- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1328,
- 2 1 April 2019.]
- 3 MJ [COL WATKINS]: The commission is called to order. The
- 4 accused is present.
- 5 Lieutenant Colonel Primoli, good afternoon.
- **6** TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Could you please account for the
- 8 prosecution team? Additionally, please state legal
- 9 qualifications and status regarding oath and detail for each
- 10 member.
- 11 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Sir, this commission is convened by
- 12 Convening Order 12-01, dated 15 February 2012. Copies of this
- 13 have been previously furnished to the military judge, counsel,
- 14 and the accused, and it will be attached to the record of
- **15** trial.
- 16 The accused and the following personnel detailed in
- 17 this commission are present: Colonel Douglas K. Watkins,
- 18 Military Judge; Lieutenant Colonel Joy Primoli, Trial Counsel;
- 19 Commander David O'Dowd, Assistant Trial Counsel; Major Richard
- 20 Mitchell and Lieutenant Brian Hayes may be present but are not
- 21 detailed to the prosecution.
- 22 For the defense, we have Mr. J. Wells Dixon and
- 23 Ms. Katya Jestin, Civilian Defense Counsel; Lieutenant

- 1 Commander Jared A. Hernandez, JAG Corps, United States Navy,
- 2 Detailed Military Defense Counsel; and Mr. Ian C. Moss,
- 3 Detailed Civilian Counsel. Mr. Moss has not been previously
- 4 sworn, Your Honor. In addition, Mr. Theodore Lange, defense
- 5 case analyst; Mr. Sean Ainsworth, defense investigator;
- 6 Ms. Riley Stevenson, Defense Information Security Officer, are
- 7 present.
- **8** Finally, Commander Darren Wall, JAG Corps, United
- 9 States Navy, the deputy defense counsel for military
- 10 commissions, is also present but not detailed. The members
- 11 are absent. The accused is present.
- 12 In addition, Captain Tim Keeton and Major Chris James
- 13 are no longer detailed for the prosecution in this case.
- 14 Ms. Natalie Orpett, Civilian Defense Counsel, is absent for
- 15 the defense.
- 16 All trial counsel have been detailed to this military
- 17 commission by the chief prosecutor. All members of the
- 18 prosecution are qualified under R.M.C. 502 and have previously
- 19 been sworn in accordance with R.M.C. 807. No member of the
- 20 prosecution has acted in any manner that might tend to
- 21 disqualify us in this proceeding. The detailing document has
- 22 been marked as Appellate Exhibit 003D.
- These proceedings are being transmitted by

- 1 closed-circuit television to CONUS in accordance with the
- 2 Commission's order in Appellate Exhibit AE 006A.
- 3 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- 4 And to clarify, you said Major Mitchell is not yet
- 5 detailed?
- **6** TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: He's not yet detailed, Your Honor.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Has Commander O'Dowd been sworn before
- 8 the commission?
- 9 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Not before the commission, but he
- 10 was sworn by General Martins ----
- 11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: All right.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: ---- the chief prosecutor.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- 14 Commander O'Dowd, could you please stand and raise
- 15 your right hand.
- 16 ATC [CDR 0'DOWD]: Yes, sir.
- 17 [Counsel was sworn.]
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- 19 And Colonel Primoli, do all members of the
- 20 prosecution team present in court have all appropriate
- 21 security clearances?
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: We do, sir.
- 23 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Good afternoon, Mr. Dixon.

- 1 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Trial counsel has accounted for the
- 3 defense team that's present. I can have Mr. Moss do this, if
- 4 you like, but I would like to have him state his legal
- 5 qualifications and status regarding oath.
- **6** DDC [LCDR HERNANDEZ]: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
- 7 Lieutenant Commander Jared Hernandez, JAG Corps, United States
- 8 Navy, for the defense. Your Honor, if we may, may we state
- 9 all qualifications for defense counsel on the record, sir?
- **10** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Certainly.
- 11 DDC [LCDR HERNANDEZ]: Sir, I have been detailed to this
- 12 military commission by Brigadier General John Baker, United
- 13 States Marine Corps, Chief Defense Counsel for the military
- 14 commissions.
- 15 I am qualified and certified under Rule for Military
- 16 Commission 502, have previously been sworn in accordance with
- 17 R.M.C. 807, and have previously appeared at prior sessions on
- 18 behalf of Mr. Khan.
- I have not acted in any manner which might tend to
- 20 disqualify me from this military commission.
- 21 Also present are Mr. Khan's pro bono civilian defense
- 22 counsel, Mr. J. Wells Dixon and Ms. Katya Jestin. They are
- 23 qualified, have been previously sworn, and have represented

- 1 Mr. Khan throughout these commission proceedings. Their
- 2 detailing letters are AE 008 and AE 009, Your Honor. They
- 3 have not acted in any manner which might tend to disqualify
- 4 them from this military commission.
- 5 In addition, Mr. Ian C. Moss is present. Mr. Moss
- 6 has been detailed to this commission by the chief defense
- 7 counsel. His detailing letter is AE 007E and is qualified and
- 8 certified under R.M.C. 502 but has not yet been sworn pursuant
- 9 to R.M.C. 807. Mr. Moss has not acted in any manner that
- 10 might tend to disqualify him from this military commission.
- 11 And, as appropriate, all members of the defense possess the
- 12 highest security clearances and are proud to represent
- 13 Mr. Majid Khan, Guantanamo's sole high-value cooperator.
- 14 Thank you, Your Honor.
- 15 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- 16 Mr. Moss, could you please stand. Raise right hand.
- 17 [Counsel was sworn.]
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you, Mr. Moss.
- **19** Good afternoon, Mr. Khan.
- 20 ACC [MR. KHAN]: Good afternoon, sir.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Mr. Khan, do you want Mr. Ian Moss as
- 22 part of your defense team?
- ACC [MR. KHAN]: Yes, sir, I do.

- 1 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Mr. Khan, Ms. Orpett filed a
- 2 request to be excused from this week's sessions, and I've been
- 3 provided what appears to be a waiver from you consenting to
- 4 her absence. Do you consent to proceeding this week without
- **5** Ms. Orpett being present?
- **6** ACC [MR. KHAN]: That is correct, sir.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you, Mr. Khan.
- 8 An R.M.C. 802 session occurred at 1700 hours on
- 9 31 March 2019 in the deliberation room in AV-34 at U.S. Naval
- 10 Station Guantanamo Bay. The parties and the military judge
- 11 were present. The accused was not present.
- 12 At the R.M.C. 802 session, the following topics were
- 13 discussed:
- 14 The commission discussed the order of march today for
- 15 today's session to include my desire to complete any
- 16 unclassified argument and all pending motions prior to
- 17 conducting any 505(h) proceedings or closed 803 sessions.
- 18 The commission ascertained there was no need to
- 19 discuss AE 025, a defense request for support, as there was no
- 20 substantive change in status from the last filing on
- 21 28 March 2019 at AE 025R.
- 22 Defense noted they did not believe oral argument was
- 23 necessary in AE 027, and AE 028 could be handled in an

- 1 unclassified setting unless the military judge desired to
- 2 inquire into specific items of discovery. I stated at that
- 3 time I desired to ask some questions. I have since determined
- 4 that I no longer need to, but I'll allow the parties an
- 5 opportunity to present any additional argument if they feel
- **6** that's necessary.
- 7 In the 802, prior to any closed session in Appellate
- 8 Exhibit 030, the prosecution indicated a need to resolve
- 9 Appellate Exhibit 030C. I noted I needed to review all the
- 10 classified pleadings this morning, which I have done.
- 11 Mr. Dixon requested permission to split argument on
- 12 Appellate Exhibit 028 and Appellate Exhibit 030 with
- 13 Ms. Jestin. Mr. Dixon would provide the applicability of the
- 14 Constitution argument, and Ms. Jestin, the factual portion of
- 15 the argument. I granted that request.
- 16 Defense had the following comments. Defense
- 17 requested the immediate release of Appellate Exhibit 028 and
- 18 Appellate Exhibit 030 to the media. I said I would take that
- 19 request under advisement. After considering the request, I've
- 20 determined the request is not ripe without a formal motion for
- **21** appropriate relief.
- 22 Defense asserted a July sentencing date may need to
- 23 be rescheduled to allow for Mr. Khan to testify in a different

- 1 case and thus show substantial cooperation with the government
- 2 pursuant to the pretrial agreement. This issue is also not
- 3 currently ripe, but I appreciate -- I appreciate the advanced
- 4 notice.
- 5 Defense requested to ask two additional voir dire
- 6 questions of me, and I granted that request. We'll get to
- 7 that in a moment.
- **8** Finally, I closed the 802 conference encouraging the
- 9 parties to conference with each other to see what additional
- 10 issues they could work out while on island.
- 11 Do counsel for either side have anything to add or
- 12 correct based on the commission's R.M.C. 802 conference
- 13 summaries held on 31 March 2019?
- 14 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: No, Your Honor.
- 15 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, the only thing that I would
- 16 like to do is clarify for the record. You mentioned
- 17 Mr. Khan's cooperation. The standard for cooperation is set
- 18 forth in the plea agreement, and Your Honor said, I think,
- 19 "substantial cooperation." The actual standard is included in
- 20 the pretrial agreement. I just want to be clear about that
- 21 for the record.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- 23 Mr. Dixon, do you have questions or challenge of me?

- 1 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I do, Your Honor. Thank you,
- 2 Your Honor.
- 3 When this commission last convened in July of 2018,
- 4 Your Honor indicated at that time that you are retirement
- 5 eligible and you were contemplating retirement perhaps in two
- 6 years.
- 7 My question for you is: Have you made any further
- 8 plans to retire from military service?
- 9 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have not initiated retirement, but my
- 10 intent is sometime in the summer of 2020 or later.
- 11 CDC [MR. DIXON]: And has Your Honor explored or applied
- **12** for any post-retirement job opportunities?
- **13** MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have not.
- 14 CDC [MR. DIXON]: So Your Honor has not applied to be an
- 15 immigration judge with the Department of Justice, for example?
- **16** MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have not.
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you.
- 18 My other question for Your Honor is: Have you issued
- 19 any ex parte rulings or orders in this case or otherwise had
- 20 any ex parte communications with the prosecution, Department
- 21 of Defense, or others?
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have not. I've reviewed an ex parte
- 23 pleading filed by the government, which is Appellate

- 1 Exhibit 030C, which you've responded to, I believe. I have
- 2 not engaged in any ex parte communications with the
- 3 prosecution or defense.
- 4 CDC [MR. DIXON]: So there have been no -- just so I'm
- 5 clear, there have been no exparte rulings or orders issued in
- 6 connection with AE 030C or any other proceeding in this case?
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Not with 030C. And no, I've not issued
- 8 any ex parte rulings.
- 9 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 10 Based on Your Honor's responses to my questions
- 11 today, we do not have any objection or challenge to Your Honor
- 12 presiding over this case.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Very well. Thank you.
- 14 Mr. Khan, I understand that you've had some time to
- 15 meet with your counsel this morning to discuss the matters we
- 16 will be taking up today. However, before we address those
- 17 matters, I need to advise you of your right to attend these
- 18 sessions.
- 19 You have the right to be present during all open
- 20 sessions of the commission. If you request to be absent from
- 21 any session, your absence must be voluntary and of your own
- 22 free will. Your voluntary absence from any session of the
- 23 commission is an unequivocal waiver of your right to be

