This is the third iteration of them. The rules in 9 this iteration are somewhat better for due process than the 10 others, but there are still many deficiencies in them. And 11 you know that from the motions that you have -- and orders 12 that you have read from Judge Pohl and the ones that you 13 consider now.

14 But the perception here is this is a race to the 15 finish line and we're going to proceed for the basis of 16 convenience and expediency so that you hold your robust 17 ex parte hearing to make sure that it gets done before we come down here and the prosecutors on the opposite side don't even 18 19 have to come here. It seems to me that there was absolutely 20 no reason for that to be done. It could have been done in an 21 orderly way, which was done before.

The SRT made many appearances in 292 down here andthis is the place to do it. And you can say, well, I had the

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

authority to do what I did. And I suspect an appellate court
 would probably say you could have done it in Washington. But
 I go back to the perception about these commissions and the
 fundamental unfairness that the world looks at about these.

5 And, Judge, the -- I'm not going to repeat what 6 Mr. Nevin said, but I have to bring out some things with 7 respect to AE 292, of which my -- excuse me, my team, and 8 particularly me, were the target of an investigation. And 9 when I think about this, Judge, it has less of an effect on 10 me, I think, than the other members of my team, solely because 11 of my age and where I am with my career. The effects of 12 something like this are much different for me than they are 13 for other -- other members of our team. It doesn't mean that 14 they're not important. It doesn't mean that I don't have 15 concern. But they are far different.

But this is really like somebody who has cancer and is successfully treated and the cancer goes into remission. And as time goes by, the person -- it fades somewhat. It's always there. But then when the cancer comes back, it's not like it's a brand new event. You go right back to the first cancer and what happened in that. It comes right to the top. And that's what happened -- that's what happens --

23 has happened to the Ramzi Binalshibh team. When 292 happened,

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 we went for a long period of time where the SRT came into 2 court and said, Judge, there is no conflict. Nothing is going 3 We just have to get a report to you. We'll get a report. on. 4 It kept drifting and drifting. And the next thing we know, 5 no, everything is abated. SRT stops making that statement, 6 and we're into a full-fledged criminal investigation. And we 7 only find that out at the end. We don't find that out while 8 it's going on.

9 But the effect that it had on the members of my team
10 were absolutely devastating. There are still members of my
11 team who were here then who have never fully recovered from
12 that. We had people on our team who wanted to leave right
13 away.

14 Alaina Wichner joined our team right as this was 15 taking place. She spent countless hours talking to paralegals 16 and other members of our team who were genuinely concerned and 17 wanted to leave the team right away. And I'm particularly 18 talking about military persons whose careers and whose 19 security clearance were absolutely essential for their 20 careers. And she would call me and report to me and I would 21 fly down to Washington and I would sit with the members of my 22 team trying to assure them and trying to calm them down and 23 asking them to stay. These were terrific, terrific people on

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** our team, and they -- it seemed to help somewhat.

And I'm saying to myself, Jim, you're a nice guy.
That person really likes you. You're the target of the
investigation and you're the one that's giving the assurance
to the people?

6 So when this episode happens with Mr. Bin'Attash's 7 team, we come right back into that situation again. And so 8 we're back at the same point where members of my team now 9 wonder, should I stay? Should I go? And as Mr. Nevin says, 10 the FBI, prosecutors have an obligation to investigate 11 criminal activity, or other agencies have an obligation to 12 investigate violations of security clearance. We don't 13 dispute that. But we dispute the way that this has happened 14 and what has happened again with it.

And when a member of the Bin'Attash team is asked about the other teams, and we're led to believe that our team was specifically one of those that they were asked about, that's a dagger right into the heart and that brings back the early cancer. And it's very, very hard -- very, very hard to get over that.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Harrington, if I may ask you a
question, what led -- leads you to believe that your team was
one of the teams specifically asked questions about during

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** that interview?

2 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Just conversations I've had, Judge,
3 with the parties involved.

4 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But there's nothing in the5 declaration ----

**6** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: No.

7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: ---- that's evidence before ----

**8** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: No.

**9** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand.

10 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: And, Judge, I want you also -- at 11 the end of 292, when Judge Pohl -- we had gotten a report from 12 the SRT and they said it's all over, there's a letter here, 13 nobody is going to get prosecuted. Another letter, nobody is 14 going to lose their security clearance, we're all set to move 15 There's always the qualifier, which is, "at this time" or on. 16 words to that effect. And, obviously, the prosecution is 17 leaving themselves open to -- if something new arrived, that 18 it -- it wasn't over. I understand that. That's common 19 practice in every U.S. attorney's office around the country. 20 I understand that.

But Judge Pohl, at our request, forced the SRT to
come right out and say, no, the file is closed and, no, we're
moving on. We're not -- there's no -- there's no

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 investigation going. And I think that that is something that 2 has to be done here. And, Judge, I also noticed in your 3 decision that you did not do what Judge Pohl did in 292JJJJJ, 4 the last paragraph of his order was that he directed the SRT to provide our team and any of the other teams that were 5 6 subject to investigations discovery of what it is that they 7 had done, what materials they had obtained and the rest. And 8 at the conclusion of that, we received a large amount of 9 discovery from the SRT.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Harrington, isn't the situation
distinct in the -- I think your colleague pointed this out.
292 was largely completed at the time that this issue came up,
where perhaps we might be talking about a prospective
investigation where it would be inappropriate.

15 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, if you're talking about a 16 prospective investigation and one that's still going on, the 17 question is, why are we here and why did you issue the order?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, I think the order was quite
clear that the investigation does not involve any current
member of any defense team.

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: And that may well be true. The
problem is, if that investigation continues, even for a member
not presently of one of the defense teams, if it implicates

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the defense team and conduct while the person was on the 2 defense team, it may well, and it raises certainly the 3 potential of a conflict, which means it's unsettled. 4 That's all I have, Judge. 5 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, Mr. Harrington. 6 Mr. Connell, do you care to be heard on this issue? 7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: No, thank you, Your Honor. 8 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Ruiz? 9 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Judge, at the outset, I want to echo the 10 comments of both my colleagues and adopt their arguments in 11 relation to this particular issue. 12 What I want to key in on is the -- there seems to be 13 a focus on the -- the issue of current defense team members. 14 And what I want to explain to the commission is that for our 15 purposes, all of the same duties and all of the same 16 obligations that exist for current members exist for people 17 who have since departed from the team. In fact, for our team, 18 we have each member that departs the team sign a 19 confidentiality, nondisclosure, that basically highlights for 20 them the fact that they still have a duty and a responsibility 21 for privilege, for confidentiality in defense matters; and if, 22 in fact, they are harassed or contacted or investigated, that 23 we need to be informed of those issues.

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

It's not simply enough for us to say that there is no
 current defense team member that is being investigated,
 particularly as Mr. Nevin highlights, when that team member
 who has since departed the active service of the team is
 questioned about matters that relate specifically to the inner
 workings of the team or the inner workings of team members.

7 And this is a delineation that we saw in this -- in 8 the special litigation team's filings. It's one that I'm 9 seeing in your rulings and in your orders that we think is not 10 an appropriate distinction. When a team member departs our 11 team, they carry those same duties and obligations with them. 12 When those team members are questioned, harassed, surveilled, 13 followed about and then asked questions about the inner 14 workings of the team, the communications of not only the 15 particular team they were a member of, but other teams, that 16 is an issue of grave concern to us.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Although it may be an issue of grave concern and may implicate some other aspect of, you know, attorney-client -- the government's access to attorney-client material, things of that nature, specifically adhering or focused on the issue of conflict, what's the authority to suggest that it creates a conflict if a former member of a defense team is under investigation?

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: The conflict comes from when the 2 individual attorneys in litigation feel that there may be an 3 investigation that relates back to their duties and 4 responsibilities in the ongoing litigation. It's everything 5 that Mr. Nevin talked about in terms of the chilling effect. 6 The chilling effect can come from a direct investigation, as 7 Mr. Nevin underwent, or for an investigation of a former team 8 member that relates back to the inner workings of the team.

9 So, for instance, when I look at that, one of my team 10 members leaves the team, then they are questioned on the way 11 out and they say, well, is Mr. Ruiz patriotic, right? That's 12 a question that was asked I know of at least one of the 13 learned counsel. It was asked of one of the team members who 14 was departing that team. What does that mean, is Mr. Ruiz 15 patriotic? Does it mean that, because I am serving on this 16 case at the behest of the U.S. Government and formerly as an 17 active duty member, that somehow I'm not patriotic? And what 18 is that getting at? Is there -- is there a question there 19 about duty of loyalty to the United States?

So when I hear that, that person may technically no 21 longer be on my team, but the fact that they're being asked 22 those kinds of questions does have an impact on the manner in 23 which we assess our positions on this team, our advocacy. And

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 it may -- in my case it didn't -- that kind of question 2 wouldn't impact me in that sense. But it is something that we 3 have to assess, factor in, analyze. And those kinds of 4 reach-back questions into the inner workings of the team, into 5 the duties and responsibilities of the counsel, whether we 6 communicate a particular way with a client, whether particular 7 information is shared, does relate back to the inner workings 8 of our team.