- 1 present during that session.
- 2 Your absence from any session may negatively affect
- 3 the presentation of the defense in your case. Your failure to
- 4 meet with and cooperate with your defense counsel may also
- 5 negatively affect the presentation of your case. Under
- 6 certain circumstances, your attendance at a session can be
- 7 compelled regardless of your personal desire not to be
- 8 present.
- **9** Regardless of your voluntary waiver to attend a
- 10 particular session of the commission, you have the right at
- 11 any time to decide to attend any subsequent session.
- Do you understand what I've just explained to you?
- 13 ACC [MR. KHAN]: I do, sir.
- 14 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you, Mr. Khan.
- 15 Appellate Exhibit 031, the docketing order for this
- 16 hearing, lists four specific motions we would be addressing
- 17 this week. As discussed during the Rule for Military
- 18 Commission 802 conference yesterday evening, there is no
- 19 substantive change to or need to address Appellate
- **20** Exhibit 025.
- 21 As to the remaining three motions, the commission
- 22 plans to hear unclassified argument on the motions in the
- 23 following order:

1 In Appellate Exhibit 027, the defense filed a motion 2 requesting the commission order the government to provide the 3 accused a laptop computer loaded with specific software. 4 In Appellate Exhibit 028, the defense submitted a 5 motion to compel production of Brady material. In Appellate Exhibit 030, the defense submitted a 6 7 motion to compel the production of witnesses to testify in 8 person in connection with Mr. Khan's sentencing. 9 If required to complete argument in this motion, the 10 commission will conduct a Military Commission Rule of 11 Evidence 505(h) hearing which will be closed to the public. 12 The accused will not be present during any M.C.R.E. 505(h) 13 hearings. Additionally, if necessary, we may need to conduct 14 a closed Rule for Military Commission 803 session to hear 15 classified argument on this motion. 16 Finally, I advised the parties that it's unnecessary 17 to cover the same arguments provided in their pleadings. 18 Moving on, then, to the first motion, in Appellate 19 Exhibit 027, the defense requested the commission order the 20 government to provide Mr. Khan access to a privileged laptop 21 computer loaded with Microsoft Office, Adobe Acrobat Pro, and 22 photo-and video-editing software for his use in assisting his

counsel and participating in a meaningful fashion in

23

- 1 preparation of his presentencing case and/or petition for
- 2 clemency.
- 3 The defense argued the laptop at issue, albeit
- 4 without the additional software, has already been made
- 5 available to Mr. Khan -- or to the defense, I should say --
- 6 and that the laptop has not been provided to Mr. Khan due to a
- 7 security incident having nothing to do with Mr. Khan or this
- 8 case.
- **9** The defense also argued that Mr. Khan's access to a
- 10 privileged laptop is necessary to avoid any undue infringement
- 11 on his constitutional rights, to petition the government for
- 12 redress, to enjoy meaningful access to the courts, and to have
- 13 the effective assistance of counsel. The defense argues
- 14 there's no legitimate government interest in denying
- 15 Mr. Khan's request.
- In Appellate Exhibit 027A dated 19 February 2019, the
- 17 government requested the commission deny the defense motion.
- 18 The government argued that, first, the accused does not have a
- 19 legal right or is otherwise entitled to a laptop computer and
- 20 that the government is unaware of any United States court ever
- 21 determining that a prisoner or a pretrial detainee has a right
- 22 to possess and use laptop computers; second, the accused has
- 23 meaningful access to the courts and effective assistance of

- 1 counsel regardless of access to a laptop computer; and third,
- 2 that the government has legitimate security interests
- 3 associated with denying law of war detainees, to include
- 4 Mr. Khan, access to highly sophisticated electronic computing
- **5** devices.
- **6** The defense replied in Appellate Exhibit 027B and
- 7 argued, for all practical purposes, there is no way for
- 8 Mr. Khan to prepare for his presentencing proceedings fairly
- **9** and adequately without a computer.
- As I stated before, I have no questions, but does the
- 11 defense wish to present any additional oral argument?
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, I would like to clarify one
- 13 aspect of what you just said, and then I would like to present
- 14 the arguments concerning the application of the Constitution
- 15 to Guantanamo. That is an issue that the prosecution raised
- 16 in AE 027. It's also an issue that applies in AE 028 and
- **17** AE 030.
- 18 With respect to the clarification, I believe
- 19 Your Honor indicated that Mr. Khan has a laptop or that the
- 20 defense has a laptop. That's not technically accurate. It is
- 21 accurate to say that a defense laptop has been obtained and is
- 22 in possession of the government. The laptop has been
- 23 processed for security purposes. It has been prepared for

- **1** delivery to Mr. Khan.
- 2 There is, as we understand and believe, a memorandum
- 3 signed by a number of relevant parties, including the chief
- 4 prosecutor, authorizing that laptop to be provided to Mr. Khan
- 5 for rehabilitative purposes. Our motion is asking that that
- 6 laptop be delivered to Mr. Khan for privilege purposes; that
- 7 is, for use in connection with his sentencing.
- 8 As we indicated in our papers, and we will rest on
- 9 our papers, other detainees in other circumstances have
- 10 similarly had access to laptops for similar purposes.
- 11 Beyond that, we rest on our papers, with the
- 12 extension of the constitutional argument that I am happy to
- 13 present at any time Your Honor may wish.
- 14 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I'll leave that to you. I know you
- 15 want to address it in the other two motions. You can address
- **16** it now, if you like.
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor. I will address
- **18** it now.
- 19 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I would like to say, I attempted to
- 20 clarify myself and I didn't do a good job, but I believe your
- 21 characterization of who provided a laptop and where it was at,
- 22 I believe all that to be accurate.
- 23 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor.

- 1 With respect to the issue of the Constitution,
- 2 throughout these three filings, AE 027, 028, and 030, the
- 3 prosecution has taken issue with our citation to
- 4 constitutional authorities. By "constitutional authorities,"
- 5 what I mean is cases that address the basic right of
- 6 defendants to a fair trial; that is, a fair trial guaranteed
- 7 by principles of due process. Now, it's unclear to us whether
- 8 the government objects to the cases or to the fair trial right
- **9** principles that they represent.
- 10 What the government doesn't do is argue that the
- 11 Constitution does not apply in its totality to Guantanamo, nor
- 12 could the prosecution do that. I direct Your Honor to
- 13 Justice Kennedy's concurring opinion in the Verdugo case,
- 14 494 U.S. 259, where he said the proposition -- this is a
- 15 quote -- "The proposition is not that the Constitution doesn't
- 16 apply overseas, but that there are certain provisions that
- 17 don't necessarily apply in all circumstances in every foreign
- 18 place." That was a concurring opinion that cites
- 19 Reid v. Covert, which was, of course, a case arising out of
- 20 the Uniform Code of Military Justice.
- 21 What the government argues is that there is no case
- 22 that specifically recognizes the constitutional rights that we
- 23 invoke. And that, I submit to Your Honor, is wrong. We have

- 1 addressed the government's arguments in our papers. We have
- 2 addressed the cases that they cite.
- 3 With respect to the <u>Brady</u> motion, AE 028, the Supreme
- 4 Court's decision in Boumediene v. Bush affirms that detainees
- 5 at Guantanamo have the right to obtain and admit relevant
- 6 exculpatory information; and, in fact, federal courts have
- 7 relied on that decision in habeas contexts.
- **8** We cited in our papers, and I want to highlight, the
- 9 case of Duran v. Trump. It involves another high-value
- 10 detainee that I actually represent. In the case management
- 11 order in that case, Judge Walton of the federal court in
- 12 Washington ordered the government to produce exculpatory
- 13 evidence, including medical records, which is one of the
- 14 categories of information that we have requested here.
- 15 There's also the Bin'Attash case that we've cited, issued by
- 16 Judge Lamberth, that specifically cites Brady. And so we
- 17 think that there is clear precedent for the right to receive
- 18 exculpatory evidence under the principles of Brady.
- 19 With respect to the motion to compel production of
- 20 witnesses, the Military Commissions Act, specifically
- 21 Section 949j, subsection (a)(1), provides that the right to
- 22 obtain witnesses and the process for obtaining those witnesses
- 23 is equivalent to the process in Article III courts. Now, the

- 1 process in Article III courts, of course, and the cases that
- 2 we've cited bear this out, specifically rely on the Fifth and
- 3 Sixth Amendments.
- 4 The government in its opposition has essentially
- 5 nothing to say about this. They certainly don't cite any
- 6 cases that would foreclose invocation of the rights that we
- 7 seek -- that we invoke. Again, these are just basic fair
- 8 trial rights.
- 9 I do want to make another point with respect to the
- 10 Constitution -- application of the Constitution more broadly,
- 11 and that is, the Supreme Court in the Boumediene case said, of
- 12 course, that detainees at Guantanamo have a constitutionally
- 13 protected right to petition for habeas.
- 14 That decision was not -- it didn't state a new rule
- 15 of -- it didn't state a new constitutional rule. What it did
- 16 was it reaffirmed the Supreme Court's longstanding
- 17 jurisprudence to decide whether certain provisions of the
- 18 Constitution apply outside of the United States. The court in
- 19 Boumediene said it's a functional test. You have to ask
- 20 whether it would be impracticable or anomalous to recognize
- 21 the right that's at issue. And again, we are talking here
- 22 about basic fair trial rights.
- The Supreme Court answered that question in the

- 1 habeas context. It pointed out that Guantanamo is not a
- 2 transient possession, right? It's within the constant
- 3 jurisdiction of the United States. It cited the Rasul
- 4 decision in 2004, which was a decision litigated by my
- 5 organization, which said that Guantanamo is in every practical
- **6** respect a U.S. territory.
- 7 I do want to point out, looking around this
- 8 commission, I mean, the only thing about Guantanamo or this
- 9 commission that is foreign is Mr. Khan's citizenship; and even
- 10 Mr. Khan has legal status in the United States. He has asylum
- 11 status.
- Now, we addressed in our reply brief in support of
- 13 the <u>Brady</u> motion that it follows from the <u>Boumediene</u> decision
- 14 and the principles that I have just outlined that detainees
- 15 have some measure of due process rights at Guantanamo, in our
- 16 view, certainly fair trial rights. The Supreme Court has been
- 17 clear in a number of cases that habeas and due process are
- 18 inextricably intertwined, and there is certainly nothing --
- 19 there are no practical barriers -- the government has
- 20 certainly cited none -- that would prohibit our client from
- 21 invoking cases that simply stand for his right to have a fair
- 22 trial applying due process principles.
- The <u>Kiyemba</u> case, cited in -- the D.C. Circuit case

- **1** in <u>Kiyemba</u> cited by the government is not to the contrary.
- 2 That case held that a detainee doesn't have a right under the
- 3 due process clause to enter the United States, right? And
- 4 since that decision in Kiyemba, you know, it's been -- the
- 5 only way to read that decision consistently with Boumediene
- 6 and subsequent cases in the D.C. Circuit is to acknowledge the
- 7 limited holding in that case. That's why some of the later
- 8 Kiyemba decisions, the Aamer case that's addressed in the
- 9 government's brief, and the Bahlul case, which we have raised
- 10 which arose out of these military commissions involving the
- 11 ex post facto clause which the government conceded applies in
- 12 Guantanamo, I just don't think that there is any other way to
- 13 read the holding in Kiyemba.
- Now, it is true, as the government points out, that
- 15 district courts in Washington have reached different
- **16** conclusions about whether -- about the scope of <u>Kiyemba</u>'s
- 17 holding. The government cites the Salahi case to say that
- 18 there are no rights. We cite the <u>Basardh</u> case to say that
- 19 there are rights; the holding in <u>Kiyemba</u> that the government
- 20 relies on is dicta.
- 21 But I do want to point Your Honor to the last word
- 22 that the D.C. Circuit has said with respect to the issue of
- 23 the scope of the <u>Kiyemba</u> holding, and that is a case called

1 Ali v. Trump. This is a case, again, that I am currently 2 litigating in the D.C. Circuit. We petitioned in that case --3 the case concerns the application of the due process clause 4 and whether it limits duration of detention at Guantanamo for people who are not charged. So that's the issue. It's a 5 6 different issue than is raised here. 7 That case is on appeal. We petitioned for an initial 8 hearing en banc which was denied, but in connection with the 9 denial of en banc review -- or initial hearing en banc, 10 Judges Tatel and Pillard issued an opinion. That opinion 11 acknowledged that in Kiyemba, the court addressed only one 12 theory of how the due process clause might reach Guantanamo, 13 and that relevant dispute in the Kiyemba case concerned only 14 whether the law gave the detainee at issue in that case a 15 substantive due process right to enter the United States. So 16 members of the D.C. Circuit in this concurring opinion are 17 acknowledging the limited scope of Kiyemba. 18 We also cited the statements by Judge Millett in our 19 reply brief in the case of Mr. Qassim. And the final thing 20 that Judges Tatel and Pillard said was that the limited 21 understanding of Kiyemba was -- the limited nature of the

D.C. Circuit have demurred in reading that case to say for all

holding in that case explains why subsequent panels of the

22

23

- 1 time that detainees don't have any due process rights. It's
- 2 not the law, Your Honor.
- $\mathbf{3}$ The final thing I'll say is, I know -- and I
- 4 appreciate that the question of the application of the
- 5 Constitution at Guantanamo is one that has been percolating
- 6 around these military commissions for a number of years and
- 7 has not at this point been resolved to my knowledge in the
- 8 military -- in connection with the military commissions except
- 9 for the Bahlul case.
- 10 Having said that, you know, certainly Your Honor can
- 11 take up that issue in the context of this case if you deem it
- 12 appropriate. But it's the defense's position that that is not
- 13 necessary because in connection with the relief that we're
- 14 seeking, there is clear authority and precedent at least for
- 15 the citation of the authorities that we rely on. Again, in
- 16 connection with the <u>Brady</u> motion, that's <u>Boumediene</u>. In
- 17 connection with the witness motion, that is the Military
- 18 Commissions Act, explicit adoption and incorporation of the
- 19 Article III standard, which is based on the Fifth and Sixth
- **20** Amendment.
- 21 Thank you, Your Honor. If you have any questions, I
- **22** am happy to address them.
- 23 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I do have one for now. In two places

- 1 in Appellate Exhibit 028, which is a Brady motion, you assert
- 2 there is no dispute that Brady applies to both sentencing and
- 3 in the military commissions. In your second assertion of that
- 4 nature, you asked the commission to see
- 5 United States v. Hawkins, 73 MJ 605.
- 6 Assuming for argument's sake that case can stand for
- 7 the proposition that Brady applies to sentencing proceedings
- 8 in courts-martial, Hawkins was an Army private who was
- 9 court-martialed in a general court-martial.
- 10 So my question is: How does that case, which has
- 11 nothing whatsoever to do with military commissions, resolve
- 12 all disputes about whether Brady applies to military
- 13 commissions?
- 14 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, we don't rely specifically
- 15 and exclusively on that case. We rely on Supreme Court
- 16 precedent, a precedent that Ms. Jestin will address. I don't
- 17 think that there is any dispute that Brady applies at
- 18 sentencing. It is, I submit to you, black letter law under
- 19 the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. I just don't think
- 20 there's any dispute about that.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Then I guess I have a second question,
- 22 if you don't mind. The precedent you cite and the government
- 23 cites talks about dicta, it talks about analogy, for instance,

- 1 habeas petitions, and it talks about assumptions for argument
- 2 sake.
- 3 And I think you -- I think you may have answered this
- 4 just a minute ago, but do you have any authority that
- 5 explicitly applies the Fifth Amendment due process clause to
- **6** these commissions?
- 7 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Well, Your Honor, as I -- I'll say two
- 8 things. First of all, I just want to reemphasize that Brady
- 9 itself was a sentencing case.
- **10** MJ [COL WATKINS]: No, I got that.
- 11 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Okay.
- 12 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I'm saying explicit authority that
- 13 applies the Fifth Amendment due process clause to these
- **14** military commissions.
- 15 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Well, I think, Your Honor, respectfully,
- 16 the question is whether the provisions of the Constitution
- 17 apply to Guantanamo. And I think the Supreme Court has
- 18 answered that question with respect to Brady, and I think that
- 19 the district court decisions that followed Boumediene have
- 20 answered that question. It's a question of
- 21 extraterritoriality, not the type of proceeding in which we
- 22 are operating.
- But I will say this, that, again, we are talking

- 1 about a fair trial right. This is what we're talking about,
- 2 at minimum. And the government raised -- I believe it's
- 3 Rule 705 -- indispensable judicial guarantees, and they
- 4 pointed specifically to courts-martial Rule 705, which
- 5 explicitly identifies due process of law as one of the
- 6 indispensable judicial guarantees that may not be bargained
- 7 away. As Your Honor knows, our position is that -- that core
- 8 Brady is not waivable as a matter of law, as a matter of
- **9** Supreme Court law.
- And again, with respect to the witness motion, the
- 11 Military Commissions Act specifically incorporates the
- 12 Article III standards, which are Fifth and Sixth Amendment
- 13 standards.
- **14** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right.
- 15 CDC [MR. DIXON]: So in that sense, I submit to you that
- 16 the Constitution does apply to the extent certainly that we
- 17 have argued in our papers.
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I guess what I'm getting at is, you
- 19 just said this issue is percolating around the commissions and
- 20 some D.C. courts have demurred, and I understand your argument
- 21 completely.
- What I'm getting at is, do you have authority that
- 23 explicitly applies the Fifth Amendment of the United States

- 1 Constitution, and the due process clause therein, to these
- 2 proceedings?
- 3 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I cite Your Honor to 10 U.S.C.
- 4 949j(a)(1), which specifically incorporates Article III
- 5 standards that include the due process clause. But again, I
- 6 submit to Your Honor ----
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: For ----
- 8 CDC [MR. DIXON]: ---- that the issue is the
- **9** extraterritorial reach of the Constitution.
- And when I say that the issue is percolated within
- 11 these commissions, I mean with respect to questions like the
- 12 exclusion of torture evidence. Because in any due process
- 13 analysis, as I know Your Honor is well aware, application of
- 14 the due process clause raises a question of, well, what
- 15 process is due?
- And so, you know, there are procedural due process
- 17 rights, of course, and substantive due process rights. And
- 18 this is the only military commission case I am involved in,
- 19 but, to my understanding, there have been a number of issues
- 20 raised in a number of contexts, in a number of cases in these
- 21 military commissions, that have not been resolved.
- I don't think that that means that there is any doubt
- 23 that our client is entitled to a fair trial that ensures

- 1 minimum due process protections or that he's entitled to <u>Brady</u>
- 2 material which the Supreme Court has said in the habeas
- 3 context detainees are entitled to.
- 4 And why that's important and why it's relevant to
- 5 this commission is that a habeas proceeding is a more limited
- 6 proceeding. Detainees have fewer rights in habeas than they
- 7 do before this commission. And so it necessarily follows that
- 8 if a detainee in a habeas case can invoke Brady, and district
- 9 courts will apply Brady in those contexts, that Mr. Khan
- 10 surely should be able to invoke Brady.
- I mean, there's no question in my other high-value
- 12 detainee case that my client is entitled to, for example, CIA
- 13 medical records, right? There's a case management order --
- 14 it's on the public docket -- that says that he's entitled to
- 15 this information. It's one of the categories of information
- **16** we've requested in our <u>Brady</u> motion.
- 17 If that's the standard in a case where a detainee is
- 18 entitled to fewer protections, I respectfully submit that
- 19 there's no dispute. The government has certainly not raised
- 20 any question concerning Boumediene. They don't address the
- 21 argument about whether Mr. Khan is entitled to Brady material.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. I'm going to ask one more time.
- 23 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes.

- 1 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Has a higher court said the
- 2 Fifth Amendment due process clause in toto applies to military
- **3** commissions?
- 4 CDC [MR. DIXON]: In toto, no.
- 5 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. That's what I wanted to
- 6 know. I understand how it applies in different scenarios and
- 7 different jurisdictions, and you're making an excellent
- 8 argument that that's kind of an aggregated authority that it
- 9 should apply in this case to get your client what you're
- 10 requesting. I understand that argument completely. I'm just
- 11 trying to understand my authorities as well.
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Hopefully, Your Honor, we have convinced
- 13 you by the -- through the cases and the statutory authorities
- 14 that we've cited.
- 15 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I appreciate your argument. Thank you.
- 16 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you.
- 17 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Government -- I'm trying to
- 18 stay organized here, and I went far afield -- do you have any
- **19** further argument on 027?
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: No, sir. We stand by our motion.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Thank you. All right.
- And as we've covered to an extent, defense requested
- 23 the commission in Appellate Exhibit 028 to compel the

- 1 government to produce <u>Brady</u> material for use in extenuation
- 2 and mitigation in sentencing. Is that correct, Defense?
- 3 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes, Your Honor.
- 4 May we have a moment to confer?
- **5** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Certainly.
- **6** CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor. May we proceed,
- **7** Your Honor?
- 8 MJ [COL WATKINS]: One second. Oh, that was defense's
- 9 request in Appellate Exhibit 028 on 11 March 2019. In
- 10 response, the government filed Appellate Exhibit 028A
- 11 requesting the commission deny the motion. And on
- 12 15 March 2019, the defense replied.
- 13 Again, Counsel, I've read all of the written
- 14 arguments, and I understand, Defense, you would like to
- 15 present further oral argument on 028. Please proceed.
- 16 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Your Honor, at Mr. Khan's sentencing
- 17 hearing, he plans to put on a mitigation case. That is his
- 18 right. It's a right he retained under his pretrial agreement
- **19** at paragraph 21.
- 20 Critical to his mitigation case is information and
- 21 evidence favorable to Mr. Khan that is uniquely in the
- 22 possession of the government. This is specifically evidence
- 23 that tends to establish and corroborate Mr. Khan's account of