9 And as we highlighted in 615L, which was
10 Mr. al Hawsawi's objection to the ex parte hearing, the
11 session that you had, we highlighted that we have an
12 independent, ethical legal duty to make an informed decision
13 about whether we may be under a conflict.

14 And what complicates, I think, this particular 15 situation is the way in which the defense was handled, quite 16 frankly, almost as an afterthought. Granted, as Mr. Nevin 17 said, there was an indication and there was notice that you 18 wanted a robust presentation. But that presentation went 19 ahead. And even as of today, there's still no -- no legal 20 ruling with respect to our objection. Obviously you went 21 ahead, so it was denied. But there's no -- there's no 22 response in terms of the legal basis for requesting an 23 ex parte session such as the one that you had when those

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ex parte sessions are heavily disfavored.

2 There was nothing in there to address the legal and 3 ethical obligations that we raised that we have such a 4 concern. And it's not enough for us to then look back and 5 say, well now, defense, you can make an argument after I've already issued my ruling. I echo Mr. Harrington's sentiments 6 7 in that. What is the purpose? What is the reason for that? 8 Is it to put on a show or to show the appearance of fairness, 9 of justice? I'm not sure that there's any utility.

10 Maybe I feel a little better about having the ability 11 and the opportunity to say these things to you, but what legal 12 significance is there? I still don't even have a ruling on 13 the motion that we properly submitted before the court as a 14 proper objection to the hearing that you had requested.

15 So the -- that compounds the issue that we have. 16 That compounds the concerns. But as I indicated in 615L, the 17 manner in which the session was handled also limited our 18 access to information, and also -- and that -- in doing that, 19 has limited our ability to independently assess whether we do 20 have a conflict. And the manner in which it has been handled 21 is the defense is an afterthought. We're going to tell you, I 22 took care of it. You said the court has an interest in 23 determining whether there is a conflict ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, Mr. Ruiz, what does the rule say
about who has a primary duty to assess whether there is a
conflict?

4 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: The court has the duty to address the5 conflict.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: And do you think that, in part, that
could be because some of the material may involve ongoing
investigations that have to be handled in an ex parte fashion?

9 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: In some instances, yes. However, another
10 avenue that the commission could have taken was to be as
11 inclusive as possible with the defense.

12 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay, so do you think ----

13 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Which, in essence, you could have issued
14 a ruling to say we're going to seal this ----

15 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You are ----

**16** LDC [MR. RUIZ]: ---- we're not going to talk about it.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Hold on. You are aware, and I think we've gone over this, that the commission has -- has taken steps to give the defense as much as possible, hence the -the part of my order that directs that the SRT to provide as much as they can without disclosing potentially ongoing investigations to the defense.

23 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Well, I mean, that remains to be seen and

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 so ----

2 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, the order doesn't remain to be 3 Maybe the contents of what's in there remains to be seen. 4 seen, but the order is guite definitive. What I'm getting at, 5 Mr. Ruiz, I think it's somewhat disingenuous to say that the commission isn't making efforts to try to resolve this 6 7 conflict. As I've pointed out with Mr. Nevin, I mean, I have 8 just as much interest to ensure that you're all conflict free 9 as you all do. And I think that the commission, I certainly 10 will state, takes that responsibility seriously to ensure that 11 it's a thorough inquiry.

12 So my opportunity -- or me providing you an 13 opportunity to be heard is not hollow, it's not shallow. It's 14 genuine. Because I do want to hear what the -- the position 15 of the defense and the concerns of the defense are. 16 Obviously, I didn't have that ability to do that prior to 17 coming down here, and certainly wanted to alleviate the issue that may have been lagging in your mind as to whether to get 18 19 on the airplane or not, so to speak.

But I'm certainly willing to and -- and am fully open to hearing the concerns of the parties and making every attempt to address those so that you do feel better. And I also want to, I guess, address something you've said, because

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

you've pointed out about a feeling or a fear. If I'm not
 mistaken, my predecessor addressed whether or not being in
 fear of investigation constitutes a conflict; is that correct?
 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Amongst that -- amongst other things,
 yes.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. So there's a difference between
being informed and having a feeling. So in terms of
information, do you have any information specifically that
leads you to believe that your team specifically is under a
conflict?

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Well, speaking of disingenuous, I think
it's disingenuous for the court to ask me if I have
information that you're well aware I don't have, partly
because of the manner in which you've chosen to proceed in an
ex parte fashion.

16 And what I'm getting at, Judge, and what I think my 17 colleagues were getting at, it's not only is the inception of 18 the issue troubling, the fact that this former defense team 19 member was accosted, was questioned, was harassed, relating 20 back to matters internal to the inner workings of defense 21 teams, but you compounded -- you compounded that concern by 22 the manner in which the commission chose to approach this 23 issue.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 You very well could have held off on ruling until 2 after we had an opportunity to make our case to you. You very 3 well could have ruled on the issue that was raised before you 4 regarding the ex parte session. But what that leaves us with 5 is the impression -- and that, myself -- is that the defense 6 was an afterthought. You were going to take care of the 7 assessment and the issue. And I understand that you believe 8 you have that duty and that responsibility, and you do. Ι 9 definitely don't take issue with that.

10 But what I do take issue with is that the approach 11 seems to be that you don't think that we have an independent 12 duty ourselves to assess whether we have that conflict with as 13 much information as necessary on a timely manner. And so as 14 I'm standing here having this argument with you, I'm at a 15 disadvantage, and I'm at that disadvantage because you've 16 chosen to provide them two weeks to provide us a redacted 17 version of whatever information it is you have.

And, yes, that is -- that is part of the issue that I
have here. And I appreciate the opportunity to let you know
that, and I understand that you can very well just ignore it.
It's certainly your authority and your prerogative. But it's
a concern.

**23** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand. Thank you, Mr. Ruiz.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Thank you.

2 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, I'm having a health issue. May I
3 have a brief break?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You may. Are you okay with us
proceeding in your absence or would you like the commission to
take a recess?

7 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Being the learned counsel, I don't
8 think you can proceed without me, but I'll be as fast as
9 possible.

10 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: All right. This commission is in11 recess.

12 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1113, 28 January 2019.]
13 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1120,

14 28 January 2019.]

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: This commission is called back to
order. All parties who were present when the commission last
recessed are again present.

18 Ms. Bormann?

**19** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Judge, good morning.

**20** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Good morning.

LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I am not my normal self today because
I have the flu, so I'm going to speak very -- as loud as I
can. Please let me know if you can't hear me.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. I will.

2 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: If for some reason I can't finish,3 Mr. Montross will.

**4** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay.

5 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: This case, as the other co-counsel
6 have so competently argued, has been filled with what occurred
7 just recently. And Mr. Bin'Attash's team is the team that is
8 directly affected by what happened with our paralegal.

9 So a little background for the public because -- and 10 for you, because there is no posting of the motion online. 11 But on December 20th of 2018, I received a call from our 12 military paralegal who had been permitted to travel to 13 Fort Hood, Texas, where his family resided to help transition 14 them while he was awaiting orders. His orders for his new 15 position were to begin on January 16th, and they were 16 overseas.

So still a member of our team, that paralegal was
misinformed and tricked to appear for a two and a half hour
interrogation by FBI agents. The -- you asked my other
colleagues how we know this had to do with our team, and all I
can say to you is circumstantial evidence.

So let's take an old prosecutor trick and talk aboutsnow on the ground when they're arguing in closing argument

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 about how we know it snowed. So you go to bed at night and
2 there's no snow on the ground. But you wake up -- I live in
3 Chicago, so this is really apt. You wake up in the morning,
4 and there's snow on the ground. That's circumstantial
5 evidence, very strong circumstantial evidence, that it has
6 snowed overnight, even though you didn't actually see it snow
7 overnight.

8 So what do we have here in terms of circumstantial 9 evidence that this investigation entails the very center, the 10 core, and the focus of Mr. Bin'Attash's defense? First of 11 all, we have the circumstances of the interrogation itself. 12 It was a big lift to get the two FBI agents to Fort Hood, 13 Texas. As you know, and as counsel for the SRT know, there 14 aren't resident FBI agents living on Fort Hood. In order to 15 get FBI agents onto Fort Hood, there had to be coordination 16 between the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of 17 Justice, and the Army. That doesn't happen overnight.

We also know that the FBI agents were in the National Capital Region, what we call -- that's what we call in Department of Defense the area around Washington, D.C. And we know that because, assuming they told our former paralegal the truth, they had gone to his house in Woodbridge, Virginia, which is south of the Washington, D.C. area, to go look for

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** him one week earlier.

2 So on December 13th, those same FBI agents were 3 knocking at a door in Woodbridge, Virginia, looking for 4 Sergeant Skeete. We also know that this was about inner team workings and that our paralegal was not the target because 5 6 they didn't issue him Article 31, what we call in the civilian 7 world Miranda warnings. So I'm not a military justice expert, 8 but I am an expert in criminal law; and when someone is a 9 target of an investigation, they're required to be Mirandized. 10 Our former paralegal was not given his Article 31 rights; and 11 so from that piece of circumstantial evidence, I can garner 12 that he wasn't the target.

13 The questions put to Sergeant -- our paralegal. I 14 don't want to use his name because it seems to me that we've 15 already besmirched a fellow that I found particularly helpful 16 in handling this case. The two and a half hours of 17 interrogation centered on -- what we found, 85 to 90 percent 18 of it -- so something like two hours and 15 minutes of the two 19 hour and 30 minute interrogation centered on my client, 20 Mr. Bin'Attash, the members of Mr. Bin'Attash's defense team, 21 with particular attention directed to the three civilian 22 defense counsel. That would be me, Mr. Edwin Perry, and 23 Mr. William Montross sitting in the back there.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 They asked about the work of Mr. Bin'Attash's defense 2 team, what we did, how we did it. They asked who among the 3 defense team Mr. Bin'Attash trusted. They asked the specific 4 duties that individual members of Mr. Bin'Attash's defense 5 team performed as part of their regular duties. They asked 6 which defense team members communicated with Mr. Bin'Attash 7 and how. They asked the nature of the content of the defense 8 team communications with Mr. Bin'Attash.

9 They asked whether Mr. Bin'Attash communicated -- and 10 this is a quote directly from what the FBI agent -- and all we 11 have is a first name, Chris, asked our paralegal, how he 12 communicated with, quote/unquote, the outside world. The FBI 13 agents asked whether -- or how Mr. Bin'Attash communicated 14 with the outside world. They asked what views Mr. Bin'Attash 15 held of individual defense team members. They asked what 16 views Mr. Bin'Attash's family members held about us, about the 17 defense team members. They asked whether Mr. Bin'Attash was 18 difficult to work with. They asked if Mr. Bin'Attash was 19 difficult to work with, to what extent he was difficult to 20 work with and how.

They asked whether Mr. Bin'Attash's co-defendants
were the same or different from Mr. Bin'Attash in that regard.
They asked what extent, if any, were Mr. Bin'Attash's

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 co-defendants the same or different. They asked about the
2 personalities of individual defense team members, including me
3 and Mr. Montross and Mr. Perry. They asked our paralegal's
4 personal opinions of Mr. Bin'Attash and his personal opinion
5 of each and every team member. They also asked about the
6 cadre -- or individuals who worked as confidential ex parte
7 consultants for our team, experts for our team.

8 That's two hours and 15 minutes of the interrogation. 9 There's nothing mentioned not about Mr. Bin'Attash's defense. 10 The rest -- the other 15 minutes was rapport building, was 11 attempts by the FBI agents to garner information by doing a 12 traditional rapport-building type of interrogation. That is, 13 we're all on the same page here. We're all good Americans. 14 We just need your help. All of this evidence can be found in 15 our attachment that is our paralegal's declaration attached to 16 615, our original filing.

17 The SRT in its filing didn't deny any of it. And as 18 I stand here today, there's absolutely no doubt in my mind 19 that what they were questioning that sergeant about relates 20 back to something he did for the defense team prior to the 21 first filing by the regular trial counsel in December.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But, Ms. Bormann, similar to what I
asked your colleagues, I mean, you would concede -- I mean,

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

you're speculating. At the end of the day, you can talk about
 circumstantial evidence, but no -- of no fault of your own,
 you don't have all of the facts.

4 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I don't, because we've been denied5 them.

**6** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Correct.

7 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: All I have -- all I have and all I can
8 go on and all that's informing my very deep fear is everything
9 that I'm listing for you that I have that's circumstantial.
10 And until I receive direct ----

11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well ----

12 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: ---- evidence -- it is possible like 13 you said, right -- or like I said earlier, it's possible that 14 maybe a snow machine came in the middle of the night and 15 dropped snow on my front yard and that's why it ----

16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. So where I'm going with this --17 and I'm sorry to interrupt you, but where I'm going with this 18 is that because you don't have access to all of the facts, in 19 AE 615, you ask this commission to make the inquiry. And that 20 relief was granted, despite the fact that the SRT, in their 21 response to AE 615, suggested that the commission didn't need 22 to do that inquiry because they had in the attached 23 declaration assured all the teams that they were conflict

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 free.

2 So the commission, notwithstanding what the SRT 3 suggested, granted the relief and conducted that inquiry. So 4 understanding that you may have initially been operating from 5 a severe disadvantage and have every right to feel suspicion 6 that you were under investigation, and even though you 7 perhaps, out of no fault of your own, do not still have access 8 to documents and presentations that were ex parte, explain to 9 me, now that the commission has specifically indicated to all 10 parties that there is no ongoing investigation by any agency, 11 to include background security checks -- other than routine 12 background security checks, what facts you have here to 13 suggest that there is still a conflict. In other words, why 14 wasn't the commission's very specific findings of fact and 15 conclusions in AE 615 and '13 sufficient?

16 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I didn't see any specific fact-based 17 determinations. I saw the fact that you had a meeting with 18 attorneys from the Department of Justice who advocated for a 19 position, and you didn't have anyone else from any other side 20 asking questions, and then you accepted their advocated 21 position. In any sort of process ----

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: That's speculation as well. I mean
obviously, it was ex parte, and I understand certainly ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Obviously.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: ---- that the defense wasn't there to ask questions, but it's speculative to say that the commission didn't ask questions or make further inquiry or just accepted the government on their proffer. Had I wanted to do that, we would have probably never had that ex parte presentation because I would have granted their relief that they requested in their response to your motion.

9 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: But you ----

10 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But the finding of fact I'm 11 specifically referring to is -- and I think it's probably a 12 couple of places, but it is very clearly stated in this 13 commission's ruling that no member of a current defense team 14 is currently under investigation by either the FBI or any 15 other government agency, and that's not just a criminal 16 investigation but also background security checks.

17 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I understand that. But -- so let me
18 take you a little bit back. And maybe this is because I've
19 been living through this since 2011.

20 So no current defense team member is currently under21 investigation is exactly the words.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I don't think that was the words. It
was "No current member...is under investigation" and then I

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 think I even elaborated that -- if you give me a moment, I'll
2 find the specific language.

**3** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Thank you.

4 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But that there was no indication that
5 any member of a defense team would be under investigation.

6 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: So I can't tell you how -- I have no 7 idea how you determined that, and I don't remember reading 8 that in your -- in your ruling. But I can tell you that the 9 special review team represented that exact scenario to Judge 10 Pohl back in 2014, and Judge Pohl, thankfully, didn't accept 11 it. He required more.

12 And so I'm going to talk to you a little bit, and13 hopefully not lose my voice.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Before you do, I'll just reference to page 6 of the commission's ruling where it says: "Based on the totality of information, this Commission is thoroughly satisfied that no member of the five Defense Teams is currently, or likely to be, under investigation by the FBI or any other government agency."

**20** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Thank you for that.

So let me talk a little bit about how -- the part you didn't get when you had your ex parte meeting with the special review team. The paralegal who was examined worked for me for

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

three years. He was an integral part of the team. And as you
 know, as every lawyer here knows, paralegals don't operate in
 a vacuum. They don't make legal decisions and then act upon
 them. They -- they are assigned tasks and they do things at
 the direction of the attorneys and other staff, the team.

6 So it is clear from the facts that whatever is 7 alleged to have occurred occurred before November 20th --8 because we know from the supervisory agent's declaration that 9 a full investigation was begun on November 20th. On November 10 20th, that paralegal was a defense team member. If that 11 defense team member was performing -- the paralegal was 12 performing -- excuse me. I'm sorry. I don't feel well.

13 If that defense team member was performing an action 14 that is related to anything having to do with his duties as a 15 Bin'Attash defense team member, then we are all implicated. 16 And I don't know if -- Judge, if you considered that or not. 17 I have no idea, because I've not seen the basis of the 18 information. But I do know that I have not seen anything 19 factually that leads me to believe that this was anything but 20 focused on what that paralegal did prior to his finally 21 PCS'ing to his new orders.

And so I understand that the inquiry has to be doneby a judge. But I also understand that I have a separate

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ethical duty to determine whether or not I am burdened by a 2 conflict. And I'll direct your attention -- you asked ----3 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Ms. Bormann, in making that 4 separate -- and contrary to what Mr. Ruiz represented, which 5 was flat-out wrong, I do understand and appreciate that 6 counsel have that independent ethical duty. But is it not 7 fair to say then that, in making that assessment, you can rely 8 upon the finding of the judge in part?

9 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: I can rely upon a finding of the judge 10 if there's some basis for me to rely upon the finding of a 11 judge. Right now I have conclusions; and, frankly, given the 12 background information that I have, the thing I operate under 13 is a quotation from Holloway, and it's found at page 20 of our 14 initial finding. And it says, in addressing conflicts, trial 15 courts are clearly instructed to defer to the judgment of 16 defense counsel whether a conflict exists because counsel 17 himself is usually, quote, in the best position professionally 18 and ethically to determine when a conflict of interest exists 19 or will probably develop in the course of a trial, unquote. 20 And that's found at 435 U.S. 475, page 485, in the Holloway 21 case.