- 1 his torture, his severe pretrial punishment at the hands of
- 2 the United States Government. Without this evidence -- to
- 3 deprive Mr. Khan of this evidence renders his right to put on
- 4 a mitigation case somewhat hollow, and it will deprive him of
- 5 due process and a fair sentencing trial.
- **6** This issue really strikes at the heart of the
- 7 Fifth Amendment that Mr. Dixon just discussed and the
- 8 protections it affords to defendants. The dimensions of
- 9 Mr. Khan's liberty are at stake. The government has an
- 10 ethical and constitutional obligation to satisfy the dictates
- 11 of fairness. The government must produce favorable material,
- 12 construed broadly, in a timely manner to Mr. Khan. That is
- 13 what the Constitution requires and that is what the
- 14 fundamental principles of fairness and legitimacy commend
- 15 here. It is an indisputable judicial guarantee.
- 16 But, Your Honor, the government is claiming waiver,
- 17 that Mr. Khan waived his right to discovery. But Brady,
- 18 Your Honor, is not a discovery rule. It sounds in due
- 19 process. It obliges the government to provide criminal
- 20 defendants with favorable evidence through sentencing. You
- 21 simply cannot bargain it away. And none of that can really be
- 22 in dispute.
- So guery why there is such resistance here. Because

- 1 the material we seek, that is uniquely in the possession of
- 2 the government, concerns Mr. Khan's torture. The CIA torture
- 3 program in this case, Your Honor, appears to be the third
- **4** rail.
- Here, we have a defendant who was tortured, but
- 6 despite that, he has pled guilty, he has accepted
- 7 responsibility for his crimes, and he has been a committed
- 8 cooperator for the last seven years. He is not seeking this
- 9 material because of second thoughts. He is still deeply
- 10 contrite. He's completely committed to cooperating.
- 11 He's simply seeking this material because he wants to
- 12 put on a credible and persuasive mitigation case in an effort
- 13 to secure his liberty sooner. And he's entitled to the Brady
- 14 material that we've asked for in advance of that contested
- 15 proceeding. And respectfully, it is our position that the
- **16** government should be ordered to provide it.
- 17 Beyond these remarks, Your Honor, and those of
- 18 Mr. Dixon, we rest on our papers.
- 19 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Just a few questions, please.
- 20 Do you believe it matters in my analysis when the
- 21 request for discovery is made?
- 22 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: So, Your Honor, requests for discovery
- 23 have to be made timely, but this type of material that we're

- 1 seeking is not required under the discovery rules; it's
- 2 required as a matter of fairness and due process. The
- 3 government, no matter when it comes into possession of core
- 4 Brady material of an exculpatory nature, has an obligation to
- 5 turn it over, and that obligation extends through sentencing.
- 6 In terms of our discussions about this material,
- 7 they've been ongoing since 2012. I can represent to the court
- 8 that we discussed them with the prior prosecutor on the case.
- **9** Mr. Khan mentions them in our proceeding in 2016. We filed
- 10 the motion to preserve the SSCI Report, which was granted in
- 11 connection with this motion. So these discussions have been
- 12 going on during the entirety of this proceeding, since
- 13 Mr. Khan's guilty plea.
- 14 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. In your oral argument just
- 15 now, you indicated that Brady material cannot be waived. Did
- **16** I understand you correctly?
- 17 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Your Honor, my argument is that certain
- 18 core <u>Brady</u> material cannot be waived.
- 19 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. So ----
- 20 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Impeachment material can be waived.
- 21 Under Ruiz, the court makes clear that a plea agreement that
- 22 required the waiver of certain types of Brady material,
- 23 because it went to the fairness of a trial and the defendant

- 1 was pleading guilty, did not impact the voluntariness of that
- 2 plea and that that was therefore appropriate and survived
- 3 constitutional scrutiny.
- 4 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Ruiz is something I wanted to
- 5 ask you about. Your argument seemed to indicate that in a
- 6 plea agreement, you can only waive impeachment material, but
- 7 on page 633 of that opinion, the court says the Constitution
- 8 does not require the government to disclose material
- 9 impeachment evidence prior to entering a plea agreement with a
- 10 criminal defendant, but then they go on and talk about waiver
- 11 of material that would go to an affirmative defense.
- 12 We do not -- quoting, We do not believe the
- 13 Constitution requires provision of this information to the
- 14 defendant prior to plea bargaining for most, though not all,
- 15 of the reasons previously stated.
- Judge Thomas's -- his concurring opinion goes on to
- 17 state that "I agree with the court, that the Constitution does
- 18 not require the government to disclose either affirmative
- 19 defense information or impeachment information relating to
- 20 informants or other witnesses before entering into a binding
- 21 plea agreement with the criminal defendant."
- So -- and you can clarify this for me. I read your
- 23 arguments to say that the only Brady material you can waive is

- 1 impeachment, but clearly the Supreme Court believes that there
- 2 are other parts of Brady that are clearly waivable in
- 3 negotiating a pretrial agreement.
- 4 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: So in Ruiz, what the Supreme Court --
- 5 my understanding of the opinion, the Supreme Court was saying
- 6 that the government can be released from its obligation to
- 7 provide categories of material that would fall under
- 8 Brady v. Maryland, that fall within what might be helpful or
- 9 favorable to a defendant in their effort to defend themselves
- 10 at the guilt phase. That is impeachment material about
- 11 government witnesses and other information of that ilk.
- 12 However, the court also made clear that the government is not
- 13 absolved from providing exculpatory information to the
- 14 defendant, period; and the type of Brady we're requesting we
- 15 posit falls into that category.
- 16 We are not in a situation where Mr. Khan is -- is
- 17 agreeing to a stipulated sentence. He's about to engage in a
- 18 contested sentencing trial, one central issue of which is
- 19 mitigation. So our argument is that the government is
- 20 obligated to provide favorable information to the defense in
- 21 connection with mitigation.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Make that nexus for me, that
- 23 mitigation evidence is a subset of exculpatory evidence.

- 1 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: So it's evidence that tends to show --
- 2 tends to mitigate the potential sentencing penalty faced by
- 3 Mr. Khan because of the nature of his pretrial punishment. So
- 4 it's evidence that could corroborate his recollection of what
- 5 happened to him; it could establish certain components of what
- 6 happened to him. And all of that is core <u>Brady</u> material about
- 7 exactly what he's arguing should mitigate his sentence.
- 8 And that's why we believe that it falls within the
- 9 category of Brady material that was carved out by the court in
- 10 Ruiz as being appropriate to being waived in connection with
- 11 the plea agreement. It goes to the fundamental fairness of
- 12 the proceedings, not the voluntariness of his guilty plea.
- 13 And the proceedings I am referencing are his sentencing -- is
- **14** his sentencing trial.
- 15 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- You cited <u>Johnson v. Zerbst</u>, a 1935 habeas case.
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes, Your Honor. That's the decision
- 18 that specifies that waiver of fundamental rights have to be
- **19** explicit and will not be inferred.
- 20 MJ [COL WATKINS]: And if you could, either of you, help
- 21 me with Mezzanatto again that allowed for the waiver of
- 22 prohibition of use of statements made during failed plea
- 23 negotiations and cross-examination of the accused at trial.

- 1 How does that relate to waiver of discovery of Brady material?
- 2 And I use "discovery" in the plain sense of the word.
- 3 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Understood.
- 4 So the Mezzanatto case, Your Honor, it's a Supreme
- **5** Court case from 1995. And it's really cited for the more
- 6 general proposition that certain rights are so fundamental to
- 7 the reliability of the fact-finding process that they cannot
- 8 be waived.
- **9** And the analogy the court uses in that case is that a
- 10 defendant can't waive his rights to the point of having a
- 11 group of monkeys, you know, preside at his trial. So it's
- 12 really cited for that more general proposition that in
- 13 criminal cases in particular, there are just certain rights
- 14 that really go to fundamental fairness. I would characterize
- 15 them as indispensable judicial rights, and they are critical
- 16 so that the public has faith in the fairness of the
- 17 proceedings and in our rule of law. And that's what we think
- 18 is at issue here.
- 19 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- 20 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Government, any response?
- 22 ATC [CDR O'DOWD]: Yes, sir. Just to address a few
- **23** points. Thank you.

1 So first of all, sir, with regards to defense brought 2 up the point of the accused and the pretrial agreement, 3 paragraph 21., and his right to call witnesses and present 4 evidence subject to any rulings by the military judge 5 regarding matters in aggravation and mitigation for sentencing 6 consideration. And, of course, you know, the prosecution --7 the government has no objection to that. Of course he can put 8 on a case in extenuation and mitigation. 9 The question is: What does the government have to 10 produce? And as we stated in our motion, the government's 11 position is that the accused entered into a pretrial agreement 12 with the convening authority, a contract. And one of the 13 terms of that contract was that he would waive all discovery 14 except for limited discovery from 701 -- excuse me, sir, 15 701(b)(1) and 701(d). 16 701(b)(1) was provided to the accused I believe 17 approximately seven years ago, after he pled guilty at the 18 commission. And as stated before in our motion response, 19 701(d) material to provide to the accused, we've -- the 20 defense already has the one prosecution exhibit that the 21 prosecution will -- is planning on presenting during 22 sentencing. And at this time, there is no witnesses for the 23 prosecution, so we don't have any names to provide to the

- 1 defense there.
- With regards to the paragraph 12 of the PTA, the
- 3 accused waived all -- his right to any discovery beyond what
- 4 the government is obligated to provide pursuant to
- **5** R.M.C. 701(b)(1) and 701(d). I just draw your attention to
- 6 701(e)(C) [sic], which is exculpatory evidence to reduce the
- 7 punishment. This is one of the terms that the accused waived
- 8 in his pretrial agreement. It's explicit in the document
- 9 itself.
- And going back to my earlier point about the accused
- 11 entering into this agreement with the convening authority, as
- 12 we know, pretrial agreements serve both sides for various
- 13 reasons. The accused gets certain benefits out of the
- 14 agreement, considered -- sentencing considerations. In this
- 15 instance, he also got a few expert consultants and some other
- 16 benefits.
- 17 The government also receives benefits of this. The
- 18 accused has pled guilty to the charges. He's cooperating,
- 19 working on that. And importantly also, it provides the
- 20 government a benefit from having to provide limited discovery,
- 21 limiting our discovery obligations. And that is one of the
- 22 key provisions of this pretrial agreement.
- 23 Compared to other commissions cases that have

- 1 extensive and -- have been working on production issues -- of
- 2 discovery issues for years, this is obviously a time-consuming
- 3 and taxing burden on the government, and it is a valuable
- 4 consideration that the government considered when entering
- 5 into this agreement.
- **6** It's not as simple as something's on the shelf and
- 7 the government has it and can just pull the binder off the
- 8 shelf and hand it to the accused. This is a process, a long
- 9 and lengthy process, that again is -- is a -- would take an
- 10 extensive amount of -- of resources from the government if we
- 11 had to now change what paragraph 12 says is the burden on the
- **12** government.
- I think rather than go over my other points, sir, I
- 14 think those are covered in our motion, so I will stand by
- 15 those.
- 16 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Do you have a response to the defense
- 17 assertion that <u>Brady</u> is not a discovery right and so the
- 18 waiver is not applicable?
- 19 ATC [CDR O'DOWD]: Sir, I think as far as, you know, any
- 20 implication of the constitutional rights or that play into it,
- 21 I think our motion will speak to that.
- As far as what is -- you know, the words used from
- 23 defense in what they're asking for, whether it's called Brady

- 1 or exculpatory evidence or whatever, I believe is covered
- 2 under Rule 701(e)(C), exculpatory evidence. (C) is to reduce
- 3 the punishment, and I think that is exactly one of the -- one
- 4 of the provisions that was bargained for in this pretrial
- 5 agreement seven years ago.
- **6** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. And just to make it clear,
- 7 at this time, it is not the government's intent to call any
- 8 witnesses except possibly rebuttal witnesses?
- **9** ATC [CDR O'DOWD]: Yes, sir.
- 10 MJ [COL WATKINS]: So no victims or victim family members
- 11 from the Jakarta bombing either here, in person, or by VTC
- **12** from CONUS?
- 13 ATC [CDR O'DOWD]: There is no current plan from the
- **14** prosecution, yes, sir, to do that.
- 15 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Thank you, Commander O'Dowd.
- **16** ATC [CDR 0'D0WD]: Yes, sir.
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, may we have a moment to
- 18 confer with our client, please?
- 19 MJ [COL WATKINS]: You may.
- 20 [Pause.]
- 21 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Defense, any rebuttal argument?
- 23 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Two very brief points, Your Honor.