I don't want to be difficult here, but given the
state of the record and where we're at -- I mean, my team is

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

at a distinct disadvantage. Everybody on our team is
 terrified that an FBI agent is going to come knocking at their
 door. You know, I haven't had to hire counsel three times,
 but I have had to hire counsel, and it's not fun.

5 So all of that being said, we are operating under a 6 conflict. We are burdened by a conflict. When and if the 7 investigation ends, or if there is -- if the investigation 8 doesn't involve anything that's team related, there's no 9 reason why it can't be provided to us with an order to seal. 10 If it's team related in any way, then we're under a conflict. 11 So it should be one or the other. But I shouldn't have to 12 stand here and rely upon the prosecution and their recitation 13 of the facts when, in fact, everything that I've seen says 14 something very, very different.

So that's where we are. Of course, I, as a lawyer, respect all courts. But you'll have to bear with me, when there's no facts to back up a conclusion and it deals with my license, we have a problem. I'm here to say we have a problem.

20 Subject to your questions, I'm done.
21 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I have no questions. Thank you.
22 LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Thank you.
23 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. At this point in time, I'm

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** going to turn it over to the special review team.

2

SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: Thank you, Your Honor.

We have a discrete and specific question here, which
is, are defense counsel operating under a potential or actual
conflict of interest, as those terms are defined by law,
because their loyalties are divided. The claim here is that
they are because they are under investigation. And that claim
has been demonstrated to be incorrect, and not by anything
ex parte, but by declarations that were made on the record.

10 The court appropriately conducted an ex parte hearing 11 in order to learn the details of an ongoing national security 12 investigation, the integrity of which would have been 13 undermined by an open hearing. That investigation was opened 14 as a full investigation on November 20th. Contrary to 15 Mr. Nevin's assertion, there is no long history of 16 investigation that predates that 11/20 opening date.

17 The SRT has been involved in this investigation since 18 its inception, which is unlike prior investigations that this 19 court has reviewed, and we have been working diligently to 20 wall off the prosecution and to ensure that there is an 21 entirely -- that the prosecution team and its supervisors 22 remain entirely clean.

23

We will comply promptly with all of the commission's

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 orders to provide additional information to defense teams in 2 the form of the redacted AE 613 and AE 613A, and we will 3 continue to comply with AE 292QQ in order to provide requested 4 information ex parte to Your Honor in order to permit you to 5 comply with your duty to ascertain whether there is a 6 potential or an actual conflict so that counsel can continue 7 to rely on -- at least in part, on your findings as to the 8 existence of those potential or actual conflicts.

9 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Ms. Ballantine, let me ask you a
10 question. With respect to the point raised by Mr. Nevin,
11 what's the status of the redactions to AE 613 and 613A; and
12 notwithstanding the date specified in the commission's order,
13 could they be provided earlier?

SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: I've completed the redactions for
AE 613A and I'm awaiting FBI review to make sure their
equities are protected. It will not take me long to redact
AE 613 and I believe we will be able to comply with the
court's order well before the 8 February date specified in
your order.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. I'm sorry, one other
 question. What about the status of the declaration that was
 directed by the commission? Do you have an update on that?
 SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: I do, Your Honor. I spoke with the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

investigating body, which is Army 902nd, on Friday. They
 agreed to provide me with a declaration today. I don't know
 whether we will need additional edits to that declaration. I
 understand what the court wants that declaration to contain,
 so we need to make sure that it is a fulsome declaration
 that's responsive to the commission's order.

7 Once we have completed that process, I will provide
8 an unredacted copy to the court ex parte and we will provide a
9 redacted copy to the defense teams as well. I imagine we'll
10 be able to complete that by the end of this week, which would
11 be 1 February of 2019.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. You may please proceed.Do you have anything else, Ms. Ballantine?

14 SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: I do not, unless the court has15 specific questions for the SRT.

**16** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I do not.

17 Mr. Nevin?

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yes, Your Honor. I heard you ask -- I can't remember if you asked me or not, but I heard you ask some of the other counsel what makes you think you're under investigation. And that's in part why I laid out the -- the context, the history of my team, and me in particular,

23 being -- having been under investigation many times and this

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

raising a high degree of concern or scrutiny on our part to be
 sure that we understand what's going on before we go forward.

But I also pointed out to you that there were several very specific things that were inconsistencies that were not addressed by your order. So I spoke of the fact that this team member -- Bin'Attash team member was told that someone from another government agency, which in our speak is the CIA, was involved in administering a polygraph. So -- but no one, including your order, says anything about the CIA.

10 So was he lying about that? Was that just a -- was 11 he -- I mean, why was that said? Or is there independent 12 evidence that -- that you asked me about assume -- it assumes 13 that the team member's declaration is accurate, and it does. 14 But I don't -- I haven't been given any reason to suppose it's 15 not.

Do I just ignore that? Do I just walk away from that and later on when it turns out the CIA is involved in this and has been all along and someone says, well, why didn't you raise that? Why weren't you concerned about that? Why didn't you ask about that? Am I a walking violation of the Sixth Amendment? I think I might be if I don't ask you or the SRT or somebody to say, what's up with that?

23

And that's something that we raised in our moving

### UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 papers. Those were in your hands before you issued 615P and
2 E, and there's no -- you don't speak to it. And I asked you
3 about it today and you declined to tell me about what went on
4 or to answer my questions about who testified or what they
5 said.

6

What am I supposed to make of that?

7 MJ [Co] PARRELLA]: I think what's pertinent is that I've 8 made it clear that none of the teams are under investigation 9 by either the FBI or any other government agency, which would 10 be inclusive of the CIA. I mean, the fact -- the only 11 reference to the CIA is an assumption you're making based on 12 the declaration saying "other government agency." You know, 13 given the individual's history working with the commissions, I 14 would assume that they could have provided more specificity. 15 But regardless of whether it's that agency or any other 16 agency, I think the pertinent point is that no member of any 17 defense team is under investigation by any government agency. 18 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: And let me ask again: How do you know 19 that?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: So certainly, Mr. Nevin, that -there's -- the commission has received information in an
ex parte fashion. I mean, it seems to me what you're
wanting -- and I can certainly appreciate your wanting to know

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

it -- is what did I receive that led me to that conclusion?
 And so I am not going to go down there. I'm not trying to
 avoid your questions, but I don't want to inadvertently
 divulge information that was presented ex parte because it's
 part of an ongoing investigation or perhaps is classified.

6 So instead, what I'm going to do is to order the 7 government to produce that information, to the extent they 8 can, directly to you so that you have it directly from the 9 source, not from the commission. But my role in it was to 10 make my independent, thorough inquiry, which I've done, and 11 can emphatically state that, based on what information I was 12 presented, there is no current conflict.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay. Well, I -- I mean, I've -- you
know, you see the position I'm in. I've articulated to you
that there are unanswered questions, and I think it's fair
that they're unanswered. I mean, you're saying the answer is
no, but you're not giving me anything on which to say what's
the basis for that. And I ----

**19** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Yeah.

LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I use this example of the CIA, the guy in the CIA who is asking questions or who appears to be. And it -- sure, it might be that that person has been interviewed and he says, I never said that; or it might be that he says, I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

said that but it's -- but that wasn't true. I did it to try
 to intimidate him and get him to talk, or whatever it is.
 There -- yeah, I recognize there could be an explanation other
 than the CIA or some other government agency.

5 It doesn't make any difference whether it's the CIA 6 or not. If it's some other agency that's involved, then what 7 effort has been made. And SRT has gone to some lengths, and 8 it strikes me as incomplete, but nonetheless, they've queried 9 database -- a database and they've made some statements about 10 that, which I think they see, and you presumably see as well, 11 the question logically asks someone to say, how do we know 12 there's not an investigation? Okay, so you were offered some 13 material from the -- from the FBI about querying a database. 14 What do you have from the CIA? What's the explanation for 15 this other -- other issue?

And believe me, we've been in this long enough to know that when there is -- when you have, you know, a list of ten things but five is missing, that's not an accident. There's a reason that you're not being told that. There's a reason that that little -- that that little part of the thing is not being -- is not being spoken about. And, you know, we've learned that over the years.

23

So you asked me how do I know that I'm being

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 investigated? And I know it in part by what you're not
2 telling me or by -- or by what the SRT is not telling me. And
3 those things are real for us, is all I can tell you.

4 And there are other aspects of this, Your Honor, that 5 I mentioned during the first part of my argument. There's not 6 been an explanation that I've heard at this point for why 7 these people are asking the team member questions about the 8 other defense teams. And if that's not investigation of the 9 other defense teams, what is it? Is it just idle chatter or 10 is it a rogue agent or is it -- what does it mean that there's 11 an investigation or that there's no investigation?

12 Somebody was obviously investigating the other teams, 13 someone who claimed that they were an FBI agent. Was that a 14 lie, too? An FBI agent is asking this person questions about 15 my team. I mean, not -- I understand this is different -- I'm 16 in a different position from Ms. Bormann, but they're asking 17 questions about my team. And they're official law enforcement people. They're investigators. They're not investigating me? 18 19 Okay. So great. They're not investigating me. So what? The 20 team member is lying?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. So I asked this question of
Mr. Harrington. The declaration references questions about
other teams. What leads you to presume it was your team?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Because I'm another team.

**2** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Well, it doesn't mean ----

**3** LDC [MR. NEVIN]: What leads you to conclude it's not?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: There's four other teams -- three
other teams besides the Bin'Attash team. Why couldn't it have
been questions about those other teams?

7 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: It could have. Tell me.

8 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: So it is an assumption. My point is
9 it's an assumption. You're stating with a lot of certainty
10 that your team was -- questions were asked about your team.
11 That's not a true -- that's not a true statement to say that
12 you know that.

13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: I know that I am one of the other 14 defense teams and I know that a question -- well, I mean, I 15 have a declaration that -- under oath that says that questions 16 were asked about other defense teams. I am one of the other 17 defense teams or -- or the Mohammad team is one of the other 18 defense teams.

Now, I take it you're telling me that those questions
about the other defense teams were not about my team. So ---MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I think what the commission's ruling,
and what I attempted to make clear, is that no defense team is
under investigation. No current defense -- member of any

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 current defense -- "No current member of any Defense Team...is 2 under investigation." But I think I went one step further to 3 basically -- and I'll just read the language. And what I'm 4 reading is from page 6, paragraph c, "To the extent the 5 ongoing investigation relates to any Defense Team, it pertains 6 only to the Bin'Attash team. This is not to suggest that any 7 member of the Bin'Attash...Team is under investigation, but 8 rather to emphasize that no other Defense Team is even 9 remotely connected to the subject matter of the 10 investigation."

11 So I guess what I'm failing to see, Mr. Nevin, is I 12 don't know how, using the English language, I can be any more 13 clear about that factual assertion to say, you know, I can --14 aside from Ms. Bormann's team, none of the other teams are 15 even remotely connected to this investigation. So it's --16 that's where I guess I'm having a hard time, where you come up 17 and you say you're emphatically sure that you're under 18 investigation when you can't possibly be.

Because, again, as -- no fault of your own, I
understand the disadvantage you're at because you're not
invited to those ex parte presentations, or don't have access
to the ex parte information, but you are operating from an
information deficit that the commission has access to. And

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

because of that I believe in part that's why the rule suggests
 that it's my duty to make that inquiry, which I've done, and
 pretty clearly stated no conflict.

4 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Yeah, and I appreciate your doing that.
5 That's fine. But you also recognize that I have to do this
6 too.

7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: And I hope -- I do understand that you
8 have to do that, and I certainly hope that the documents
9 that ----

10 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Me too.

11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: ---- are directed to be released will
12 alleviate some of your concerns.

13 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Me too.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I certainly do, because I'm very much
aware and sensitive to the context of this case and its very
unique nature and its long history and the investigations that
have taken place in the past.

18 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Okay. And, you know, you're right, I am 19 operating from a deficit of information. And you could read 20 all the pleadings we've filed so far to be boiled down to 21 saying please give us more information so that we can make 22 this decision and be confident about it. And you're quite 23 right about that.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 And maybe it is like an ontological problem with the 2 way the English language works. But I've told you that they 3 say there's -- they're asking questions about other defense 4 You've said that's not about you. And I'm just teams. 5 saying, will you please tell me why? Will you give me 6 something to indicate why you know that's not about me? Ιs 7 it -- they asked that question. The point of that 8 investigation has to do with the Binalshibh team and the AAA 9 team, it doesn't have to do with the Mohammad team. Okav. 10 That gives me something I can go on. great.

But you're just saying no, but you're not saying why. I've got a clear indication that they're investigating the other teams. I'm one of the other teams. And no one is telling me why that doesn't equal my team at least at that -fon that day was under investigation. And as I say, I don't know how I can say it any more directly than that either.

And so just -- I mean here's -- here's another
example. This is what happens when you're on the outside
looking in, right? Okay. So you write -- on page 5 of your
order, you write, "The SRT was directly involved within one
week of the FBI opening the investigation and took steps to
ensure those involved in the investigation," et cetera,
et cetera.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Ms. Ballantine just a couple of minutes ago says that 2 the SRT was involved from the beginning. So did she tell you 3 or they or someone, did someone tell you something different 4 that led you to write that? And I know you're not going to 5 answer that question, but -- or at least I assume you're not. 6 And -- and I know I can't make you, but, I mean, when you're 7 standing on the outside looking at this stuff trying to --8 when -- and when you're on your ninth investigation, when 9 you're going around this merry-go-round for the ninth time 10 within ten years, you'd like to know what's going on. You'd 11 like to have some specific -- when you've been around this 12 merry-go-round nine times, you look for stuff that -- where 13 all the I's dot and all the T's cross. And they're not 14 dotted, they're not crossed.

15 They leave you in the position where you say, wait a 16 minute. They're telling him something different from what 17 they're coming into open court here and saying. Is it an 18 innocent mistake? Probably. But the point is, you look at it 19 and you think, what's going on? And if it's the first time 20 that it's ever happened, okay, yeah, sure. But it's not the 21 first time. And we deserve more information than this.

And so -- and, I might say, I gather some fairly
important things are going to happen the rest of this week.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And I think Mr. Mohammad is entitled to be represented in
 them. And we're on the horns of this dilemma or this Hobson's
 choice, or whatever you want to call it, as we have in the
 pleadings. And our view is until this gets clarified and
 resolved, we can't go forward.

6 But I've also asked you -- we've also asked you in 7 our earlier pleadings to say, just wait. Just wait until 8 this -- wait until they give us these redacted pleadings, or 9 whatever it is they're going to give us, so maybe then this 10 whole thing will get wrapped up. Or answer the questions that 11 I've propounded to you today in good faith and give us some 12 way to get to yes and then we can all go forward. Or else 13 just wait.

And why do we -- why are we jamming forward on this until we're -- until we've been put in a -- in good-faith terms, in a position to do it right. That's the whole idea of that prospective thing as opposed to it being a postconviction action looking back. It's a chance to do it right.

So I guess that my request to have it before
nightfall is maybe not going to happen. But please don't put
us in this position until we have this other information which
may resolve these issues.

23 Tha

Thank you for hearing my argument.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, Mr. Nevin.

2

Mr. Harrington?

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, I didn't mention it before,
but I'm not quite sure what the word "robust" means when
you've directed them to come in, whether that's a term of art
that I don't know about. I don't know. I don't know what
that entails.

8 But I guess that the arguments that you've listened 9 to here, I think to an outsider might almost sound paranoid. 10 And the problem here is that there is a real basis for our 11 paranoia. I mean, just because you're paranoid doesn't mean 12 they're not following you. And when we got the discovery in 13 292, we got three really big binders of information. I don't 14 know what, if any of that, was submitted to Judge Pohl. We 15 were in a different place with Judge Pohl because he 16 immediately put a stop to it and appointed conflict counsel. 17 So as it went on, you know, we had no knowledge of what was going on, so it was a bit different than the context that you 18 19 have with it.

But just so you know, and you've probably heard this before, but we came to these proceedings and we were told that the security light that you have there could only be operated by the court security officer. And it went off one day when

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Nevin was talking and the court security officer didn't
 know about it. And it turns out a third party had access to
 that and shut it down.

4 We were told when we came here that the 5 microphones -- which at that time were on all the time; if you 6 wanted to talk to your colleague or your client, you push the 7 mute button. But they didn't tell us they were field 8 microphones so that when one goes off, the other expands its 9 listening so those could be heard. We didn't -- we had 10 representations to us of who could hear that, but we -- we 11 don't know if those representations were accurate because the 12 people who were telling us didn't have the accurate 13 information.

14 A smoke detector was found in our visiting room -- or 15 looked at. It wasn't a smoke detector, it was a listening 16 device. They let us look at the operation room at the 17 visiting area and they said, we don't have the capability of 18 recording, it is just for listening and it's for other 19 purposes. It's not being used with you. But they had 20 machines there that had rewind and clearly showed that there 21 was capability of rewinding. In the Nashiri case, they found 22 a listening device hidden in an electrical socket, apparently. 23 And just to expand on the paranoia, recently a cable

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 company had to come to my house and the guy is going around 2 and he's saying, I don't know what this is. You know, we have 3 ingress and egress points and some places have excess egress. 4 And he said the reason for that is that they have listening 5 devices that government agencies have that -- listening 6 devices they can use, and you're a hotspot for it. What does 7 that mean? Does that mean that they're listening to me or my 8 TV watching or something at my home? I don't know.