- 1 With respect to paragraph 12 in the discovery rules, I would
- 2 just commend Your Honor to Dickerson v. United States. The
- 3 statutes, rules of the military commission cannot supersede
- 4 constitutional protections. That's what that case stands for.
- 5 It's a Supreme Court case from 2000 that's cited in our
- 6 papers.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Does it specifically say that statutes
- 8 can't supercede commission regulations?
- 9 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: No, Your Honor. It states -- it stands
- 10 for the proposition that the Supreme Court has plenary
- 11 authority over interpreting the Constitution of the United
- 12 States and that statutes cannot supersede courts' decisions in
- 13 that regard.
- **14** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay.
- 15 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: And we would argue that, by
- **16** application, rules can't either.
- 17 And, Your Honor, in terms of the waiver on the plea
- 18 agreement itself and the pretrial agreement, we would just
- 19 represent to the court -- and this is also set forth in our
- 20 papers -- that during the time that that agreement was being
- 21 negotiated, we were working with Courtney Sullivan, who was an
- 22 experienced DoJ prosecutor, and we were discussing the
- 23 provision of Mr. Khan's medical records at that time. And she

- 1 was working on -- she was taking efforts to try to get those
- 2 to us. And it was clear from our discussions with her that
- 3 Brady was not contemplated as waived.
- 4 It's also clear from the colloquy between Judge Pohl
- 5 and our client that the waiver was about relieving the
- 6 government of its obligations to prove their case beyond a
- 7 reasonable doubt against Mr. Khan.
- **8** We've made that representation to the court. And if
- 9 the court would like to have some further offer of proof in
- 10 that regard, we'd be happy to accommodate.
- 11 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Well, it raises a concern to the
- 12 commission that perhaps the parties didn't have a meeting of
- 13 the minds when they entered the pretrial agreement.
- 14 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: That is not a concern that we hold,
- 15 Your Honor. We believe that the parties did have a meeting of
- 16 the minds. It was a very carefully and thoughtfully
- 17 negotiated agreement.
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Well, your agreement is with the
- 19 convening authority, not a former trial counsel who's an
- **20** experienced DoJ attorney.
- 21 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: I understand, Your Honor. Our position
- 22 is that there was a meeting of the minds. We don't think that
- 23 that is an issue. If the prosecution would like to brief

- 1 that, we'd be happy to respond. We certainly don't think --
- 2 rescission, we think it would be unconscionable. We don't
- 3 think there is any relief to be had on that score; we are just
- 4 asking Your Honor to interpret the provision and -- based on
- 5 the law that we have provided.
- **6** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right.
- 7 CDC [MS. JESTIN]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- **8** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- 9 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I'm sorry, Your Honor. May we have
- **10** another moment?
- **11** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Please.
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. The commission has before
- 14 it Appellate Exhibit 030, which is a defense motion to compel
- 15 production of witnesses dated 28 February 2019. On
- 16 14 March 2019, the government filed Appellate Exhibit 030A
- 17 requesting the commission deny the motion. On 18 March 2019,
- 18 the defense replied.
- 19 I'd like to discuss everything we can in open court,
- 20 and if and when we need to take a break to consider a 505 --
- 21 consider a 505(h) session or any 803 closed sessions, we'll do
- 22 that after a recess.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Your Honor, may I approach the

- **1** podium to make a request, please?
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Please.
- 3 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Your Honor, with regard to AE 030,
- 4 because of the sensitive classified equities involved are so
- 5 intricately interwoven within the defense motion, the
- 6 prosecution would like to strongly request that the commission
- 7 hold the 505(h) hearing first to -- before holding any
- **8** unclassified argument.
- 9 In making this request, the prosecution is by no
- 10 means suggesting that the commission should not hold
- 11 unclassified argument on the motion. However, in order to
- 12 ensure this commission and the parties are more fully aware of
- 13 the classified information involved and that there's -- that
- 14 there's no errant release of classified information, the
- 15 prosecution believes that holding the 505(h) before any open
- 16 or closed session would be advisable.
- 17 In addition to this, I'd like to draw Your Honor's
- 18 attention to M.C.R.E. 505(h)(1)(B), which states, "Upon
- 19 request by either party under M.C.R.E. 505(h)(1)(A), the
- 20 military judge shall conduct such a hearing and shall rule
- 21 prior to conducting any further proceedings."
- Here, we have done that. We filed the 505(h) with
- 23 you when we were required to on the litigation scheduling

- 1 order. And we strongly request that we have a ruling on that
- 2 before we do an open or closed session on AE 030.
- **3** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- 4 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Thank you, sir.
- 5 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I'm cognizant of the rules, and I
- 6 believe we could discuss certain things in open court which
- 7 will probably -- will be discussed in open court, but I'm
- 8 sensitive to the government's request, and I think it's a
- 9 legitimate request.
- 10 So what I'm going to do now is recess and consider
- 11 that request carefully before I proceed, and I will alert the
- 12 parties to the way ahead. This will not be a long recess, so
- 13 I intend to come back on the record this afternoon. But I
- 14 will take a recess to reconsider that and to give everyone a
- 15 comfort break.
- 16 Is there anything else we can take up in this session
- 17 before I recess?
- 18 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, I have two items briefly.
- 19 First is, I would like to state the defense's
- 20 objection. We would like to proceed with open argument now.
- The second is, our client has asked us to please
- 22 emphasize to the court with respect to the laptop motion that
- 23 he would like Your Honor to order the laptop both for the

- 1 privilege purposes, for which we've moved, but also to
- 2 reemphasize his need for the laptop for rehabilitative
- 3 purposes. He's asked us specifically to remind Your Honor, to
- 4 inform Your Honor of that. And I believe we have now done so.
- 5 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Very well. Thank you.
- **6** Anything else?
- 7 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: No, Your Honor.
- **8** MJ [COL WATKINS]: The commission is in recess.
- 9 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1437, 1 April 2019.]
- 10 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1505,
- 11 1 April 2019.]
- 12 MJ [COL WATKINS]: The commission is called to order. All
- 13 parties present when the commission recessed are again
- 14 present. The accused is present.
- The mandatory nature of an R.M.C. 505(h) request is
- 16 tied solely to classified information. My review of the
- 17 materials indicates that certain witnesses are not implicated
- **18** at all by R.M.C. 505.
- 19 In the interests of judicial economy, I'm going to
- 20 list certain witnesses by DRW numbers -- that is, defense
- 21 requested witness numbers -- and I want the parties to tell me
- 22 whether there is any implication of classified material in
- 23 discussing these witnesses. The DRW numbers I want to hear

- **1** from both parties on are DRW 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 17,
- **2** 27, and 31.
- **3** Government, take your time, but I want to know if
- 4 R.M.C. 505 is implicated by any of those witnesses.
- 5 [Pause.]
- 6 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Would the parties like a short recess
- 7 to consult?
- 8 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Apologies, Your Honor. I think we
- 9 have -- we were conferring with respect to the question that
- 10 Your Honor asked about which individuals could be addressed in
- 11 open session, and I think we have agreement.
- **12** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, Your Honor. After conferring
- 14 with the defense, we believe that 2 and 31 will need to be in
- 15 closed session.
- And we have reached an agreement -- we conferenced
- 17 earlier this morning, and we've reached an agreement on --
- 18 they have it listed as 14, 17, and 21; it was actually 15.
- **19** There was a mistype in there.
- 20 MJ [COL WATKINS]: In where?
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Inside their witness list. When
- 22 they did the motion to compel, they listed 14, but they meant
- **23** 15.

- 1 So on those three, we don't believe that we'll need
- 2 to discuss them at all.
- **3** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Give them to me again.
- 4 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: What you have listed as 14, 17, and
- **5** 21.
- **6** MJ [COL WATKINS]: You don't believe they need to be
- 7 discussed at all?
- 8 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: We've agreed to produce them.
- **9** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Oh, okay.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Or for one, there will be a
- 11 substitute of testimony of some sort.
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, may I clarify?
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes.
- 14 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I believe that the individuals you
- 15 listed, if I may, are 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 17, 27,
- **16** and 31.
- 17 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes.
- 18 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Okay. I believe we have agreement that
- 19 number 2 and number 31 would potentially involve disclosure of
- 20 classified information. And we have reached agreement with
- 21 respect to 14, which is actually 15. That was an error on my
- 22 part; I apologize. And we reached agreement on 17; we will
- 23 have some sort of stipulated or substituted testimony for 17.

- 1 27, we have not reached agreement on.
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Right.
- 3 CDC [MR. DIXON]: But we don't believe that calls for
- 4 disclosure of classified information. To the extent that
- 5 something may come to mind, we would address that in the
- **6** closed session.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: So 14 and 17 are moot as to a defense
- 8 motion to compel production?
- 9 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct.
- **10** MJ [COL WATKINS]: And 14 being 15 in your motion?
- 11 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: We have to be careful with this, so
- **14** just to be clear, DRW numbers 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 27 do
- 15 not implicate R.M.C. 505?
- 16 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct. And should something arise
- 17 that I haven't thought of, we will certainly bring it to the
- 18 attention of Your Honor, and we will take it up in the closed
- 19 session.
- 20 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I encourage caution in that regard, but
- 21 thank you for that.
- 22 Do you agree with my numbers, Government?
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: As currently proffered by defense,

- 1 that would be correct, sir.
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. And I exercise caution in
- 3 oral argument on these witnesses, but it seems we're all in
- 4 agreement that 505 is not implicated at present. So I will
- **5** hear oral argument in open session on those DRW numbers.
- 6 Defense, do you wish to present any further argument
- 7 on those numbers?
- 8 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes, Your Honor. And I would request a
- 9 point of clarification. Would you prefer that we identify the
- **10** witnesses by number?
- 11 MJ [COL WATKINS]: By number, please.
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Not by name?
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: For the present.
- 14 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you.
- **15** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Do you have further argument?
- 16 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes. May we proceed?
- 17 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes.
- 18 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 19 The defense has tried to narrow our witness request
- 20 to a reasonable number of named individuals. We've tried to
- 21 narrow that list substantially from what was initially
- 22 requested of the government in terms of production.
- The individuals that we've requested are essential to

- **1** Mr. Khan's ability to put on a credible and thorough
- 2 extenuation and mitigation case. This is very important; as
- 3 Ms. Jestin indicated during the Brady argument, Mr. Khan's
- 4 liberty is at stake.
- 5 We've tried to meet and confer with the government
- 6 about the individuals we have requested. Those efforts have
- 7 largely failed for the reasons that we identified, explained,
- 8 and that go unchallenged in our papers. So we have filed a
- **9** motion to compel approximately 29 to 30 witnesses. Some of
- 10 them are now moot as we just addressed. That motion is nearly
- 11 100 pages in length. And we have explained what each witness
- 12 would say if called to testify and why that testimony is
- 13 relevant and necessary to Mr. Khan's sentencing case.
- 14 I think what's not been challenged by the government
- 15 is the substance of the testimony that we've proffered. So in
- 16 our motion, in the full motion, the motion that's almost a
- 17 hundred pages long, we put in a lot of information about each
- 18 individual. The substance of that proffered testimony has not
- 19 been challenged. As a consequence, we submit that the only
- 20 issue that Your Honor has to address and decide is whether the
- 21 evidence is relevant and necessary to a fair sentencing
- **22** proceeding.
- It's also clear to us -- and I'm mindful of the

- 1 caution. It's also clear to us that the government's primary
- 2 objective is to avoid the discussion of Mr. Khan's torture.
- 3 As Ms. Jestin said, that is the third rail in this case. The
- 4 government has gone so far, as we've identified in our
- 5 unclassified papers, to raise the possibility of withdrawal
- 6 from the plea agreement if Mr. Khan succeeds in this motion or
- 7 in his Brady motion. The government has also made clear its
- 8 intent to seek maximum punishment for its only cooperating
- 9 witness, the only high-value detainee that has agreed to plead
- 10 guilty and to cooperate.
- Now, we respectfully submit that this doesn't make
- 12 any sense from a practical standpoint, given that Mr. Khan is
- 13 the only high-value cooperator, but nonetheless, he faces
- 14 jeopardy as a consequence of that. And it underscores the
- 15 importance of his ability to put on a substantial extenuation
- 16 and mitigation case including the presentation of evidence and
- 17 live testimony of witnesses.
- I just want to emphasize that this is an
- 19 extraordinary case. I mean, this is not an ordinary
- 20 courts-martial case involving someone who may cooperate for a
- 21 period of a few days, make some illicit drug purchases, and
- 22 then be immediately sentenced. And I'm mindful of
- 23 Your Honor's questions during the **Brady** argument about direct

- **1** on-point authority.
- 2 This is, to some extent, a matter of first
- 3 impression, this entire case. I mean, there have been very,
- 4 very few military commission cases that have proceeded to
- 5 sentencing. More than half of them have been reversed on
- 6 appeal. I think this is only one of two that has been a
- 7 contested proceeding, the first one being the Hamdan case, and
- 8 -- so it is, in a sense, unprecedented.
- **9** Mr. Khan is also the first former CIA prisoner to be
- 10 sentenced, and so I respectfully submit that this case is
- 11 different. It's also different because it covers a 20-year
- 12 period, as we've outlined in our papers.
- 13 You know, a central theme to Mr. Khan's sentencing
- 14 case is to explain -- he didn't just wake up one day and
- 15 decide to become involved with terrorism. He just didn't
- 16 decide one day, because he got up on the wrong side of the
- 17 bed, that he was going to become involved in terrorism. I
- 18 mean, he is where he is today because of a series of events in
- 19 his life and a series of decisions in his life and a series of
- 20 actions that he has taken, all of which he accepts full and
- 21 complete responsibility for and all of which he's here as a
- **22** cooperator trying to atone for.
- 23 Part of that, part of understanding Majid Khan's

- 1 journey from Baltimore to Guantanamo, is to understand what
- 2 happened to him and to understand his decision to cooperate
- 3 with the United States Government despite what happened to
- 4 him.
- 5 Again, I can't say it enough times: He is the only
- 6 high-value detainee who has agreed to plead guilty and to
- 7 cooperate. He is the only one to face sentencing. He is one
- 8 of only two, I believe, detainees at all who's faced a
- **9** contested sentencing proceeding.
- And the only way for those who will decide his fate,
- 11 whether that is Your Honor in connection with pretrial
- 12 punishment, whether that is the panel in connection with the
- 13 sentencing range -- which the government has indicated it will
- 14 try to seek maximum punishment -- or whether that is in terms
- 15 of clemency is to put on a substantial case and to create a
- 16 robust record from which these decisions can be made and from
- 17 which his liberty and his future can be determined.
- Now, with respect to the individuals that we've
- 19 identified, that Your Honor has identified for open session
- 20 argument, I just -- I will make a few comments, and I will
- 21 save most of my comments for the closed session.
- With respect to individual number 1 and individual
- 23 number 8, the government has agreed to produce those two

- 1 individuals but not to bring them to Guantanamo. The
- 2 government has offered to bring that -- to present their
- 3 testimony via VTC. We submit to Your Honor that that is not a
- 4 sufficient method for their communication.
- 5 Individual number 8 does not speak English, will not
- **6** be able to communicate effectively by video. The emotional
- 7 reaction of individual number 8 will not be adequately
- 8 captured by video. There are other factors concerning this
- 9 individual that we have identified in our classified motion.
- 10 Likewise, with respect to number 1, we don't think
- 11 that that individual's testimony would be adequately captured
- 12 by video, including a lot of the discussion about Mr. Khan's
- 13 background, his family.
- And I will say with respect to individuals 1, 6, 7,
- 15 8, 9, and 10, there is ample precedent in the military
- 16 commission system for calling such individuals. I point you
- 17 specifically to the David Hicks case. David Hicks was a
- 18 client of mine for purposes of appeal. And we've addressed
- 19 this in our papers, but similarly situated witnesses were
- 20 brought to Guantanamo for purposes of not only the sentencing
- 21 proceeding but for other proceedings as well, from a foreign
- 22 country.
- I will also point out that individuals number 1, 6,

- 1 7, and 8 are U.S. citizens. They have the same ability,
- 2 Your Honor, to travel to Guantanamo from the United States
- 3 that any of us here in this courtroom do, but for the fact
- 4 that they don't have appropriate country clearances, which the
- 5 government has refused to issue to them.
- 6 I also want to make one legal argument, which is with
- 7 respect to the standard for production. Rule 1001(e) is
- 8 modeled on Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 17(b). That is
- 9 the rule that allows for the compulsion of witnesses at
- 10 government expense.
- 11 These individuals, numbers 1, 6, 7, 8, and even 9 and
- 12 10, are not asking to come at government expense. They will
- 13 come voluntarily. They will appear here voluntarily. If this
- 14 were an ordinary courts-martial in the United States, they
- 15 could walk into the courtroom without any assistance from the
- 16 government. But the fact that this proceeding is taking place
- 17 in Guantanamo, the fact that the United States chose to
- 18 prosecute Mr. Khan here instead of in an Article III court or
- 19 in a court-martial shouldn't change his right and his ability
- 20 to call these individuals, particularly U.S. citizens. As I
- 21 indicated, there are some other factors that perhaps we will
- 22 address in closed session with respect to them.
- Moving to individual number 11, I believe that this

- 1 has been -- this individual has been addressed sufficiently in
- 2 our pleadings. The only thing I will say is that the only
- 3 question right now with respect to this individual is
- 4 Mr. Khan's right to call this individual, to have this
- 5 individual appear. Whether that individual is ultimately
- 6 called would be a decision, a judgment that would be made by
- 7 Mr. Khan in connection with discussions with that individual.
- 8 All we're talking about right now is the right to call this
- 9 individual.
- This is an individual who has been to Guantanamo in
- 11 connection with this case, this very case. As we've explained
- 12 in our papers, this individual was brought to Guantanamo
- 13 previously for purposes of this case by the prosecution.
- 14 We've made a representation in our papers that's gone
- 15 unchallenged by the government, that the government fully
- 16 intended to bring this person back to Guantanamo for purposes
- 17 of Mr. Khan's sentencing until determining what the individual
- 18 would say and the fact that the individual would testify
- **19** favorably to Mr. Khan.
- I respectfully submit, Your Honor, that is not equal
- 21 access to witnesses. That is the government using its
- 22 administrative power to bolster its sentencing case, to avoid
- 23 evidence, to avoid witness testimony that's favorable to

- **1** Mr. Khan. That's improper. That's certainly not the
- 2 Article III standard. It would never be allowed in an
- 3 Article III court.
- 4 Now, with respect to individual 27, this is an
- 5 individual known to all the parties. All I will say is there
- 6 is ample precedent as well in the military commission system
- 7 for this individual to appear in person at Guantanamo. This
- 8 person has appeared in person in Guantanamo many times, will
- 9 likely be brought back for other cases, I assume, in addition
- 10 to this one.
- 11 And I would point you to the Omar Khadr case. In the
- 12 Omar Khadr case, witness number 27, this person's predecessor
- 13 in office testified for -- in support of Mr. Khadr and said in
- 14 substance: I know terrorists, and Omar Khadr is not one of
- **15** them.
- 16 Individual number 27 would say substantially the same
- 17 thing with respect to Mr. Khan: I know Mr. Khan personally.
- 18 I spent time with Mr. Khan. He is not like the others.
- We've provided a more full and complete explanation
- 20 of this individual's proffered testimony. But I think for
- 21 purposes of this session, and in light of the Khadr case in
- 22 which this individual's predecessor provided testimony -- I
- 23 think in that case, it was by VTC because the predecessor was

- 1 deployed overseas -- we should have the right, I respectfully
- 2 submit, to call this individual.
- 3 And with regard to number 27, I will just say also
- 4 there was a question about logistics, dates of availability.
- 5 Those are details that we are happy to compromise and work out
- 6 with the individual and with the prosecution. We do not
- 7 anticipate that this individual will be deployed overseas at
- 8 the relevant time period for purposes of Mr. Khan's
- 9 sentencing. This individual would not otherwise present
- 10 logistical difficulties.
- 11 I do -- one other point, a final point with respect
- 12 to logistics, number -- individuals number 9 and 10. 9 and 10
- 13 are foreign citizens who have the appropriate passports and
- 14 exit visas from their country of citizenship. We have worked
- 15 with that country of citizenship in anticipation of their
- 16 potential travel for purposes of providing testimony in this
- 17 commission. It's been a longstanding discussion with this
- 18 foreign government. We expect those discussions to continue.
- 19 We don't anticipate any problem logistically with the
- 20 exception of these individuals being denied permission to set
- 21 foot in Guantanamo.
- I just want to say by way of emphasis, and for
- 23 reasons that we have explained in our papers, which we can

- 1 address, again, in closed session, individual number 10 is the
- 2 single most important witness for Mr. Khan for reasons that
- $oldsymbol{3}$ should be obvious based on our papers. This individual is the
- 4 most important individual. And if Mr. Khan has the right to
- 5 call one person to appear in Guantanamo to sit in the witness
- 6 chair and testify in his behalf, it should be individual
- **7** number 10.
- 8 I'll just conclude, Your Honor, by saying that we've
- 9 tried to be reasonable. We've tried to be deliberate. We've
- 10 presented -- I'm not a military practitioner, but as I
- 11 understand it, far more in terms of anticipated testimony and
- 12 discussion of relevance, necessity, in-person testimony,
- 13 witness demeanor, all of these factors tried to explain why we
- 14 need these individuals and to explain why Mr. Khan's case is
- 15 unique and it's extraordinary.
- And it is -- whether we're talking about <u>Brady</u> or
- 17 we're talking about witnesses, it is -- it is, in many
- 18 respects, a case of first impression. And it puts Your Honor
- 19 in -- in the position of having to decide that which, from my
- 20 perspective, may be an unenviable decision -- position, but --
- 21 but, nonetheless, it's really important to Mr. Khan, because
- 22 his liberty is at stake.
- Thank you.

- MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you. 2 I have to apologize. In reading the pleadings, I was 3 a little bit confused about witnesses for motions versus 4 witnesses for sentencing.
- 5 So as to the witnesses we're discussing here in open 6 session ----
- 7 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct.

1

- 8 MJ [COL WATKINS]: ---- all of those are for sentencing
- 9 proceedings; is that correct?
- 10 CDC [MR. DIXON]: May I have a moment, Your Honor?
- 11 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Uh-huh.
- 12 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, I don't want to waive the
- 13 ability to call any of those individuals for purposes of
- 14 motions, but the issue of motions is one I believe should be
- 15 addressed in the closed session.
- 16 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay.
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: These individuals that we've been
- 18 talking about in the open session are not sort of the -- I
- 19 don't necessarily anticipate them for purposes of motions, but
- 20 I don't want to waive that.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: No. I understand.
- 22 So the flip side of that is: Of these requested
- 23 witnesses, you are asking for all of them for the sentencing

- 1 proceeding?
- 2 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct.
- **3** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes. Now, you've proffered
- 4 testimony -- and this is an important question in deciding
- 5 their relevance and their method of testimony. These are
- 6 proffers, but has a member of the defense team spoken and
- 7 interviewed each of these witnesses that you've requested? I
- 8 just want to make sure that the proffer, you believe in good
- **9** faith, would be consistent with their testimony.
- 10 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor, I can represent to the court
- 11 that we are in regular contact, and have been since 2006, with
- 12 individuals number 1 -- and I'm excluding the ones -- the
- 13 classified ones ----
- **14** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Right.
- 15 CDC [MR. DIXON]: ---- 1, 6, 7, 8, a little bit less 9 and
- 16 10, just by virtue of the fact that they're located overseas.
- 17 We have had communication with number 11, and I can represent
- 18 that the proffer in our papers is based on an interview of
- 19 individual number 11. 14 and 17, yes, we've had direct
- 20 interaction with. 27, we had had a lot of interaction with.
- **21** So yes, Your Honor.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. Can you address the commission's
- 23 authority to compel a civilian witness's presence at U.S.

- **1** Naval Station Guantanamo Bay?
- 2 And the reason I ask is because the Regulations for
- 3 Trial by Military Commission at 13-5.b. basically says there's
- 4 no authority to compel attendance on the island.
- 5 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Well, I will say two things. One, we
- 6 anticipate that a number of these individuals will travel
- 7 voluntarily. The other thing I'll say is with respect to 14
- 8 and 27, I believe they can be compelled in connection with
- 9 their official duties and responsibilities, employment in the
- 10 United States Government.
- 11 Number 17, I think we will have a substitute. I
- 12 think we agree we will have some form of substituted
- 13 testimony.
- 14 With respect to number 11, as I mentioned,
- 15 Your Honor, this is an ongoing discussion. What we are
- 16 talking about at this point is Mr. Khan's right to compel the
- 17 testimony. Whether we would ultimately seek to do that over,
- 18 say, the witness' objection, I don't know. I think that's an
- 19 ongoing discussion.
- 20 And generally with respect to the regulation, I have
- 21 read the regulation. I don't have it in front of me, but my
- 22 understanding is with respect to -- again, with respect to
- 23 civilians who are employed by the government, that they can be

- 1 compelled.
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Right. I was -- that's a fair point.
- 3 I was more concerned about witnesses who are not employees of
- 4 the United States Government.
- 5 CDC [MR. DIXON]: My understanding is that -- that those
- 6 individuals would certainly -- these individuals would appear
- 7 voluntarily, number 11 being the possible exception. I think
- 8 that we were confident that that individual would appear until
- 9 that individual had subsequent conversations with the
- 10 prosecution, and now that individual has raised some doubt.
- 11 I don't know that that's the final word, but we
- 12 continue -- we'll continue to have conversations with that
- 13 individual. And again, whether that person we would
- 14 ultimately seek to have subpoenaed and dragooned to Guantanamo
- 15 is a decision for another day.
- 16 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have a question about number 13 vice
- 17 number 14, but I really don't want to get into that right now.
- 18 I understand 14 was a typographical error and you meant 15.
- 19 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I think it's 15, Your Honor.
- 20 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Number 27 ----
- 21 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: ---- vice number 21.
- 23 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Number 21 is an individual as to whom

- 1 there is agreement. That's never been an issue.
- 2 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. But you're also requesting 27?
- 3 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Correct. 27 is a -- yes. There has
- 4 always been agreement about 21, and there is disagreement
- 5 about 27. It is 27's predecessor who testified in the Khadr
- 6 case, I believe by video, because that individual was deployed
- 7 at the time overseas, which is not the case with respect to
- 8 27. 27 will be in the continental United States following a
- 9 deployment and will be available, I believe, at or around the
- 10 time of Mr. Khan's scheduled sentencing in July. Certainly,
- 11 we're willing to accommodate that individual in terms of
- 12 in-person testimony.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I guess my question -- and I don't have
- 14 certain things in front of me. 27 offers something that 21
- 15 cannot, is what I'm getting to.
- 16 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Yes. Very much so.
- 17 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Can you flesh that out in open session
- **18** a little bit?
- 19 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I'd rather do it in closed session,
- 20 Your Honor.
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. We will do that.
- 22 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I just want to say, I mean, 21 and 27,
- 23 21, we are in very frequent contact with. 27, we are also --

- 1 notwithstanding where that individual is now, we are also in
- 2 regular contact with. And Ms. Jestin and I interviewed that
- 3 individual most recently a few weeks ago. I'm looking at my
- 4 co-counsel.
- 5 By virtue of the fact that Ms. Jestin and I have been
- 6 involved in this case for so long, we have longstanding
- 7 professional relationships with a number of these individuals,
- 8 including 27. So this request is not a surprise to 27.
- **9** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- 10 One minute, please.
- 11 [Pause.]
- 12 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I'm sorry, Mr. Dixon. I'm balancing
- 13 equities here. I want to make clear -- I want to be clear
- 14 about priorities.
- 15 1 and 8 are clearly your priority for in-court
- **16** testimony as opposed to video teleconference?
- 17 CDC [MR. DIXON]: We clearly prefer that 1 and 8 appear in
- 18 person, yes, but our priority witness is number 10.
- **19** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Okay. I'm sorry.
- 20 CDC [MR. DIXON]: That is the single most important
- 21 witness in this case.
- 22 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes, I got that.
- 23 CDC [MR. DIXON]: We do have something to say about 6 and

- **1** 7, of course, as well, and number 9, but I think we'll save
- 2 that for closed session.
- **3** MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Anything else?
- **4** CDC [MR. DIXON]: No, Your Honor.
- 5 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you very much.
- **6** All right. Any government response?
- 7 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes. Briefly, Your Honor. And I'll
- 8 try to hit on the ones that he hit on, but there will probably
- **9** be some that we may need to discuss a little bit more in
- 10 closed session.
- 11 I'd like to first hit on the -- Mr. Dixon discussing
- 12 how they were trying to be -- the defense was trying to be
- 13 reasonable with their witness requests. As you know, they
- 14 attached at Attachment C to their motion what was their
- 15 original witness request. In it, they gave usually one- to
- 16 two-sentence proffers on what they would testify to on these
- 17 110 named and unnamed individuals.
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Well, is there any relevance for me for
- 19 this other than sniping at each other? I mean, I've got a
- 20 final -- I need to worry about these 29 witnesses, so ----
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Your Honor, in their order, they are
- 22 also requesting you to order us to continue to meet with them
- 23 to discuss the other 80-something witnesses, which we don't

- 1 believe they have met the requirements of 701 or 703 or
- 2 1001(e), but we did willingly give them originally the seven
- 3 witnesses that we indicated. But when looking at 703, we are
- 4 told that I agree with the accused at page 9 of their brief,
- 5 that he specifically bargained for the right to call live
- 6 witnesses and present evidence in extenuation and mitigation.
- 7 That provision in the PTA doesn't give him the right
- 8 to call any witness he wants. They still have to comply with
- 9 703(f) and that it be necessary and relevant.
- 10 MJ [COL WATKINS]: That's the only thing I'm concerned
- 11 about.
- 12 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, Your Honor.
- 13 MJ [COL WATKINS]: That's the only thing I want to hear
- 14 about.
- 15 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Okay. And our position is that the
- 16 witnesses that we have before you now that we haven't already
- 17 made another agreement on, that they do not meet the
- 18 requirements of 1001(e)(2). They -- you have to meet all five
- 19 of the conditions laid out in there, and we have said that we
- 20 would be willing to stipulate at any 1time.
- In addition to this, the rules impose these
- 22 restrictions but allows for alternatives to live testimony,
- 23 including relaxed evidence and alternatives to in-court

- 1 testimony. We have offered to do that in the -- for number 1
- 2 and number 8, I believe. Yes, for number 1; and 8, we have
- 3 stipulated to that.
- 4 They also in their motion state one of the reasons
- 5 why it is imperative that these 29 witnesses be called is
- 6 that -- page 10, they said: The prosecution has signaled its
- 7 intention to present an aggravation case and attempt to
- 8 maximize the punishment imposed on Mr. Khan.
- **9** As you know, as we have met all of our deadlines set
- 10 in place by the litigation scheduling order, we don't have any
- 11 witnesses coming. We have one piece of evidence that we had
- 12 agreed to with the defense at the time of the PTA, which is
- 13 the Prosecution Exhibit 1, which is the stip of fact that he
- 14 agreed to. So the government is baffled by their allegation
- 15 that we are going to present extreme matters in aggravation
- 16 because we have not posted any evidence or witnesses.
- We also, Your Honor, would like to point out in the
- 18 case -- with cases that we cited in our briefing with
- 19 Combs, Briscoe, Mitchell, Courts, there are alternatives to
- 20 testimony, and they did find on sentencing it is not as
- 21 imperative as a case on the merits that witnesses be
- 22 presented.
- Your Honor, the defense brought up when they got up

- 1 here that we had canceled a meeting that we were supposed to
- 2 have to discuss what was the original witness requests. It
- 3 was our determination, based on that witness request, that
- 4 because they didn't meet the requirements of 1001(e) and the
- 5 number of witnesses were so far away from where we could get
- 6 to, that it would not have been a productive meeting at all.
- 7 I would like to go through and address some of the
- 8 witnesses. Particularly, he discussed witness number 11.
- 9 Witness number 11, we have spoken with her. What was
- 10 originally proffered when she was requested as a witness was
- 11 that she was going to testify regarding what -- in our
- 12 opinion, her expertise in terrorism, we didn't feel that that
- 13 was something that she was qualified to do.
- 14 They have given us further proffer since then, when
- 15 they narrowed it down to these 29; and we have asked her if
- 16 she is willing to come, and she has declined. So short of
- 17 issuing a subpoena to take her to the Mark Center, she is
- 18 declining participation.
- With witness number 27, he is currently stationed
- 20 overseas; he's not stationed in the continental U.S. And I
- 21 talked -- we spoke with him. He sent us an e-mail last week.
- 22 And during that time, he will be TDY and in the process of
- 23 PCS'ing from where he lives, so it would cause an extreme

- 1 burden on him. And as you pointed out, what he has to say is
- 2 largely cumulative to witnesses that we've already agreed to
- 3 with the defense to produce.
- 4 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Aside from the cumulative argument, I
- 5 hear from witnesses almost every day who are PCS'ing or TDY or
- 6 in school, and the court makes accommodations for that
- 7 witness.
- 8 Assuming his testimony is not for days, why is that
- **9** such a big deal if it were remote testimony?
- 10 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Testifying via VTC or something like
- 11 that; is that what you are asking?
- **12** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Right.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: I don't think we would have a ----
- **14** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Oh, okay.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: ---- problem with that. We don't --
- 16 we don't have a problem to -- and we put this in our motion,
- 17 and we put it in the response to them, we don't necessarily
- 18 have a problem to alternate forms of testimony if someone is
- 19 necessary, relevant, and meets the other requirements and is
- 20 not cumulative. I don't think we have a problem. And there's
- 21 a lot of options available to the defense, whether it be via
- 22 VTC; if they relax the rules of evidence, they can put it in
- 23 letters. We can stipulate to a verifiable fact with them to

- 1 make this happen. A lot of these we felt were cumulative,
- 2 however.
- In this particular witness, he's -- he's very much
- 4 indicated that during that time when we're currently scheduled
- 5 to go, it would cause him a personal hardship. Could we
- 6 probably get him available via VTC? I think he would be
- 7 amenable to do that. It's better than trying to fly him all
- 8 the way here from Europe while he's in the middle of a PCS. I
- 9 think it's a concern on that one.
- As for witness number 1 and 8, we have agreed to
- 11 produce them via video teleconference from the Mark Center in
- 12 the National Capital Region. We feel that due to the
- 13 practical difficulties of producing the civilian family member
- 14 here at the very highly secure detention facility just doesn't
- 15 meet the burdens established by -- the rules established by
- **16** 1001(e).
- 17 Witness number 6, we just feel that there is no
- 18 extraordinary circumstances involved. That was a quote used
- 19 from a number of the cases that we cited, talked about
- 20 extraordinary circumstances when producing witnesses. There
- 21 was one case where they did not produce the father of the
- 22 accused when it was an overseas case. In another one, they
- 23 didn't produce the mother. It's very standard for -- if

- 1 they're not cumulative, to be able to go ahead and do an
- 2 alternative form of testimony; or the accused is always open
- 3 to submit, if he relaxes the rules, as many letters as he
- 4 desires supporting his case.
- 5 Without discussing the other witnesses that we need
- 6 to discuss in the closed session, we look forward to
- 7 discussing each of those with you when we go into closed
- 8 session. And we're willing to answer any questions that you
- 9 have at this time regarding the witnesses that we just
- 10 discussed.
- 11 But again, we -- we would urge you to deny them in
- 12 that they have not met the requirements of 1001(e), but we are
- 13 willing, for noncumulative, relevant witnesses to do a stip of
- 14 fact or do alternative forms of testimony.
- 15 MJ [COL WATKINS]: All right. Thank you.
- I have a couple of questions.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, sir.
- 18 MJ [COL WATKINS]: One moment, please.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, sir.
- 20 [Pause.]
- 21 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you. That's all.
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, sir.
- 23 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I just wanted to check my notes. I

- 1 don't have any further questions.
- 2 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: Yes, sir.
- **3** MJ [COL WATKINS]: Defense, any rebuttal argument?
- 4 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll be brief.
- I want to begin by addressing a statement that trial
- 6 counsel made. I believe the trial counsel said that
- 7 Your Honor had indicated that 21 and 27 were cumulative. I
- 8 don't believe Your Honor has indicated that.
- **9** MJ [COL WATKINS]: I have not.
- 10 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Your Honor did, I believe ----
- 11 MJ [COL WATKINS]: I wanted to know -- I'm asking
- 12 questions. I haven't made any assertions about anybody being
- 13 cumulative.
- 14 CDC [MR. DIXON]: Let me say with respect to 21 and 27, to
- 15 be clear -- and I'll be happy to address this tomorrow in the
- 16 closed session in greater detail, but 21 and 27 have different
- 17 roles, responsibilities, and involvement with respect to
- 18 Mr. Khan. It is qualitatively different. There's obviously
- **19** some overlap, but it's qualitatively different.
- They also cover different time periods. 27 -- 27,
- 21 the relevant time period, I believe, is approximately two
- 22 years, between 2011 and '13. 21 covers a period, I'll just
- 23 say, begins approximately 2016; I will not give you an end

- 1 date for that at this time. So they cover different time
- 2 periods.
- 3 That's important for the reason that I outlined at
- 4 the beginning of my remarks, which is this is not an ordinary
- 5 case. Mr. Khan has been at Guantanamo since September 2006.
- 6 He's been cooperating for seven years, and that's -- there is
- 7 no one or two witnesses who can cover that entire time period
- 8 adequately for purposes of his sentencing.
- **9** So it's not just a question of, you know, are you
- 10 generally relevant and necessary, but over an extended period
- 11 of time to show things like cooperation over an extended
- 12 period of time, a period of time that is unprecedented in the
- 13 military justice system as far as I know. There has not ever
- 14 been a case as far as I know like Mr. Khan, ever. Whether
- 15 it's commissions or courts-martial, I'm not aware of a single
- 16 case that even comes close in terms of the breadth and extent
- **17** of cooperation.
- The other thing I want to say is that the government
- 19 remarked on the narrowing of our request for production of
- 20 witnesses. As we explained in our papers, we did -- we make
- 21 decisions all the time for strategic reasons to narrow our
- 22 case, and we continue to do that. We will continue to do
- **23** that.

1 With respect to the meet and confer, I mean, it --2 our motion to compel is with respect to these 29 or 30 3 individuals. That's now, I believe, been reduced even 4 somewhat during the course of this proceeding today. We would 5 like to meet and confer with respect to the others, but we 6 haven't moved to compel the rest of them. We've moved to 7 compel 29 or 30 individuals. So that's what this motion is 8 about. I just want to be clear about that. 9 With respect to stipulations and other compromises, I 10 would say we've tried, and we've had a little bit of progress 11 here today; and perhaps tomorrow, we'll have a little bit of 12 progress as well in that regard. But we've tried. And we 13 have explained this in our papers, and I will have to say, you 14 know, from our side of the podium, I mean, we're left with the 15 impression that compromise is not an option for the 16 prosecution. And I think that will become crystal clear 17 tomorrow, but, you know, we certainly infer that there really 18 isn't an ability to meet and confer. We've tried. 19 The last point I want to make is with respect to the 20 It is true that the government has offered to produce 21 individuals number 1 and 8 by VTC and is claiming that it is 22 too burdensome to produce them in person and also is claiming 23 that 6 and 7 can't be produced in any fashion.

1 Those four individuals are U.S. citizens. They live 2 in the United States. They have the same legal rights that we 3 have, that I have, that Your Honor has. They have the same 4 ability to travel. And it is no more or less burdensome for 5 them to travel to Guantanamo than the individuals who are 6 sitting in the back of the courtroom observing these 7 proceedings, the visitors, the NGOs, the media. It is no more 8 or less burdensome for these U.S. citizens to travel to 9 Guantanamo. All they need are country clearances. We're not 10 asking for the United States Government to fund them, just 11 simply allow them to come to Guantanamo the way the observers 12 in this courtroom are allowed to come to Guantanamo. 13 With respect to individuals 9 and 10 -- 10, again, 14 being the single most important witness for Mr. Khan -- there 15 is precedent in these military commission proceedings, direct 16 and on point, and that is the David Hicks case. We addressed 17 this in our papers. 18 In the Hicks case, individuals comparable -- directly 19 comparable to individuals -- to witnesses 9 and 10 were 20 permitted to attend in person on multiple occasions, not just 21 in connection with sentencing. So for purposes of the Hicks 22 case, these individuals should be in the courtroom now 23 observing these proceedings, but they're not because the

- 1 government won't let them travel here.
- 2 So I want to conclude by saying this is not equal
- 3 access to witnesses and evidence which is guaranteed by the
- 4 Military Commissions Act, applicable military rules, or the
- 5 practice in Article III. Your Honor should respectfully grant
- 6 the motion.
- 7 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Thank you.
- **8** Okay. Before I describe the way ahead, is there
- 9 anything else to take up now in open session by either party?
- 10 TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: No, Your Honor.
- 11 CDC [MR. DIXON]: No, Your Honor.
- 12 MJ [COL WATKINS]: Government, I don't need anything else
- 13 to rule on Appellate Exhibit 030C. I'm required by the Rules
- 14 of Military Commissions to issue a written ruling on that
- 15 request, so I'm going to be recessing the court -- or the
- 16 commission, excuse me.
- We will conduct an M.C.R.E. 505(h) session starting
- 18 at 1330 tomorrow. We may need to conduct a closed R.M.C. 803
- 19 session at some time thereafter. I'll know more about that
- 20 tomorrow after the 505(h) session.
- 21 Any questions?
- TC [Lt Col PRIMOLI]: No, Your Honor.
- 23 CDC [MR. DIXON]: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Just to confirm.

1	We are beginning tomorrow at 1330?
2	MJ [COL WATKINS]: Yes. And the delay is because of the
3	requirement for me to complete the ruling on the 505(h)
4	request. And it gives both parties an opportunity to
5	conference with each other or with their clients prior to
6	going into closed session.
7	CDC [MR. DIXON]: Thank you.
8	MJ [COL WATKINS]: The commission is in recess.
9	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1602, 1 April 2019.]
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	