9 I turn my computer off in my office and I wait until
10 it's shut down. Nine out of ten times when I come in in the
11 morning, my computer is on. What does that mean? I've had
12 our IT people look at it and all that stuff. They can't
13 explain it. I don't know.

All I'm saying to you is: When you ask us to accept representations made to you by the government, I'm not faulting the lawyers that are sitting here. They're as good as the information given to them. We have reasons to distrust the law enforcement agencies that are involved in this case, and they're real; and it heightens the impact that this kind of an investigation has on all of us.

21 Thank you.

**22** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, Mr. Harrington.

23

Mr. Ruiz?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	LDC [MR. RUIZ]: A couple of points, Judge.
2	First, if I indicated during my argument that you did
3	not know or were unaware that we have an independent duty to
4	make a conflict assessment, that's not what I meant to say.
5	Certainly I believe that you are well aware of that and were
6	well aware of that even before we filed our objection to the
7	ex parte session.
8	Whether wordsmithship or articulated it poorly, what
9	I meant to say was that my impression on Mr. al Hawsawi's
10	team, and certainly listening to some of the discussions we've
11	had here this morning, is that you don't care about it that
12	much, and you don't value it certainly as much as we do. And
13	that comes because you feel like you have the independent
14	duty, as you do to make a final
15	MJ [Col PARRELLA]: If that were the case, though,
16	Mr. Ruiz, why would I order the SRT to release anything to you
17	at all? Why wouldn't I just make my determination and say
18	I've made my determination and we're moving on? I mean
19	LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I understand that.
20	MJ [Col PARRELLA]: that's the whole reason
21	LDC [MR. RUIZ]: But also why would you not wait until
22	we've had an opportunity to review those materials and make
23	our case as to why we do or do not think that we may have a

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** conflict?

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: The first thing we need to do is
establish -- we just can't talk over each other. These fine
gentleman in front of me are going to get very upset at me, so
let's try not to speak over each other.

6 I made my determination and, knowing your 7 requirements, directed the release as much as I can possibly 8 release. But ultimately it's a determination, given the 9 nature of the investigation, the information, that 10 predominantly I have to make because there's just -- it's --11 and perhaps we'll get to a point in time where -- and I see no 12 reason why we wouldn't follow Judge Pohl's precedent in 292 13 where we can, when everything is said and done, order that 14 discovery to be turned over to the defense as well. We're 15 just not there yet. So I'm giving as much as I can as quickly 16 as I can.

17 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I understand that. My only point was to 18 say I didn't mean to infer that you had no lack of knowledge 19 of that independent duty, but I certainly wanted it to be 20 clear that the impression is that you certainly think your 21 duty overrides our independent assessment. And that's based 22 on not only some of the discussions that we've heard this 23 morning but also on the manner in which you chose to approach

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the resolution of the issue.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I think it logically has to override
it because you simply don't have access to the information and
can't get access to it. So the commission is not a party.
The commission has got to make that inquiry and give you
assurances that there's no conflict.

7 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: And I think we can agree and -- to 8 disagree on that. Certainly the fact that we're going to get 9 a redacted transcript or redacted pleadings leads to the 10 reasonable inference that there were many things that were 11 discussed during that session that were not matters that 12 impact national security or an ongoing investigation. 13 Certainly if they're going to be released to us now, that 14 seems to be the judgment that is being made.

15 The special litigation team has indicated it wouldn't 16 take very long at all, which seems to indicate there isn't a 17 whole lot of information that would need to be redacted. 18 Which then leads to my reasonable inference that the session 19 was not narrowly tailored -- 505 leading to an 806 is in order 20 to narrowly tailor what then becomes a closed session, which 21 is why the rule exists, right? You want to narrowly tailor 22 what the public is excluded from. Here all I'm simply saying 23 is that it appears that there was no narrowly tailoring, and

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** we're ultimately going to see exactly what that is.

Having said that, I just wanted to clear that point
up. And in answer to your comment about how you don't know if
you can be any more clear in the English language, I
understand your statement in that regard. But I want to offer
perhaps maybe an explanation or additional context as to why
experience has taught me and has taught, I think, my
colleagues as well that words are particularly important.

9 Very early on in my career, and I think all of us
10 have now learned this lesson, we learned that the government
11 very carefully chooses the words that it uses when they're
12 answering questions, when they're submitting pleadings, when
13 they're doing those kinds of things.

14 So if I ask somebody, was this person interrogated, 15 an agent may simply respond and say no, they were not 16 interrogating. I have to ask, well, were they questioned? 17 Because the agent may be simply thinking, well, I didn't 18 interrogate the person, I interviewed them; or I didn't 19 interview them, I debriefed them.

So the lesson that we've learned over time is that we have to be very precise in the language that we use to follow up and to understand and to account for perhaps that kind of -- that kind of dialogue, that kind of back and forth.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 In this instance when I hear there is no 2 investigation, there is no current investigation, what I'm not 3 sure is how the word "investigation" is being defined, right? 4 And I think you certainly had some experience as a Department 5 of Justice prosecutor, so I'm going to assume that you have a little bit of this context in terms of how the Department of 6 7 Justice or federal agencies define what an investigation is. 8 And there is a continuum when an inquiry ultimately 9 becomes an investigation. And if I'm wrong about that, then 10 please correct me. But certainly it is true that I heard 11 the -- one of the prosecutors indicate that the investigation 12 was open full on 20 November, right? So the question that I 13 have in my mind is: Everything that happened before that, is 14 that considered an investigation? Or in the verbiage of the 15 Department of Justice, federal prosecuting authorities, does 16 an investigation become an investigation when they decide to 17 call it an investigation on 20 November, a full, open 18 investigation? Before that, is it considered background? Ιs 19 it considered an inquiry? Is it considered a person of 20 interest? That type of specificity is important for me, it's 21 important to make that kind of assessment.

So when I hear there is no investigation, I'm
thinking, well, how are you defining "investigation"? Do you

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** understand?

2 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: What do you see to be the pertinent3 time period?

4 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I -- you know, guite frankly, I don't 5 know, because I don't have full insight as to what they call 6 an investigation or what you define as an investigation. So 7 if there is a period in time before that when there is -- for 8 instance, the questions they asked about the other defense 9 teams, right, their definition, that may not be an 10 investigation. That may be simply certain questions or 11 inquiries.

12 My view and Mr. Nevin's view, we look at that as 13 questions about the inner workings of our team, the manner in 14 which we do our job, we're being -- they're asking questions 15 about what we do. Law enforcement agency's investigation that 16 may lead to whatever they call it, a full-open or a -- a 17 full-blown investigation. Why not? That's the kind of 18 information and that's why a lot of times we spend a lot of 19 times dancing on the head of these pin needles, is because we 20 have learned the lesson over time that we have to be very 21 precise in our language and that we need to have very precise 22 context to understand and to be fully aware of exactly what is 23 meant in that document.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 And that's also why we fight for access. It's why we 2 try to get access to additional information, so that we can 3 make our independent assessment and look at it in the context 4 of your assessment and say, well, Judge, you know, what? Ιn 5 the 292 series, if you -- if you had an opportunity to look at 6 that, Mr. al Hawsawi's team looked at that issue after we 7 received some discovery and said we don't have a conflict. 8 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. So, Mr. Ruiz, is it your 9 concern that the investigators who provided information to the 10 commission are -- are essentially manipulating the English 11 language to use -- and maybe they're saying "investigation" 12 but they're doing an inquiry? Or are you concerned that the

13 commission is doing that in its ruling?

14 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: I'm not saying there's malicious intent 15 in that. I do believe that there's very specific verbiage 16 that is used. So when I ask -- you know, to use the example, 17 when I ask an FBI agent, did you interrogate the person? And 18 they say, no, I interviewed them. You know, are they 19 manipulating the language? I'm not necessarily sure that 20 that's a manipulation, because that infers that there's some 21 malicious intent somewhat. But they're certainly using 22 different dialogue and different language to address the same 23 issue that I'm looking at. I look at that as an

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** interrogation.

2

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand your argument.

LDC [MR. RUIZ]: So what I would like is to have some type
of assurance and understanding that when you say there is no
investigation, that means that any -- any degree, any inquiry,
any questioning, anything along those lines.

7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. Ms. Bormann or8 Mr. Montross?

9 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: We have prayer time coming up at 12:14,10 I believe.

11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. Ms. Bormann, how long do you12 anticipate needing?

**13** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Not very long, Judge.

**14** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay.

**15** LDC [MS. BORMANN]: Because I don't think I could do it.

16 All right. A couple of points. One, when we filed 17 AE 615 in early January, we were required to seek a request 18 for position from the special review team. And -- excuse me. 19 And so I reached out to General Martins and I solicited the 20 names of the folks in the special review team. And I received 21 an e-mail back from Mr. Trivett that said, without conceding 22 that there is an ongoing investigation, you can contact 23 Ms. Ballantine.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And then we wrote, you know, we intend to file a
 <u>Holloway</u> inquiry into a potential conflict based upon an FBI
 investigation. The response I got back from the special trial
 counsel was "Because we are unaware of any FBI investigation,
 we must oppose the relief requested."

6 Now, when I got that, I thought, well, that's odd. 7 And then it got even odder. Because we filed 615 on -- I 8 think it was the 9th -- I might get the days wrong here, 9 please forgive the cold medicine -- of January. The day after 10 we filed -- we had no idea that 613, filed by Mr. Trivett, was 11 in any way related to an ongoing investigation. But the day 12 after we filed AE 615, there was a subsequent filing in 613 by 13 the SRT. And so, you know, again, using circumstantial 14 evidence, I -- I thought to myself, hmm, this must be involved 15 with the investigation.

16 So what it looks like, and again, I haven't seen the 17 filings, is that trial counsel was involved in the first 18 notification to the commission and that the special review 19 team, unless they were not being honest, didn't know about it 20 until we filed AE 615. And then they must have coordinated 21 with trial counsel to learn there had been a previous filing 22 under 613 and then they put together something and filed on 23 613. That is the only thing that makes sense, assuming

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** everybody is operating in good faith.

2 Now I want to talk -- you asked Mr. Ruiz about 3 whether or not your -- whose bad faith is involved here. And 4 I just want to say to you, it's less about bad faith than it 5 is about just not knowing, or sometimes the misuse of the 6 English language. Judge Pohl on numerous occasions in AE 292 7 found the following things: In AE 292QQ (Amended Order) at 8 page 27, Judge Pohl said he views with a jaundiced eye the 9 legal representations of the special review team.

In that same filing, AE 292QQ (Amended Order), he
said that the parsing of the SRT's assertions, quote, does not
provide the commission with the confidence necessary to make a
definitive finding as to whether a conflict of interest
exists. That's at page 28.

And then ultimately in his final ruling on 292, which is AE 292JJJJJ at page 6, Judge Pohl finds that the commission was well-served to reject the SRT's initial protestations because it is evident that the concerns -- and I'm quoting now -- the concerns of the commission at that time were not unwarranted.

At the time Judge Pohl was making these
determinations in AE 292, he had been on this case for more
than two years. He had -- understood the nonstop

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 investigations, the smoke detector that was -- I'm sorry, the 2 microphone that was disguised to look like a smoke detector, 3 and the ungated feeds to an OCA, et cetera, et cetera. 4 So the reason I bring it up is not about 5 assassination, it's about what we feel subjectively. You asked why it is that I can't just say, well, Judge, you ruled 6 7 that way and that's okay. I have an independent duty. And 8 given everything that I know, I can't, not without more 9 factual basis.

I want to know we're not under investigation. I
terribly want some factual basis from which I could determine
we're not under investigation, but it doesn't exist yet. So
I'm asking you to provide us that before we go any further.

**14** I have nothing further unless you do.

**15** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, Ms. Bormann.

16 Ms. Ballantine, anything further from the SRT?17 SRT [MS. BALLANTINE]: No, Your Honor.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. At this point the commission is
going to recess until 1530. I'd ask that the SRT please come
back at that time, at 1530. All right. Commission is in
recess.

22 [Pause.]

23

It was just pointed out to me that 1530 is -- is

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

counsel all here? -- the second prayer time. So if I
 remember correct, maybe 1545 would suffice. Okay. So we're
 going to go with -- okay. Is that an affirmative? Okay. So
 1545. Thank you.

5 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1224, 28 January 2019.]
6 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1552,

7 28 January 2019.]

8 [No audio.]

9 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: ---- the five defense teams is 10 currently or likely to be under investigation by the FBI or 11 any other government agency. This commission also indicated 12 it was satisfied that no member of the five defense teams is 13 under any other type of investigation, to include nonroutine 14 security clearance investigations. As such, the commission 15 found that no member of the five defense teams is currently 16 operating under a conflict of interest that would prohibit 17 them from ethically representing their clients.

18 Counsel have suggested that this court's ruling in
19 AE 613E and 615P make today's oral argument futile, as the
20 commission's mind was made up. This statement represents a
21 misunderstanding regarding the purpose of today's hearing.

22 The relief requested in AE 615 was for this23 commission to conduct a thorough inquiry. That portion of

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

AE 615 was granted, thus negating the need for oral argument
 as to whether an inquiry should be conducted. As is set forth
 in the record, the commission conducted its inquiry and
 concluded no conflict exists.

5 As is indicated in footnote 30 to the commission's ruling in AE 613E and 613P, [sic] the commission allowed 6 7 counsel to be heard today and remained open to supplementing 8 its ruling as appropriate. In other words, the commission 9 does not and did not have an inflexible attitude towards 10 reconsidering any portion of its earlier ruling, but did not 11 wait until today to grant much of the relief sought in AE 613 12 and 615.

13 The purpose of today's hearing was also to allow 14 counsel to communicate their concerns so that the commission 15 could do whatever is realistically within its authority to 16 alleviate any remaining conflict concerns. Now, the defense 17 cite the existence of unanswered questions as a reason for why 18 they remain conflicted. Additionally, counsel repeatedly 19 today on the record referred to feelings, fears, assumptions, 20 or suspicions. While the commission fully appreciates that 21 the defense teams, out of no fault of their own, do not have 22 access to the same facts as either the special review team or 23 the commission, these feelings, fears, assumptions, or

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

suspicions do not constitute a legal standard relevant to
 conflicts of interest.

3 As I stated earlier, this commission is certainly 4 aware of the unique nature of this case, to include a history 5 of past intrusions into defense teams, most prominently 6 reflected in the AE 292 series. Because of this, the 7 commission saw fit to conduct a thorough inquiry, 8 notwithstanding the special review team's initial public 9 filing which argued that no additional inquiry by this 10 commission was necessary.

11 This commission performed an inquiry based upon 12 facts, as directed by R.M.C. 901(d), and for which it 13 exclusively -- is exclusively situated to do given the 14 ex parte nature of the pertinent information. To be clear, 15 however, the defense is privy to evidence sufficient to 16 support the commission's ruling and to satisfy their own 17 ethical obligations of ensuring they are conflict free.

First, the special review team submitted as an enclosure to AE 615D a three-page declaration by FBI Supervisory Special Agent John Stofer stating that no current known member of any defense team is currently the subject of any open national security or criminal FBI investigation. The declaration details the methodology that the declarant used in

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** arriving at this conclusion.

Second, the SRT also submitted in AE 615N a
three-page declaration by Daniel Purtill, Director of
Security, Washington Headquarters Services, confirming that
the only DoD security clearance actions for known members of
the five defense teams pertained to routine periodic
reinvestigations.

8 Third, and most importantly, this commission, not 9 satisfied with the SRT's initial filings, directed a robust 10 presentation of the facts and circumstances surrounding the 11 FBI investigation and what additional investigative steps, if 12 any, were contemplated. The SRT complied, and on 24 13 January 2019, this ex parte presentation took place.

Finally, as indicated in my ruling and on the record, I have directed the government to release redacted copies of the initial notices in AE 613 and 613A. In light of today's information, I'm also modifying my earlier written ruling to reflect that the SRT shall provide those to the defense as soon as they become available.

I further directed the production of a declaration
 from the Army Intelligence Agency involved in the
 investigation. The commission did not order the production of
 these documents in furtherance of additional inquiry by the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

commission, but rather to assist in alleviating defense
 concerns, given the unique nature of this case. The
 commission remains convinced, and hereby affirms its earlier
 ruling in AE 613E and 615P, that no member of the five defense
 teams is currently operating under a conflict of interest that
 would prohibit them from ethically representing their clients.

Moreover, the commission remains committed to a need
for continued vigilance and has reiterated with the SRT the
need to be hypervigilant to any indication that the
investigation's focus has changed to encompass a current
member of a defense team and to alert the commission through
the procedures established under AE 292QQ if this occurs.

13 The commission disagrees with counsel's assertion 14 that, if a defense paralegal in question was on a defense team 15 at the time the investigation began, then all members of the 16 team are likewise implicated, as this commission ruled in 17 AE 292QQ. When defense counsel is unaware of an 18 investigation, it cannot be the catalyst for any subsequent 19 action or inaction, and consequently cannot be the basis of a 20 conflict of interest between defense counsel and their client. 21 As such, the analysis here begins at the point the defense 22 teams became aware of an investigation, which was after the 23 paralegal in question had left the defense team.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Having reaffirmed its earlier ruling, the commission 2 now considers the matter of a present conflict of interest 3 closed. Earlier today counsel for Mr. Mohammad and counsel 4 for Mr. Bin'Attash represented that, until they can conduct an 5 inquiry to their own satisfaction, they cannot ethically 6 participate in the proceedings. This position is not 7 supported by any articulable law and represents a conscious 8 choice by counsel to disregard the findings of the commission.

9 As such, the commission finds that if counsel choose 10 to not participate, notwithstanding clear findings by the 11 commission issued after a careful factual inquiry, then this 12 would constitute waiver of their right to participate in this 13 week's proceedings. While I sincerely hope that we do not 14 reach this point, the commission will not be unnecessarily 15 forced to delay these proceedings based on the counsel's 16 assumption that a conflict exists when said assumptions are 17 admittedly based on a very limited view of the facts.

18 Does any party have any questions with respect to the 19 commission's ruling?

Okay. That being the case, then what I would propose
we do is we go ahead and take a brief recess to allow the
special review team to disconnect and for the prosecution team
to reenter the courtroom.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And just for everybody's edification, the only thing
 I intend to take up in the remainder of the afternoon is the
 issue from this morning involving Mr. Binalshibh's statement
 to the commission. So once that is concluded, we will recess
 for the evening and resume in the morning with our
 M.C.R.E. 505(h) hearing.

7 That said, commission is in recess.

8 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1602, 28 January 2019.]

9 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1624,

10 28 January 2019.]

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: The commission is called back to
order. All parties present when the commission last recessed
are again present with the following exceptions: The special
review team has disconnected from VTC and the prosecution team
has rejoined us in the courtroom.

16 Okay. Mr. Harrington, have you had an opportunity to17 discuss the commission's concerns with your client?

18 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: I have, Judge. Mr. Binalshibh 19 fully understands his rights. He has waived his presence --20 or waived -- acknowledged the rights many, many times. There 21 have been occasions where he has been equivocal in his verbal 22 waiver where the court has found that, based upon his previous 23 waivers and adherence to the order of the court that he did,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

in fact, waive his rights. He is not going to retract his
 position with respect to this court. And the court obviously
 will have to make its decision then on whether that
 constitutes a sufficient waiver. I think based upon his
 history that it does.

If the court -- either way, I would just point out to
the court with respect to your concern about a safety issue, I
don't know where that came from. Even though Mr. Binalshibh
expressed an opinion to you this morning, that's the same
opinion that's been filed in legal proceedings in the D.C.
Circuit. And he came to court without any problem this
morning and he has done that throughout these proceedings.

13 And when he and the other accused come to court, 14 they're advised by the guards -- guard force of what their 15 obligations are in the courtroom every time that they come, 16 and he has abided by those throughout these proceedings. So I 17 don't know where any concern about safety of anybody comes 18 into play at this point in time. And it almost seems to me 19 like it's a threat or a retaliation and that it's unwarranted 20 in these circumstances.

And it has far-reaching effects if this court does
something like this, since Judge Pohl came up with his
procedure that the accused are not shackled in the courtroom.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 They're obviously confined to the seat where they are, other 2 than going in and out of the room, and we have restrictions on 3 our access to them and where we can be, and all of us have 4 followed that. And Judge Pohl indicated to the accused when 5 he made this policy that they would have to earn the loss of 6 that unfettered access to their places at the table. And I 7 would hope that this court would continue that, absent some 8 reason in the courtroom that something happened, or even 9 outside the courtroom, that the court found that there was 10 some reason to do something -- something further.

11 But we obviously oppose the court taking any 12 sanctions against Mr. Binalshibh, especially for expressing to 13 the court nothing more than a legal opinion in his mind and --14 which he did with -- respectfully, and told the court how he 15 felt. So I think it's in your decision now -- your discretion 16 now whether you feel that he was a voluntary waiver or not. 17 And if you decide against it, he will be here when he's 18 supposed to be here.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: So there's two issues you've raised, one being the sufficiency of the waiver. And as I found at our last session of court, for the reasons you just articulated, the commission is satisfied that Mr. Binalshibh understands -- notwithstanding his unresponsive answer, that

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 he understands his rights and, as such, I will continue to
2 find that, if he chooses not to be here, he sufficiently
3 understands those rights.

Additionally, it's not this commission's intent to either force a confrontation or to alter my predecessor's practice of essentially the default is, is you are in the chair and without any kind of restraint or anything of that nature. But what you just said is, absent something in the courtroom, and I guess where we disagree is I think that's what's transpired.

When the accused states in open court that he doesn't recognize the authority -- my authority to preside over this proceeding, it could be interpreted one of two ways, and that's what I'm hoping to flush out. And maybe I can do that through a colloquy with your client.

16 It could be that he disagrees with some of the 17 rulings of the court; he's simply articulating the position of 18 counsel that counsel have taken with respect to recusing the 19 military judge or the qualifications of the military judge. 20 And in that regard, I certainly have no issue with 21 Mr. Binalshibh having those positions or -- what I have a 22 concern about, though, is that I have an obligation to 23 maintain not only the dignity and decorum, but also the safety

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** of those in this courtroom.

So what I'm looking for is simply Mr. Binalshibh's recognition that it's my duty as a military judge to enforce those things and that if an issue were to arise that requires me to address him and to maybe tell him to have a seat or to stand against the wall, or whatever it may be, that he recognizes my authority as a military judge and he's going to follow those instructions.

9 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, I don't understand where
10 that concern comes from because he has adhered to all of these
11 rules the whole time, and there's nothing that's been
12 indicated that he's not going to adhere to them ----

**13** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay.

**14** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: ---- in the future.

15 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: So then that should be simple enough. 16 I mean, the indication is when he states now twice in open 17 court that he doesn't recognize me as the military judge, 18 that's the indication. And I agree with you, there hasn't 19 been any behavior to suggest that, but I'm concerned enough 20 that I at least want to make that -- get that assurance 21 verbally from him. It shouldn't be a complex thing to do. Ιt 22 shouldn't be hard for him to say that if -- yes, if you tell 23 me to stand, I'm going to stand; if you tell me I need to sit

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 down, I'm going to sit down. And if he's not able to give me
2 those assurances, then I do have concern, in light of what
3 he's now stated twice in open court.

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Well, Judge, he certainly
recognizes that you have control over this courtroom and
control over the guard force that's in this thing and that you
will enforce the rules that he has adhered to all along, and
he knows what those rules are. But you just gave an example
of if you tell him to stand, he has to stand; well, they don't
stand when you come in. And they're -- you know ----

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: And I'm okay with that. That's an example meant to illustrate that there may be a situation that arises that I need to ensure that, whether he agrees with my rulings or not, he recognizes my authority as the presiding officer of this commission.

16 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Well, he recognizes that, Judge,
17 because he knows that everybody in this courtroom on the guard
18 force will do what you tell them to do in this courtroom.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I will accept that you're telling methat that -- he understands that.

21 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: He does, Judge. Sure. Absolutely.22 Absolutely.

**23** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. And we will go with that

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

**1** and ----

LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: He's been warned, Judge, about if
there is anything in the court, what could happen to him, that
he could be forced out of the courtroom. He knows all those
things.

6 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand. Between now and the 7 next session of court, I would suggest that if he states the 8 same thing again, this issue may come up again. There's a 9 different way perhaps he can communicate his point without 10 stating the way he's doing and in an open court, because it 11 sounds very much to the commission as a challenge to the 12 commission's authority to do anything.

13 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: It is not, Judge. It's a challenge14 with respect to legal issues and nothing more.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: All right. Well, thank you,
Mr. Harrington, and I think that concludes the matter for
right now.

18 Anybody else? Trial Counsel, anything from the19 government?

20 CP [BG MARTINS]: No, Your Honor.

ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] Please.
[Speaking in Arabic.] It is clear that the judge wants to
escalate the issue.

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. Mr. Binalshibh, as I just told
your counsel -- or Mr. Bin'Attash, I'm sorry ----

**3** ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: Bin'Attash.

4 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Bin'Attash, this isn't a matter
5 that really pertains to you, so ----

ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] No, but you
7 threaten us. And it's very clear you want to escalate this
8 problem. I don't know why ----

**9** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Bin'Attash ----

10 ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] ---- to us.

11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: ---- this matter doesn't pertain to 12 you and you're to not say anything more on this issue. Do you 13 understand?

ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] No, but it's
really clear you take it personally. I don't know why.

16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Not taking it personally, but this17 does not concern you at this time.

**18** ACC [MR. BIN'ATTASH]: [Speaking in English] Okay.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: All right. As we discussed earlier, tomorrow we will start with our 505(h) hearing. At the conclusion of that, I anticipate taking a recess and then we will, assuming that the information at the 505 hearing necessitates it, do an appropriate closure order, come back so

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 that we can argue the classified portion of any argument2 pertaining to 616.

We will then take a recess to allow the courtroom to transition, come back, argue the unclassified portion of any argument pertaining to 616. I know that's sort of reverse of how we normally do it, but I think for ease of transition of the courtroom, it's the appropriate way to do it. And then since the courtroom at that point will be in open session, we can then take up the issue of AE 614.

10

General Martins?

11 CP [BG MARTINS]: Your Honor, we just want to be able to 12 give the right guidance to the guard force for those accused 13 who do not waive presence. The timing of that sounds a bit 14 fluid. Looking to you for guidance.

MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Yeah. It's a bit fluid. I would say
we can -- I think the earliest we will require the accused
would be at 1300, after the midday break.

18 Any other questions? All right. There being none,19 this commission is in recess.

20 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1635, 28 January 2019.]
21

- 22
- 23

# UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT