1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 0904,2 25 July 2022.]

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: This commission is called to order.
Trial Counsel, good morning. Please identify who's
here on behalf of the United States, that they have the
necessary clearance, and whether they are located here or
appearing remotely in the Remote Hearing Room in the National
Capital Region.

9 TC [MR. MILLER]: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you.
10 These proceedings are being transmitted via CCTV to public
11 viewing locations in the United States pursuant to your order
12 in AE 028M.

Present for the United States here in Guantanamo, as
identified in detailing memorandum AE 3380, as in Oscar:
Myself, Mark Miller; Mr. John Wells; Major Michael Ross; Major
Stephen Romeo. Also assisting the government will be Forrest
Parker Smith, Mr. Pascual Tavarez-Patine, and Staff Sergeant
Jaune Daniels.

Also present in the Remote Hearing Room in northern
Virginia for the prosecution, Your Honor: Lieutenant
Commander Cherie Jolly, Lieutenant Commander Keven Schreiber,
and Lieutenant Tess Schwartz, who will need to put her
qualifications on the record. And they are being assisted by

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Master Sergeant Laura Speranza.

2	With your permission, Your Honor, I would ask that
3	Lieutenant Schwartz be allowed to make her appearance at this
4	time and announce her qualifications to the commission.
5	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes.
6	TC [MR. MILLER]: I would also add, Your Honor, that all
7	persons, present here or in the Remote Hearing Room, have the
8	necessary clearances and qualifications.
9	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you, Counsel.
10	Lieutenant Schwartz, if you could please put your
11	detailing qualifications on the record, please.
12	ATC [LCDR SCHREIBER]: Your Honor, this is Lieutenant
13	Commander Schreiber. Lieutenant Schwartz had a uniform
14	problem and her husband had to come support her. She's
15	literally on her way back up the elevator. We were
16	anticipating she would be able to get up before we came to
17	order, but unfortunately did not. If we could give her a
18	brief indulgence, sir.
19	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I will grant that indulgence. What
20	we'll do, after I get information from defense counsel, we'll

22 that, Government Counsel, just remind me.

23 TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor.

21

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

have her put it on the record. And if I -- if I blast past

1 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Good morning, Defense Counsel. Good2 morning.

LDC [MR. NATALE]: Good morning, Your Honor. Anthony
Natale on behalf of Mr. Nashiri, who is present in court.
Also present here at the ELC is Captain Mizer, Ms. Carmon,
Mr. Padilla, Ms. Morgan, Ms. Janes, and Mr. Dolphin.
Ms. Janes and Mr. Dolphin may need to come and go as needed.

8 In the RHR we have Commander Piette, Ms. Pinate,
9 Mr. Hoffmann, Ms. Brown, Mr. Roosevelt, and Staff Sergeant
10 McGuire. All of these individuals have the necessary
11 clearances and qualifications to be present.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you, Defense Counsel. It appears
Commander Piette looks alone on his side. Are those other
individuals there or are they going to show up?

LDC [MR. NATALE]: They are -- they are supposed to show up and be there. So maybe what I should say, Your Honor, is that we expect them to be coming and sometimes maybe going based on what evidence we need to have them do or things we need them to do. I am assuming that Mr. Piette is there, although from what I can see, I think I see his reflection, but I'm not sure.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: It's only his reflection behind him.
 Commander Piette, are you there indeed alone? You can

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 answer from counsel -- Commander Piette, can you hear me?

2 DDC [LCDR PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Are you there alone?

DDC [LCDR PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor. The other people are
in the building and will come up and go as necessary, is my
understanding.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you.

8 Counsel, as a reminder -- I know I say this every
9 time -- the RHR is an extension of the well of this courtroom.
10 Only personnel that are authorized to be in this courtroom are
11 authorized to be in the RHR. It's not an observation point.
12 Please enforce that vigorously.

I'm looking at you, government, because you tend to
bring in the most extra people occasionally, so it's -- if
there -- if I wouldn't allow them in here, then I don't want
them up there. Thank you.

17 TC [MR. MILLER]: Understood, Your Honor.

18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Trial Counsel, I think you
19 mentioned it, that we are being broadcast over closed-circuit
20 TV with the orders to that effect?

21 TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you.

23 All right. The accused is present today.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Good morning, Mr. Nashiri. I'll now advise you of 2 your right to be present and to waive said presence. You have 3 the right to be present during all sessions of the commission. 4 If you request to absent yourself from any session, such 5 absence must be voluntary and of your own freewill. Your 6 voluntary absence from any session of the commission is an 7 equivocal waiver of the right to be present during the 8 session. Your absence from any session may negatively affect 9 the representation of your defense in this case. Your failure 10 to meet with and cooperate with your defense counsel may also 11 negatively affect the presentation of your case.

Under certain circumstances, your attendance at a
session can be compelled regardless of your personal desire to
not be present.

15 Regardless of your voluntary waiver to attend a 16 particular session of the commission, you have the right at 17 any time to decide to attend any subsequent session. If you 18 decide not to attend the morning session but wish to attend 19 the afternoon session, you must notify the guard force of your 20 desires. Assuming there's enough time to arrange 21 transportation, you will then be allowed to attend the 22 afternoon session.

23

You will be informed of the date and time of each

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

commission session prior to the session to afford you the
 opportunity to decide whether or not you wish to attend.

3 Do you understand what I've just explained to you?
4 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: Yes. Yes.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Since our session ended in
May, we conducted two R.M.C. 802 conferences. The first was
held on 26 May with counsel for both sides. The following
issues were discussed at the 26 May session:

9 The docket for this session, including which motions
10 the commission needs to receive evidence on and hear argument,
11 was the first topic, which there was uniform agreement on from
12 the parties as to which ones we were going to hear.

13 The bulk of the conference concerned the need to
14 litigate the admissibility of the -- I believe the number is
15 116 hearsay statements that the government plans on
16 introducing. I informed the party that it was and remains the
17 intent of the commission to decide the admissibility of each
18 statement on an individual basis and that the parties must be
19 prepared to litigate each statement on an individual basis.

The commission informed the parties that the proposed plan to only litigate five of the statements during this session of the commission was an insufficient and inefficient use of our time, and informed the parties that they needed to

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

be prepared to litigate more than the five proposed
 statements.

3 The remainder of the 802 conference was the commission 4 again informing the parties of which other motions the 5 commission would hear during this session to which both 6 parties agreed. This plan was memorialized in the docketing 7 order for this session, and it supplements in AE 483, 483B, 8 and 483C.

9 Later in July of 2022, after receiving the proposed 10 litigation plan for this session which only included planning 11 on hearing about the five statements, the commission again 12 reminded the parties of its previous direction to be prepared 13 to argue and present evidence on more than the five hearsay 14 statements originally proposed.

A second 802 conference was held yesterday where we discussed the order of the -- of the events for this session, including our -- the 505(h) hearing which will be necessary that we will get an update on 473, 474. The commission will address 339X prior to the 505(h). That we will take argument -- then I will take argument, pardon me, on 452D and 475.

I got an update on witness availability, includingthat of Agent Gaudin.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

We discussed the argument for 461, that we will only
 hear the legal -- a legal objection from the government on
 that issue.

4 At the end of the session, I gave the government three 5 things to do which is, one, is to provide the corroborating 6 evidence for the -- for the hearsay statements to the defense; 7 that the government provide the list of the additional -- the 8 statements in addition -- the specific statements that they 9 intend to proffer at this session to the defense; and that the 10 parties confer regarding an issue regarding the defense's 11 marking and submission of exhibits that it intends to use 12 during this session.

Do counsel have anything they'd like to add or any objections they would like to make to my summary of our 802 session?

16 Government?

17 TC [MR. MILLER]: No, Your Honor.

18 LDC [MR. NATALE]: No, Your Honor.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. All right.

First, the parties have agreed to at least begin
addressing and for the commission to begin its inquiry into
the issue of Captain Mizer and his motion to withdraw from
representation of Mr. al Nashiri presented in 339X. In 339X,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

filed on 17 June 2022 by Captain Mizer, again he filed a
 motion to withdraw from the case based upon a conflict of
 interest with a former client, Salim Ahmed Hamdan.

As background on this issue, Captain Mizer represented
Mr. Hamdan beginning in October 2007 until September 2009,
when Captain Mizer left active duty. However, Captain Mizer
asserts that he continued to assist with Mr. Hamdan's case
until the case was dismissed with prejudice on 16
October 2012.

Prior to Captain Mizer's initial detail to this case against Mr. Nashiri, the government produced the statements of Mr. Hamdan to the defense of Mr. Nashiri. This production occurred in December 2011 and again in January 2012. Captain Mizer began representing Mr. al Nashiri for the first time on July 2013, when he was detailed to this case.

Not long after Captain Mizer was detailed to this
case, the government gave notice on 17 September 2013 of an
intent to introduce into evidence in this case the hearsay
statements of Mr. Hamdan. Captain Mizer continued to
represent Mr. Nashiri in this case until Captain Mizer's
release from this case in October of 2015.

22 Captain Mizer was later recalled to active duty in May23 of 2018, and was once again detailed to represent the accused

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 in this case. At that time, Captain Mizer was, for the second 2 time -- at the time that Captain Mizer was detailed again to 3 enter -- to this case, the government had not withdrawn its 4 intent to introduce Mr. Hamdan's hearsay statements in this 5 case. Altogether, Captain Mizer has represented the accused 6 for six years since the government provided notice of its 7 intent to rely in this case on the hearsay statements of 8 Mr. Hamdan.

9 On 19 May 2021, this commission published a litigation 10 schedule, AE 440, setting deadlines related to the litigation 11 of the admissibility of hearsay statements in this case. The 12 first deadline relating to hearing of the admissibility of 13 hearsay statements, such as the statements made by Mr. Hamdan, 14 was almost a year ago on 29 July 2021. In that litigation 15 schedule, the commission made it clear that we would be 16 litigating the admission of hearsay statements in the upcoming 17 sessions of the commission.

18 On 26 May 2022, the commission conducted an R.C. -- as 19 I stated before, we conducted an R.M.C. 802 conference with 20 the parties where the commission discussed litigating the 21 admissibility of hearsay statements. Captain Mizer was 22 present at that conference and he did not raise any concern 23 regarding the potential conflict related to the litigation of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 hearsay at that time.

On 9 June 2022, the commission published AE 483, the
docketing order for this session, which included litigation of
hearsay statements. On that same day, the defense moved to
suppress the hearsay statements by Mr. Hamdan.

6 On 17 June 2022, again Captain Mizer filed 339X,
7 seeking to withdraw from the representation, citing the
8 litigation related to the admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's
9 hearsay statements as the reason for the conflict of interest
10 and his need to withdraw.

11 The basis for Captain Mizer's request to withdraw is
12 essentially that he represented Mr. Hamdan and cannot reveal
13 information he learned from Mr. Hamdan, and that Mr. Hamdan
14 and Mr. al Nashiri have conflicting interests.

15 The defense has responded to Captain Mizer's motion in 16 AE 339AA, AA, stating that Mr. al Nashiri opposes Captain 17 Mizer's withdrawal and the defense alleges that the government 18 has created a conflict to manipulate the composition of 19 Mr. al Nashiri's defense team. The defense goes on to argue 20 that the defense can moot this -- that the -- pardon me, that 21 the government can eliminate this issue by not introducing 22 Mr. Hamdan's statements.

23

The defense suggests that Captain Mizer's withdrawal

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 from the case would irreparably prejudice the defense.

2 Finally, in AE 485, filed on 15 July 2022, the defense 3 again moved to suppress Mr. Hamdan's hearsay statements. And 4 their argument seems to center on the prejudice to the accused 5 that would result from Captain Mizer's withdrawal from the 6 case. The defense argues that if the commission does not 7 suppress Mr. Hamdan's statements, the defense would require an 8 indefinite continuance so that another attorney can be 9 appointed to advise Mr. al Nashiri regarding Mr. -- pardon me, 10 regarding Captain Mizer's alleged conflict.

A potential conflict of interest is a serious concern which requires inquiry by the commission. The accused has the right to conflict-free counsel. The source of this alleged conflict of the statements, again, made by Mr. Hamdan regarding the accused.

Due to the importance of ensuring that Mr. al Nashiri is not prejudiced by any potential conflicts of interest, the commission agreed to initially take up Captain Mizer's motion in this session. The government has concurred, but we're not scheduled to take up the admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's statements during this session.

All right. Captain Mizer, if you could come up to the
podium. I'm going to -- I'm going to begin an inquiry into

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 this issue. Captain Mizer, is it safe to assume that you've 2 not shared any confidential client information regarding 3 Mr. Hamdan with the defense team? 4 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Of course, Judge. 5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I know I'm asking some obvious 6 questions, but I just need to get it on the record as part of 7 the inquiry. 8 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Sure. 9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Safe to say that you knew of this 10 potential conflict issue as early as your own detailing to 11 this case but no later than 17 September 2013, when the notice 12 of intent to introduce the statements was provided by the 13 government to the al Nashiri defense team? 14 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, Judge. And I could, not in this 15 setting, provide an explanation for decisions that were made, 16 but ----17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No -- oh, I understand. 18 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: I was aware, Judge, and I raised it with supervisory counsel at the time. 19 20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I understand. This is at the 21 beginning -- this is the -- the beginning of the inquiry. I'm 22 starting it today.

23 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Okay.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I don't know when I'm going to finish
this, but I'm starting it today.

3 So has this conflict existed since you were detailed
4 to this case back in 2013, in light of the government's
5 expressed intent to admit Mr. Hamdan's statements?

6 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: As I laid out in the application, 7 Judge, that was not the view at the time. I mean, this is -this is different than an individual being put on a witness 8 9 list in, say, federal court as in the -- the number of cases 10 that we've signed -- or submitted to the -- to the commission. 11 I mean, there is this issue that still remains unresolved as 12 to whether or not this is a constitutional procedure. And so 13 in my mind ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The admission of hearsay statements?
DDC [CAPT MIZER]: The admission of hearsay statements.
MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well -- so -- but you were aware of at
17 least the potential of a conflict as early as 2013?

DDC [CAPT MIZER]: A potential conflict, yes, Judge. But I'm not telling you anything that you don't know, Judge, that this 116 testimonial hearsay statements aren't going to come into any court-martial or any federal court. And until that issue is resolved, it is a speculative conflict in my mind. MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But yet you still -- I still haven't

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ruled on any of those as well, and you've still applied to
2 withdraw. So does the conflict exist as we sit here now or
3 not?

DDC [CAPT MIZER]: It does, Judge, and the reason -you're exactly right that you haven't ruled, but you've also
been very clear that you want to start taking those
statements.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Uh-huh.

9 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: And so in my mind, even though there is 10 not perhaps that de jure ruling, we're proceeding with that 11 evidentiary foundation. And that trigger doesn't happen when 12 whatever agent, whether it's Barghouty or Ali Soufan sits in 13 that box. This team needs to prepare for that. And I am 14 actively withholding confidential, privileged, and even 15 classified information from this defense team that they need. 16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. But you knew about it at least, 17 then, a year ago when I put it on the litigation schedule 18 then?

19 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, Judge. And the ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. That's all I need. Because
21 that's when I -- that's when we put it on the schedule.

22 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, sir.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why was there a delay until now to raise

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 this issue?

DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Your Honor, I think I put it in the
application. There was a ruling on the Fourth Amendment which
signaled a pretty clear intent as to the <u>Boumediene</u> analysis,
which would govern not just the Fourth Amendment, the Fifth
Amendment, but also the Sixth Amendment, and the commission is
proceeding with that evidentiary hearing.

8 This is not something that I do lightly, Judge. I
9 have gone as far as I possibly think that I ethically can to
10 assist this defense team ----

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

12 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: ---- with this litigation, but I'm up
13 against it now, Judge. And that was the issue.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: In light of the fact that we're not
going to be litigating the admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's
hearsay statements at this session, is there a need to resolve
this conflict issue now?

DDC [CAPT MIZER]: I think that there is, Judge, because I think you're either doing it this session, or if it's in the October session, I have information that this team needs and I ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You can't ever provide it to themanyway, though.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: I can't.

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You can never provide it to them3 regardless, correct?

4 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: That's absolutely right, unless
5 Mr. Hamdan waives, and he has no intention of doing that,
6 Judge.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. Oh, I understand. But -- I
8 understand. You cannot provide the information. That's not
9 going to change one way or the other, correct?

10 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, Judge.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. That -- that's all I want to hear. You haven't provided it, you haven't provided it to Mr. Nashiri, and you haven't provided it to the defense team, and you can never provide it, because of your duty of confidentiality to your former client, correct?

16 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: That is right, Judge.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

DDC [CAPT MIZER]: But it is my view that we are now proceeding with conflicted counsel and that I've carried the ball as far as I can carry it, Judge. And I've thrown the flag, not lightly, knowing what I know, where I can't do it any longer.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If the issue is admissibility of a

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 hearsay statement and there's no possibility that you'd be put
2 in the position of cross-examining a former client, does that
3 change the calculus in any way?

4 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: I doesn't, Judge. It doesn't. And 5 part of the calculus is, as I submitted in the application, 6 those five hearsay statements were selected -- the five 7 hearsay statements that we're going to litigate certainly were 8 selected for a variety of bases. With respect to the two 9 Yemeni witnesses, it's part of the defense's argument that 10 they're not available.

We would make the same argument -- I would submit that
Mr. Hamdan should be on that witness list and I can
potentially make that happen, but I ethically can't make that
happen for this defense team, Judge.

15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood.

16 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: That's part of the conflict.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: One of the cases that you cited, and you brought up that you brought up several cases, and one of them was <u>U.S. v. Williams</u>, suggests the use of auxiliary counsel to cross-examine a defense counsel's former client might, under certain circumstances, be an appropriate remedy to the type of conflict which your application is concerned. Would that remedy be appropriate here?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: I don't believe that it would be, 2 Judge. I think, again, the statement doesn't even come in if 3 I could assist this team in producing Mr. Hamdan. I mean, that's -- that's one of the -- the core issues at issue here 4 5 and I ethically can't do that because that is not in 6 Mr. Hamdan's interest, in the same way that it wasn't in 7 Mr. al Hilah's interest. Williams is a Fourth Circuit case, 8 Obviously, I'm interested in the Fourth Circuit as a Judge. 9 Virginia lawyer, but I also gave you two cases from the D.C. 10 District Courts where they rejected that. Even with -- with 11 both waivers, Judge.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood. I'm just -- like I said,
13 this is the beginning of an inquiry, not the end.

14 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, Judge.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The -- if the commission were to delay litigation of Mr. Hamdan's statements until, say, closer to the beginning of trial, could you not continue to represent Mr. al Nashiri without conflict?

19 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Judge ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If we're not talking about Mr. Hamdan.
 He's the only person to which your conflict applies, correct?
 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: That is absolutely right.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. And you've represented him for

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

six years up until now, ably. And I would say if that is
 delayed, just for time, for a particular period of time, could
 you not continue to represent Mr. Nashiri on the remaining - the remainder of the case to a point?

5 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Judge, it is my view that now that 6 certain red lines have been tripped, that the confrontation 7 clause isn't going to prevent this from happening, and that he 8 is, in fact, going -- going to be a witness. I mean, I 9 submitted that application, the government could have come 10 back and said we're not even going to use the statement. I'm 11 not suggesting that's right or wrong. It's their case, but 12 their decisions trigger certain ethical obligations that I 13 have.

And so knowing that the confrontation clause isn't going to bar testimonial hearsay and that we're going to start hearing that at this session and knowing that he is, in fact, going to be a witness, I think this is the cleanest way rather than proceeding with conflicted counsel for ----

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well ----

20 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: ---- a number of months.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You've been proceeding for six years,
Counsel, that you say, in a conflicted way. That's why I
don't understand why it's a -- it's an emergent issue now.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Judge, it is the same argument that was 2 made with respect to Mr. Paradis back in 2012 when this issue 3 came up with Mr. Bahlul. Mr. Paradis was there to write legal 4 motions. As you know, that legal motion deadline has come and 5 gone. I'm an appellate lawyer. I filled a certain role on 6 this team. But now we're getting down to brass tacks. We're 7 getting down to evidence. We're getting down to the actual 8 hearsay, and this team needs to prepare for it. It is my 9 responsibility to the commission, to Mr. Nashiri, to this 10 defense team and, frankly, to the prosecution, to throw the 11 flag once I think that the gator has gotten too close to the 12 boat, and that's all I've done, Judge.

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you. I have no14 further questions for you at this time.

15 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Yes, Judge.

16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Part of the -- Captain 17 Mizer's application and I think part of the defense response 18 was a request to grant a continuance to resolve this issue. 19 The commission denies the request for a continuance at this 20 time. As I stated before, Captain Mizer has ably represented 21 the accused in this case for several years -- yes, several 22 years -- never raising this potential conflict to the 23 commission.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

The conflict, if one exists, is isolated to the
 statements of Mr. Hamdan and the potential admission of
 those -- of that particular statement or those particular
 statements. The admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's statements will
 not be before the commission during this session.

6 As Captain Mizer has for several years provided 7 representation to Mr. al Nashiri while -- all while knowing of 8 this potential issue, there's no need to grant the continuance 9 while the commission considers this matter or conducts further 10 inquiry.

If the Military Commission's Defense Office desires, it may appoint an independent counsel to advise the accused on this issue. The Military Commissions Defense Office may also seek appointment of alternate counsel to eventually assume Captain Mizer's role should Captain Mizer's application for withdrawal be granted. The commission will take up further inquiry and arguments on 339X at a later date.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, the defense would seek 19 to be heard to make a record as to Mr. al Nashiri's rights on 20 this matter.

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You may proceed.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And Your Honor, to -- just as an
initial matter, Mr. al Nashiri has not been advised as to ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why not? Why not? I'm looking at - besides Captain Mizer, I'm looking at four other attorneys,
 including capital-gualified attorney ----

4 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- who has not had this conversation6 with him.

7 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood. No attorneys on the team8 have, and ----

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why?

10 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: If we want to get into a more 11 substantive conversation, Your Honor, we can do that in 12 ex parte. But the defense position is that this very well 13 maybe an imputed conflict. Now, the ----

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: How so?

15 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Well, Your Honor, from a legal basis, 16 what is unique about military practice is that the effective 17 assistance of counsel, when a team is composed of civilian and 18 military lawyers, is that the effective assistance is judged 19 as a team -- by the team as a whole, and that comes most 20 recently from United States v. McCollum. I'm sorry. And that 21 draws on 60 years of military practice, both come in CAAF 22 cases going back, I believe, to 1972.

23

And so what's really unique, Your Honor, about the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

jurisdiction we're practicing in is -- you know, typically
 you'd be in federal court. You'd have a law firm. One
 counsel is conflicted, now the firm can't represent. You have
 one PD's office, you have a PD who's conflicted, well, now
 that PD's office can't represent. You're pulling from a CJA
 panel.

7 We function in this really weird society where
8 military counsel have been allowed to often represent clients
9 that are somewhat closer -- you know, we touch conspiracy
10 cases within the same regional defense offices. But ----

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That's why you haven't advised him,
12 right?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: No, Your Honor. We haven't advised him because what's unique about our team is this issue -- let's assume Captain Mizer has an actual conflict. Let's assume that going forward today, by doing anything in this case, that he is now lumbering under an actual conflict. That means that Mr. al Nashiri is receiving the ineffective assistance of counsel.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If that -- if that conflict has existed,
21 then it's existed since 2013.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Respectfully, Your Honor, I would
disagree, and I'm happy to address the commission as to why.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 But ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I don't -- again, I don't -- I'm not
prepared to hear entire -- the entire argument on this issue
today. I'm beginning the inquiry to -- to go forward.

5 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood.

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: It sounds like you're suggesting that 7 you're -- that because of the beginning of the taking up of 8 other people's hearsay statements that are not Mr. Hamdan's, 9 that now there's a conflict that has materialized now.

10 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Your Honor, the defense position is 11 that this must be handled now. And again, the need to make 12 the appellate record on this point, the defense position is 13 should we lumber forward today? And if there is an actual 14 conflict, which from an appellate perspective will be reviewed 15 on a de novo standard, if there is an actual conflict for 16 Captain Mizer and we proceed, that when that is analyzed, if 17 that conflict existed, it will mean that Mr. al Nashiri has 18 received ineffective assistance of counsel.

And what is unique about our jurisdiction is that you
cannot have ineffective assistance of just a single counsel.
If there is an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, it
will be against the entire team.

23

And so the question then is whether all of us -- and

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

while Captain Mizer is correct that he has not shared any
 confidential information, nor would he, there is information
 that we do know that could potentially impute a conflict onto
 members of the team.

5 So looking at this -- and I don't say this lightly, 6 Your Honor. We are playing with fire here. We are playing 7 with issues that won't maybe turn this case on appeal but will turn this case on appeal. And so recognizing the need to 8 9 protect Mr. al Nashiri's rights to effective assistance of 10 counsel and recognizing his need to protect his rights to his 11 counsel of choice, the defense has, in our best ethical and 12 professional judgment, elected not to advise him as to the 13 potential consequences of continuing -- of waiving the 14 conflict that might exist -- or that we believe does exist 15 with Mr. Hamdan. We believe that ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But it didn't exist -- it didn't exist for the previous six years. It only began to exist in June. ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Respectfully, Your Honor, I think that there is -- there is a distinction. Conflicts are a term of art. There is a speculative conflict, potential conflict, and there's an actual conflict. And an attorney's ethical obligations are triggered when an actual conflict arises.

23 In 2013, when Captain Mizer was assigned to this case,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 there was a speculative conflict. And as Captain Mizer said
2 when he came on this case, he came on as an appellate
3 attorney.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, I understand.

5 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Now, what I think -- point needs to be 6 made, Your Honor, and cannot be stressed enough, are the 7 unique circumstances in which Captain Mizer left and came back 8 to this case. Captain Mizer was demobilized in 2015. Captain Mizer did not accept orders. He did not volunteer to come 9 10 back here. He was, you know, to use a naval term, impressed into service. In 2017, Captain Mizer was ordered back onto 11 12 this case by the prior military judge.

Now, the government was aware of this. It is not a -the obligation to bring things to the attention of the commission is not an obligation that solely flows from the defense. And I would point out, Captain Mizer does not have the authority or the ability to waive this conflict and unilaterally choose to continue ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, I understand that. But he has, asall attorneys do, the obligation to raise conflicts.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, you have heard --- MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And it's been -- and he's been on since
 2018, when this has continued -- he's been continuously on

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

this case since 2018, that's four years now, since the
 beginning of his second period of representation of
 Mr. al Nashiri, while this conflict issue was there.

I don't -- I'm not sure that I buy your argument that there was a triggering event that caused this conflict to spring into -- into existence, and I don't know that the rules, that the ethical rules that bind attorneys, both in the military and in their individual jurisdictions, their state bars, support such a finding.

I did not ask -- there is a -- to me, there's a question of whether or not this existed from the beginning, and that the -- and that the request for this -- this raising of this issue now is -- is questionable as to why it's raised now ----

15 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- in my mind. That's -- that's what
springs to mind for me. An ungenerous of view of this would
be that there's a timing issue with this.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, I think the defense
position would be it's questionable as to why it was raised
with Mr. Paradis in 2012 and six months later not raised with
Captain Mizer -- Commander Mizer.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. The government raised an issue

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 as far as Mr. Paradis is concerned, correct?

2 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: But ----

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And then this issue ----

4 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, again ----

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- was known by Captain Mizer since6 2013.

7 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And in the event that the commission 8 has any concerns about Captain Mizer acting in any manner, or 9 the defense acting in any manner that is anything other than 10 completely above board, I would implore this commission to 11 then move into an ex parte session because we can happily 12 answer any questions.

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That is -- that is the consideration14 that I'm ----

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: But -- but I would just, again, walking through -- and I apologize, Your Honor. I didn't mean to ----MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. No, I -- I know that that is a -that is a tool that other courts have used, and I'm considering that. But again, this was raised very late before this came -- before this session began, okay? This issue. And I'm not prepared to do that today.

So -- and this existence of representation -- the
representation of Captain Mizer has continued for at least the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 last four years, and at least the last -- and then short of 2 that, for the last year, knowing that I was -- that this 3 commission was going to take up the hearsay statements. I've 4 repeatedly brought up that we're going to take up the hearsay 5 statements, and nothing was said. Nothing was done. And now 6 it's a -- it's a -- we have the -- the specter of this 7 conflict of interest that's being raised.

8

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: So, Your Honor ----

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And I hear your argument. I know you 10 have put on the record now that you believe that going forward 11 could -- is problematic from this point. But I don't think 12 that that argument holds weight, considering the fact that if 13 that -- if this issue existed, it existed for a long time 14 until now.

15 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: So, Your Honor ----

16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And if he was able to proceed from 2018 17 until now, then he's able -- as long as we don't talk about 18 the Hamdan statements, then he's able to continue until such 19 time as that is necessary, which is why I advised the MCDO 20 that they, the MCDO, can appoint an independent counsel to 21 advise the accused of his rights on this issue, that the MCDO 22 can then begin to onboard perhaps a replacement for Captain 23 Mizer until such time as this needs to be resolved.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: So, Your Honor, I would just like to 2 clarify the timeline somewhat, because I recognize the 3 commission's concern and the timing of this. But there is --4 there is reason behind the timing. And so while this has been 5 discussed in abstract terms, this doesn't actually show up on 6 the docket until the first week of June, recognizing we had had a -- a status conference in May. And we had had abstract 7 8 conversations prior to that. You know, I'm not disputing 9 that. Captain Mizer's withdrawal application follows a week 10 after that.

And then in the normal briefing schedule, the defense files our reply. And our interests, while in some ways closely align with Captain Mizer's, Mr. al Nashiri's interests are distinct. We file our response which, quite earnestly, Your Honor, were that this might be an oversight because they wouldn't possibly have brought Captain Mizer back in 2017 knowing this was out there. So maybe this ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I don't think that the government brought him back. I believe it was the -- it was the -- it was the then-military judge ----

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: No.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- sitting at the time, right,
that ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: My understanding ----

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I believe that he ordered, or heavily 3 requested, that the Secretary of Defense recall Captain Mizer. 4 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I was certainly not in the room. Μv 5 understanding is that it -- the origin of that order was from 6 a government suggestion. And so regardless of who had the 7 power to do it, the government recognized that he was coming 8 on the case as learned counsel, and so this is going to be 9 problematic. The -- Captain Mizer is being recalled to be 10 learned counsel on this case.

11 If we let this happen, we know this conflict is out12 there. This is going to blow up at some point.

And so on July 1st, when the defense filed their reply, candidly, most of us having not had a ton of institutional knowledge with the Hamdan piece, a very reasonable response to that reply seemed to be that was an oversight on our part. We're not going to use those statements.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Which was the oversight? Bringing
Captain Mizer back or ----

21 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: No.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- using the statements?

23 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: The statements. There's 116 statements

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

out there. In the course of the, I believe, nine years since
 that notice was filed, it seemed reasonable to think the
 government's response might be we're not using those anymore.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Another -- an alternate view would be
that this request to withdraw is an attempt to get the
government to not use those statements.

7 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Well, Judge ----

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm just ----

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I mean, you ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- asking. You put it into one direction and I'm just looking at it from the other end of the lens.

13 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: But, Judge, that's not nefarious. Τn 14 fact, that's entirely supported in the case law in every --15 almost every circuit. And that comes out of the Gerhardt case 16 in the Seventh Circuit where they cite basic unanimity that, 17 you know, hey, this right to your counsel of choice is so 18 sacred that, in fact, if the government's going to choose to 19 admit evidence that is going to create a conflict issue, the 20 judge has the authority to prohibit the admission of that 21 evidence under 403. And that's from the federal rules that 22 mirror the rules that we play with.

23

So it's not maliciously, hey, I'm trying to bully you

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

into keeping this evidence out. It's it seemed reasonable
 that might be an oversight. And even if it's not, there is a
 legal mechanism in place to keep it out, because the
 government's interests in whatever this evidence is are not
 going to outweigh Mr. al Nashiri's interest in his counsel of
 choice and his right to conflict-free counsel.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm going to protect Mr. al Nashiri's
right to have conflict-free counsel and make sure that he has
appropriate representation. I'm going to protect that. I
appreciate your -- are you finished?

11 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I would just make ----

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: It sounds like you're ----

13 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: One more point as to why this must be 14 done now, Your Honor. And that would come from the Grimes 15 case out of D.C. -- Grimes v. District of Columbia. The case 16 cite on that is 794 F.3d 83. And essentially what Grimes 17 says, and we read that in conjunction with 901 basically for 18 why we have to go right now; we don't think we can push this. 19 It -- everything dealing with conflicted counsel, once the --20 once a credible concern of conflicted counsel is raised. And 21 whether you believe it's been existed before, it's never been 22 raised before, so now it's on your -- on your plate. Once 23 that has been raised, it impacts the fairness and impartiality

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 of everything that flows from this.

2 A disgualification motion has the potential to change 3 the proceedings entirely, which means if there is a conflict 4 right now, it will infect everything going forward. And so we 5 believe that should we be put in a position to continue right 6 now, we believe there is an actual conflict with Captain Mizer 7 and we believe that in the event the defense is ordered to 8 proceed at this point, we will be doing so under no other 9 option but to provide Mr. al Nashiri the ineffective 10 assistance of counsel.

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I understand that that's your argument. 12 I don't know how it's any different -- how proceeding today is 13 any different from proceeding for the last six years on this 14 case when that conflict was potentially there, and we're still 15 not going to get to Mr. Hamdan's statements during this 16 session. I don't know if we're going to get to Mr. Hamdan's 17 statements in October, okay? I don't know if we're going to 18 get to them in December. It certainly would be my hope to 19 have it complete by then. So I don't know how this conflict 20 would impact us at that point.

But I appreciate it. Your objection -- your points
are noted. I have them. This is not something to be quickly
resolved either, which is also why getting something very late

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 as we're preparing to take on a multitude of other issues that
2 we're not going to take up -- that I'm not going to finish
3 today. I've taken it up. I've begun my inquiry into this.
4 There may be more to follow, including hearing from Captain
5 Mizer, perhaps, in an ex parte in camera proceeding with me,
6 okay?

7 I have to do more inquiry on this and I will do more
8 inquiry when I have had time to address this issue, okay?
9 Thank you. Right now, I'm going to hear from the government
10 briefly before I say anything more. Thank you.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And the defense would just then ask for
 an explicit order from this court to go forward recognizing
 our ----

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm not issuing anything just yet. Hold 15 on one second, okay?

16 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Government. Government, one of the positions of the -- of the defense team, apart from Captain Mizer individually, is that there was some form of a creating this to manipulate the composition of the defense team by using these statements. What is your response?

22 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Your Honor, that was not the intent in
23 2011 and 2012, I believe, when the government provided the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 notice of these statements. We've been consistent ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, no. That's when you provided the
statements to them. You didn't provide notice of intent to
introduce them until 2013.

5 MATC [MR. WELLS]: 2012, sir, I think, I believe, and
6 shortly thereafter he was detailed ----

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, September of 2013 is when you8 provided notice of intent to introduce them.

9 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir.

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You provided them in discovery in 2012.
11 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Thank you.

Yes, sir. So we didn't have -- have the intent to manipulate the defense team or create a conflict. I think case law is clear that the attorney who represented the former client is in the best position to recognize the conflict and raise it.

At this point, and, you know, your focus is to say I understand what happened in the past. We think that's important because they've been effective to manage this conflict and if they followed the procedures to advise the accused of the potential that may develop into an actual, that's a point of inquiry. But it's been effective.

23

And at this point going forward, now that it's been

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 raised, we would add one additional fact that I think is 2 important, and I'm not certain if the commission hit this, but 3 on 25 May 2022, in AE 481, the defense filed a motion to 4 suppress the Hamdan statements in which Captain Mizer joined 5 and endorsed as counsel and the briefing has not completed 6 that. The commission has extended the government's response until, I believe, 9 September. So there's still an 7 8 opportunity for the commission with the defense to address the 9 admissibility of the Hamdan statements in 481.

I would note that Captain Mizer indicated that his contribution to the team might relate to the foundation of the Hamdan statement. And that seems to me that in order to suppress the statement, that necessarily would be required in that motion so at that time he had some appreciation and understanding when he signed that motion that that would be required.

He also mentioned that if it were his choice in this proceeding in AE 319KK, he would have added the Hamdan statement, and I believe his words at the lectern were as it relates to the availability of Hamdan and where he's located. I think the government would ask the commission is that confidential information that's been relayed to him or is that not. If that's their objection to the hearsay statement,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 which we've been grappling with this time, what are the 2 defense's specific objection? That does not seem to involve 3 any confidential information ----4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What, the location ----5 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Correct. sir. 6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- potentially of his former client? 7 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Right. And just putting the government 8 to the legal proof of it's our obligation to prove that he's 9 unavailable, that's an area of inquiry, I think, the 10 commission should ask the defense and Captain Mizer. 11 So the government's position is we want to protect the 12 accused's statutory entitlement to detailed military 13 commission counsel. We certainly recognize the Supreme Court 14 has stated in Wheat and its other progeny that to be effective 15 counsel, the individual counsel needs to be conflict-free. We 16 have not raised an imputed liability or imputed conflict at 17 this time to the other defense team, and I think the 18 representations from defense counsel indicate that no 19 confidential information has been relayed to them, so they're 20 protected. 21 So moving forward, our position is the rules of

22 professional conduct in Virginia, which Captain Mizer says
23 he's bound by, provide a general rule and -- and exceptions.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And we want to explore those exceptions to see if the - truly, the confidential information is required or needed to
 have effective challenge or cross-examination to Mr. Hamdan
 and the sponsoring witness.

5 So with that, sir, what specific questions can I6 address?

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The defense's proposal to solve all of
8 this is not use -- not using the Hamdan statements in part of
9 the 116 hearsay statements that you intend to introduce.

10 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir.

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Is that a consideration that is being 12 considered even in any way by the government?

13 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Sir ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Because if you stood there and said se're not going to introduce that, then this inquiry stops, doesn't it? And I'm not suggesting ----

17 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- I'm not telling you that that's
what you have to do. I'm asking you if that's a consideration
that you've even made.

21 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Your Honor, our response to 485 is due
22 and we would like to file that. We do not have ----

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yeah, but you're here. You're standing

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 up right in front of me here, so is that a consideration that 2 you've thought about?

3 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Sir, we've looked at that consideration 4 and the answer is no at this point, and I would make some 5 observations. It's not the totality of hearsay statements but 6 it's ----

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, I understand. It's the ----8 MATC [MR. WELLS]: The specific information relates to 9 only a few people saw Mr. Nashiri meet with Usama bin Laden. 10 And only a few people, during the actual conduct of the 11 conspiracy within the organization of al Qaeda, had contact 12 with Mr. Nashiri and heard him admit he was involved in the 13 COLE. Only a few people saw him use explosives to test. That 14 is more important than the balance of the other hearsay 15 statements ----

16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Oh, I understand, again ----

17 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Okay. So that's our thinking and the18 answer is no.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

20 MATC [MR. WELLS]: We do not intend at this point to 21 withdraw the notice on the use of the Hamdan statement. We 22 would like to respond to 481. And if at some point the 23 commission believes that that should go before admission of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

the consideration of the other hearsay statements, we'd like
 an opportunity to litigate 481, and then of course our
 response to 485 laying out why we think an M.C.R.E. 403
 balancing test should not be applied at this point.

5

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood.

6 MATC [MR. WELLS]: And again, though, the government is 7 concerned that this conflict is not a genuine actual conflict 8 because there are exceptions recognized in the rule that you 9 can manage and mitigate even a potential conflict and an 10 actual conflict, and still protect the integrity of the 11 commission.

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right.

13 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Thank you, sir.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you. I'm going to take a brief
recess. I anticipate taking about 20 minutes. So
anticipate -- maybe 25. So let's go back on the record at
17 10:20. The commission is in recess.

18 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 0959, 25 July 2022.]

19 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1102,

20 25 July 2022.]

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The commission is called to order. Allparties present as before, Government?

23 TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor. We do need to put

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Lieutenant Schwartz's qualifications on the record.

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes. Lieutenant Schwartz ---3 Defense, are all parties present as before?

4 LDC [MR. NATALE]: Yes, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Lieutenant Schwartz, welcome. Please
come forward and put your detailing qualifications on the
record.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Good morning, Your Honor. Lieutenant
9 Tess Schwartz, JAG Corps, United States Navy. I've been
10 detailed by the chief prosecutor of the Office of Military
11 Commissions pursuant to R.M.C. 502 and 503. I have been
12 previously sworn and certified under R.M.C. 807, Article 27(b)
13 and Article 42(a). I have not acted in any manner that might
14 tend to disqualify me from this matter.

15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you, Counsel.

16 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Thank you.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right.

18 TC [MR. MILLER]: Thank you, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The commission has begun its inquiry
into the alleged conflict of interest involving Captain
Mizer's representation of Mr. Nashiri and Captain Mizer's
former client, Mr. Hamdan. The potential conflict is isolated
to the single issue of the admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

statements alone. This issue was apparently known to Captain
 Mizer as early as 2013 and not raised until June of 2022.

In the interim, Captain Mizer has continued to
represent Mr. Nashiri with apparently no reservation,
including being the signatory on the motion to suppress
Mr. Hamdan's statements.

7 The commission scheduled litigation on the 8 admissibility of the hearsay statements in general in 9 July 2021, because, as Captain Mizer admits, this potential 10 conflict is isolated to one issue. In the interest of the 11 accused and his continued representation, the commission will 12 proceed with this session and will not take up any issue 13 regarding Mr. Hamdan until this conflict is resolved.

14 The commission is not persuaded that this potential 15 conflict must be resolved before proceeding on other issues 16 as -- because, as this commission sits here today, the 17 potential conflict issue has not changed since Captain Mizer 18 was detailed to this case in 2018. The commission does not 19 accept the argument that its previous rulings have triggered a 20 shift from a potential to an actual conflict. Captain Mizer's 21 application states that the conflict is triggered by the 22 litigation of Mr. Hamdan's hearsay statements which will not 23 occur during this session.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

The commission recognizes that the potential for a
conflict in this case is real. The commission's decision not
to litigate the Hamdan statements is to prevent an actual
conflict from prejudicing the accused and to allow the case to
proceed on unrelated issues until such time as the accused has
been properly advised of this issue and then new detailed
counsel, military counsel, is arranged.

8 The commission does not accept that this potential 9 conflict is imputed to the remainder of the defense team. 10 Captain Mizer defers -- affirmed that he has not, as is to be 11 expected, shared any information from -- confidential client 12 information with the defense team. The commission does not 13 find that this potential conflict, which is not yet triggered 14 by Mr. Hamdan's statements, is imputed to the defense team.

15 The remainder of the defense team has failed to advise 16 their client on this issue and is ordered to take steps to 17 advise him on this issue. Considering the isolated nature of 18 the potential conflict, there's no conceivable reason for the 19 defense team to not advise Mr. Nashiri on this issue.

The commission finds that Captain Mizer and the defense team are able to continue to effectively, and without conflict, continue to represent the accused until such time as the Hamdan statements are scheduled to be litigated. The

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 issue of the admissibility of Mr. Hamdan's hearsay statements
2 will be litigated by this commission no earlier than February
3 of 2023.

Captain Mizer is ordered to submit an ex parte
affidavit for in camera review setting forth the specific
nature and scope of the conflict and what steps he has taken
to advise both his former and current client on these issues.
This will be submitted in person to the commission under seal
no later than one week from today.

10 The defense may also file an ex parte submission11 through the normal filing process.

Mr. Nashiri, are you aware that Captain Mizer hasrequested to withdraw from representing you?

14 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: Yes.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. The potential conflict raised by
Captain Mizer relates to statements made by a former client of
his that the government intends to use in the case against
you. Do you understand that?

ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: Lately, I just understood thisissue.

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. But you understand it now?
22 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: Yes, yes.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I have found that there's no actual

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

conflict until the admissibility of those statements is
 litigated.

3

Do you understand that?

ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: That's your opinion. And the other
5 attorneys, they still say that there is a conflict.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I understand that. This will permit
Captain Mizer to continue to represent you, to the maximum
extent possible, until the commission takes up the
admissibility of those statements.

10

Do you understand that?

11 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: That's your opinion as well.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I expect that you will be advised by
either your current defense team or separate counsel about
this conflict in the near future.

15 The commission ordered this proceeding in AE 440 and
16 in AE 483, and the commission and all parties will proceed as
17 so previously ordered.

18 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: **[Speaking in English]** Excuse me.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes, Mr. Nashiri.

20 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: [Speaking in English] Can I talk
21 something?

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes.

23 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: Based on my understanding, there is

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 a conflict with Mr. Mizer. At the same time, I need this man 2 with me because he's been on the case for a very long time and 3 I think he's very important to the case. I don't know how can 4 this issue be resolved. However, I think I do have the right 5 to have a learned counsel, someone who is experienced whom I 6 can consult with because, you know, the other attorneys, 7 sometimes they cannot really fulfill this. I need a 8 specialist who is outside this team that can fulfill this. So 9 I don't know how this is going to get resolved, but I think 10 this is my approach.

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood. And as I stated, 12 Mr. Nashiri, Captain Mizer and your defense team have 13 represented you continuously -- well, Captain Mizer has been 14 on the team since 2018, which was the second time that he came 15 onto the team, and he has continued to represent you with this 16 potential issue being out there that they're saying is now 17 triggered but it's -- even according to their own argument, 18 it's not triggered until we get to that particular one thing. 19 It's -- the conflict is about one issue.

Nothing has changed. We still have not taken up that
one potential conflict issue, and we're not going to take that
up until I've had more chance to hear from Captain Mizer or
his -- or the remainder of the defense team on this topic.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

But because we're not getting into the -- into the issue of
 the conflict, nothing has changed in your situation, that
 you'll be represented by the same individuals so that you
 continue to have Captain Mizer on your defense team for the
 longest period possible, if he should be replaced.

6 All right. Counsel, as we previously discussed the 7 need to enter into a closed M.C.R.E. 505(h) hearing to discuss 8 classified evidence related to the motions that we will be 9 taking up during this session of the commission to include AEs 10 166, 327, 467, and 471, do counsel have anything else that we 11 should take up before we move into the M.C.R.E. 505(h)?

12 Government?

13 TC [MR. MILLER]: No, Your Honor.

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Defense?

15 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Judge, just a clarification as to what16 you mean by submitting a declaration to you in person.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You're going to hand it to me.

18 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Aye, sir.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'll have it marked myself. I'm not --20 I don't want to go through -- we're not going through -- I'll 21 have it marked. The court reporters will mark it in my -- in 22 my chambers. This is for ex parte in camera review and I'm 23 going to ensure that it remains -- because it is dealing with

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 a conflict issue, I'm going to make sure that it remains an
2 ex parte and in camera review.

3 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: Understood, Judge. Thank you.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. So you've got until Monday to5 bring that in to me.

6 Defense, you will file yours -- your ex parte 7 proceeding, just file it through the regular process. It will 8 go -- yours is -- you don't have any other confidential client 9 information to -- that is going to be shared with me, so 10 that's why you can file yours that way. And I expect yours to 11 be filed by Monday as well. Okay. I apologize. I know that 12 I left that deadline off on yours, so -- okay.

13 So if there's nothing else to take up, we know that it 14 takes 45 minutes for them to get the -- to do the shift to a 15 closed session, so what we'll do is we'll recess now for 16 lunch. And I apologize for the delay in me coming back on --17 as you're aware, these issues are one that take some 18 consideration and I'm not coming out here and speaking off the 19 cuff on those issues. So I apologize for that in advance and keeping you into these -- the current conditions of the 20 21 courtroom are a bit chilly, I understand.

So what we'll do is we'll recess until lunch -- until
lunch is over. We'll take a recess for lunch and I'll add an

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	extra 45 minutes onto that to get it started. So we'll start
2	back up with a closed session at 1300, and that's when we will
3	take up the 505(h) hearing.
4	Until that time, this commission is in recess.
5	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1115, 25 July 2022.]
6	[The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1352,
7	25 July 2022.]
8	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The commission is called to order.
9	Government, all parties present as before?
10	TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor.
11	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Defense?
12	LDC [MR. NATALE]: Yes, Your Honor.
13	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Except for Mr. Nashiri?
14	LDC [MR. NATALE]: Yes. May I put something on the
15	record?
16	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You may.
17	LDC [MR. NATALE]: Your Honor, I have explained to my
18	client that he has the right to be here and he has expressed
19	to me that he does not want to attend the afternoon session.
20	I explained to him that if need be, we could have it broadcast
21	into there. He says that he does not want that either. He
22	understands that he can change that. However, he expressed to
23	me that he did not want to be here, nor to be remotely able to

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 review what's going on.

I told him that at the end of the proceedings today, I
will go back and report to him regarding what happened at the
open sessions.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So this absence of his is voluntary and6 knowing?

7 LDC [MR. NATALE]: Absolutely, Your Honor.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you.

9 Government, are you satisfied?

10 TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor.

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. All right. He has

12 voluntarily absented himself. No -- and I will obviously take 13 Mr. Natale's word that he has communicated with his client. I 14 know that's what took him a couple of minutes to come in just 15 now regarding that.

16 Okay. So we're starting back up. I think I'm17 supposed to get updated on 473, 474 update.

18 Government?

MATC [MR. WELLS]: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John Wellshere.

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Good afternoon, Mr. Wells.

22 MATC [MR. WELLS]: I've coordinate with the defense, and I23 think on AE 473, we're satisfied with that.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

On 474, based on their articulation of information
 that has been produced in the 9/11 case, we're going to look
 back and determine what relevant and material information
 pertaining to the questions sent from the FBI to the CIA black
 sites consistent with your order in 474, so we have a little
 more work to do on that to satisfy the defense.

7

And that's the report, sir.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What's the anticipated timeline for
9 coming back with the -- with answering the remaining questions
10 from defense counsel regarding 474?

MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir. I think by Wednesday of this week, we will have a good fix on the matters that we've reviewed. We're going to look tonight and then assess tomorrow.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Let me see if I can narrow that down.
You say a good fix. Does that mean you'll figure out where
the things are and what they are or you'll have them to the
defense by then?

MATC [MR. WELLS]: Well, we'll figure out if they're relevant and material to disclose to the defense. Since they've already been disclosed in the 9/11 case, maybe we'll have an expedited review through the SC/DRT review process and the other equity review holders. However ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If it's been reviewed and disclosed in
that case, is there an issue with the -- I mean ----

MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir. I mean, the process that we have with our OCAs is it's a limited use for the particular purpose related to those 9/11 accused. And when our first review, sir, the information was requested from the FBI to the CIA, please have all detainees in your custody respond to this information, but no response back to the FBI.

9 So in that vein, I think we determined not relevant 10 and material. But we will go back through the information 11 that specifically has been disclosed in the 9/11 case and 12 determine if it's relevant to this commission and we'll work 13 with the OCAs on that.

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I encourage you to interpret that15 broadly ----

16 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Okay, sir.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- what could be relevant to the18 defense.

19 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Well ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And again ----

21 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, sir.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- I don't -- I understand that this
is classified information. It's being disclosed to cleared

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 counsel, just to cleared counsel, in some form or fashion. 2 It's already been disclosed to cleared counsel. If it has --3 if it's relevant, turn it over. 4 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Correct, sir. 5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you. 6 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Thank you. 7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Did you have anything else? 8 MATC [MR. WELLS]: No, sir. 9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. 10 Defense? 11 DC [MS. CARMON]: Thank you, sir. 12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If you could hang on one second. I just 13 need to catch up with my notes. I interrupted ----14 DC [MS. CARMON]: Sure. Go ahead. 15 [Pause.] 16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Ms. Carmon. 17 DC [MS. CARMON]: Thank you. The government's correct 18 with AE 473. We are satisfied that we've received everything 19 that we requested, and so I think we are good to go on 473. 20 And 474, we had originally sought any and all 21 questions received at overseas locations from the FBI to the 22 CIA black sites which may have been posed -- which may have 23 been posed to the accused, and your order reflects that exact

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 language.

2 And so in reviewing the 9/11 transcript -- and 3 obviously, we don't have copies of these documents, but the 4 testifying agent is reviewing a requirements document and is 5 testifying, at least in two instances that I've found, about 6 an FBI cable to a CIA black site requesting that detainees be asked 26 questions. One of those detainees that was requested 7 8 of is our client. Similarly, there's another requirement that 9 an agent was testifying to in 2019, looking at a cable asking 10 that client -- that HVDs review photographs. That also 11 includes our client.

And so I know these documents exist. And that's just what we're asking for. We -- even if there was no response given back, we want to see the questions that -- which may have been posed to our client.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. Is your proffer that even if there's no response, that they may have been posed -- that the questions may have been posed to your client at some point? DC [MS. CARMON]: And that's -- that's the testimony consistent with these agents that testified in 2019 in the 9/11 case.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That they did ask the questions? Those23 agents testified that they did ask the questions in those

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 case?

2 DC [MS. CARMON]: This is the FBI agent testifying.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, I understand. But was there -- the
4 agent testified that he submitted the questions through the
5 other agency ----

6 DC [MS. CARMON]: Correct.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- to be asked. Was there ----

8 DC [MS. CARMON]: And that some ----

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Was there any evidence that those10 questions were ever posed to any of the detainees?

DC [MS. CARMON]: Yes. In some instances, yes, and in some instances the agent testified "I never got a response back."

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

DC [MS. CARMON]: But -- and I don't -- again, I don't have the documents, but I think it's relevant no matter if a response was received or not, because it shows collaboration between the two agencies that we're interested in.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood.

20 DC [MS. CARMON]: And more to the point, your specific
21 order and what we had sought was questions ----

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Questions that were ----

23 DC [MS. CARMON]: ---- sent.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- sent, that were sent. Not whether
or not they were asked or not?

3 DC [MS. CARMON]: Correct.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Understood.

5 DC [MS. CARMON]: And so we -- since we know that those
6 exist, we're just requesting their production.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you.

8 All right. Government, just update me. You say by
9 Wednesday. I'll ask you again on Wednesday if I -- or I'm
10 telling you to update me by Wednesday close of business if you
11 have the -- if you have these cables and ready to produce
12 them. Thank you.

13 MATC [MR. WELLS]: Yes, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. We're going to take up 452D,
defense motion in limine regarding the accused statements in
the long form.

17 Ms. Morgan, I see you standing. I assume this is you.18 Good afternoon.

19 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: This is your renewed motion essentially
 because the first one -- the -- I think 452 was -- itself was
 the -- for the request to return the long form entirely --- ADC [MS. MORGAN]: That's correct.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- that had been previously ordered.
 And just a summary of this, the defense original motion in 205
 was to abate the proceedings until the accused received proper
 care. And in the course of that, the then-military judge,
 which is two before me ----

6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct, Judge.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- ordered the production of the long
form to the government because Dr. Crosby was relying upon the
statements of the accused in that motions hearing in forming
and presenting her opinion regarding the care he was
receiving, correct?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: She was relying on the long form13 itself, Your Honor. That's my understanding.

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Whether or not -- not the statements 15 themselves?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: My understanding is that she was -because she had received the long form and was relying on the long -- long form in the -- as the basis of her -- in part, her opinions ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

21 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- in the long form.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And the long form included the23 statements made. Some of this includes some of the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 statements, correct?

2 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: The statements are included in the long3 form.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

5 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I just don't know if that nuance was6 nailed down at that time.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes, okay. All right. So now you filed
8 467, the defense motion to suppress the letterhead memorandum
9 from the accused. And let me ask you this: In 467, your
10 pleading, did you rely or use or refer to any statements of
11 the accused made during the 706?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: If I could have just one moment?
MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You may.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And I appreciate the commission's
indulgence on that. I believe the answer is no. I believe
the pleading relies on statements made by Dr. Crosby, her
opinions.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. What are her opinions based -are her opinions based upon the 706 and statements made within
it?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Her review of the -- her statements are
based on her review of the 706 ----

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Does -- which includes the statements of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the accused?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: It includes the statements of the accused. I don't know that it has ever been so nuanced -- and again, Your Honor, this is a little bit of having not been here ten years ago. I don't believe any of the opinions she has given go as far as to say because he said this specific thing during the 706, I believe -- I find this.

8 So -- so recognizing ----

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right, but ----

10 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- this is a very ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Oh, I understand. But she considered
it. The question is not whether or not -- the issue is that's
part of what her universe of documents she used to form her
opinion.

15 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Yes.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. And, Defense, I think I know the answer to this, but -- I know I know the answer to this. The -- but I want to ask you. Where in the government's response in 467C does the government use the statements of the accused from the 706? Because that's why you would have to ----

22 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Right.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- make the motion.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: It gets put back in as the attachment2 to R.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes, it's an attachment and it's in there, but where do they -- you know, you can attach a lot of things to a motion. If they're not relevant, I'm not going to consider it, right? The -- and these are -- this is an attachment to the motion. I think they only refer to one thing in one place.

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And it's in the facts section.

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: In the facts section on page ----

11 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And then rely on those facts in their12 analysis.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm not going to -- I -- because of the
underlying document's classified, if you look at page 8 of
that, right, paragraph p. Do you see where I'm talking about?
ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And I do apologize, Your Honor. I
don't have 467 in front of me.

18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. This is 467C.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct. I don't have 467C in front of
me. I'm working off 452D and I don't have ----

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right, but they're obviously the -- go22 ahead.

23 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Well, I recognize I just can't give you

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the paragraph.

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. So they make one reference to3 those statements there, right?

4 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: That is correct.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. All right. I'm almost done
6 interrupting your -- or precluding your argument.

7 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I welcome questions, Your Honor.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Go ahead. I have -- I just
9 wanted to clarify a couple of those issues before I got
10 started to see if I could set the ----

11 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Sure.

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- scene.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Your Honor, my argument is really
two-prong. One is very pragmatic and one is in essence
policy-based, and so I'll begin with my pragmatic argument.

16 Really, this rises and falls on the plain language of 302. And the seminal case for that is United States v. Clark, 17 18 62 M.J. 195. It's a CAAF case in 2005. And the beauty of 19 that CAAF case is it actually looks at how did we get to have 20 these 706 reports done in the first place? Why -- why do we 21 have them? You know, why does the government get to order 22 them? And then what sort of vulnerabilities does that give 23 rise to for an accused, and what do we do to protect those.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

And, you know, the court goes as far as to talk about
 how when they drafted M.R.E., so our complimentary to
 M.C.R.E. 302, that the drafters recognized these unique
 military concerns because these military medical records don't
 have the same kind of confidentiality that we would have in
 civilian medical records.

And so instead, the way that they handled the 706 7 8 evaluations was to ensure that there was this additional level of protection that the report itself would enjoy a level of 9 10 privilege. But recognizing how these evaluations come to 11 be -- and how it came to be in this case, right? -- the 12 government says we have concerns about competency. Hey. 13 court, can you order this evaluation? Which by its very 14 nature compels an accused to make a certain number of 15 statements which may or may not be inculpatory.

Because these statements may be inculpatory, because an accused may be forced to make statements against those interests, aside from the report, these statements enjoy a separate level of privilege.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The statements separate from the long 21 form itself?

22 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct. And Your Honor recognized23 that in your ruling in 452C.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. And that's what I'm going to get 2 with the government about, is 302 talks about even the 3 procedure for the disclosure when the disclosure is made 4 for -- when it comes -- when it comes -- and for reasons of 5 mental capacity or mental responsibility are brought up, that 6 when the 706 long form is turned over to the government, the 7 statements are excised, correct? That's the procedure 8 described in 302, correct?

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I think that's the way it's supposed to 10 be done, Judge. I think a lot of times we've seen in military 11 commissions it doesn't happen in a perfect world, and so now 12 we are ----

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well, I'm just reading 302C.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Right. I think whether it's supposed to actually be physically excised or whether it's supposed to be prohibited from use, you don't get to bring the statements in unless the defense has put the ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well, let's -- let's turn to our hymnals together and -- where it says is, if the defense expert offers the testimony concerning the mental condition of the accused, the military judge, upon motion, shall order the release to the prosecution of the full contents, other than the statements of the accused.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood. You're correct, Your2 Honor.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Now, if something ----

4 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Yeah.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- other than that is happening in
6 practice -- now, I think they have it, right?

7 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: They have it.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: We know that they have it. So the issue 9 now is should it just be they have the 70 -- should it just be 10 down to a determination of whether or not this is used in 11 defense, or is this a matter of -- not presented on findings 12 of guilt or innocence but on an interlocutory issue?

13 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Sure.

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Can you address that?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Sure. You know, I think Your Honor's analysis in 452C was accurate of it is a separate question of okay, they've got it, can they use it. And so I think there's a couple arguments for why they do not get to use it on interlocutory.

I think the principal argument against it, and going
back to that, you know, there's two. There's the practical
and then there's also the policy, is the policy reason of this
is weaponizing 706, which when you ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Because he's order to do the statements.
 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Right.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: There's issue -- there's ways to address
4 it but they don't, and now to use these statements which were
5 ordered to be made by the court ----

6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct, and ----

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- is not fair.

8 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- if he declined to participate in
9 the 706 because of the concern that his statements could be
10 used against him, even in interlocutory matters, then than
11 could have its own set of negative inferences.

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And I don't think that's speculative. And so going to, you know, the <u>Clark</u> analysis of how did 302 get written, this was definitely on the drafters' minds. And so it -- it's in step with the spirit of 302 for this to not be admissible on interlocutory matters. It certainly wouldn't be admissible on guilt or innocence. I think that that's fair ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- and that's not where we are right
now.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Absolutely, unless of course -- and, of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 course, we're all getting to the point of unless you introduce 2 them.

3 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Certainly.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Unless you open the door to these.

5 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And even on interlocutory matters, Your 6 Honor, we do not intend to introduce those statements. We do 7 not intend to put -- put them at issue, those statements. You 8 know, perhaps if we were talking about -- I'm coming up with 9 an analogy on the fly, so bear with me a moment.

10 But, you know, if perhaps we were talking about a 11 Fourth Amendment violation and whether or not, you know, 12 the -- the facts and circumstances leading up to a purportedly 13 unlawful search, and that somehow becomes a relevant component 14 of a 706 evaluation and the client's recitation of those facts 15 the defense somehow feels the need to bring in when they put 16 their client on the stand to talk about the facts and 17 circumstances that did or did not lead up to what they 18 believed to be an unlawful search. The defense may, in an 19 interlocutory matter, now have made their client's statement 20 in a 706, put that at issue, and then perhaps that opens the 21 door in an interlocutory matter. That's not what's happening 22 here.

23

In 476, we are not using our client's statements. Nor

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 do we intend to. And so without us triggering that switch,2 the government doesn't get to either.

3 And one of the things that I think can't be lost 4 here -- and again, this is going back to a policy argument, 5 but there's a relevance issue in all of this. We are talking 6 about a 706 evaluation that is done in 2013. And this 7 commission is amply familiar with the purpose of a 706 8 evaluation and the questions that it is charged with asking. 9 And those questions do not deal with the voluntariness or 10 involuntariness ----

11 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Of a statement made six years earlier. 12 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- of a statement made at any time 13 prior. Certainly we would argue six years, but it is simply 14 different. And so one of the things that must be considered 15 when you look at 302 is there is an interest of justice 16 analysis, right? I think it's laden, you know, pretty much 17 everywhere we're looking today. But in 302, there is an 18 interest of justice and it doesn't further the interest of 19 justice to start being able to use what is designed truly to 20 understand if a criminal defendant is capable of participating 21 in their defense and understanding the charges against them to 22 subvert their ability to move to suppress involuntary 23 confessions, which is a completely separate legal analysis and

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

legal question. There's just -- these are an apples and
 oranges type of scenario.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But the interest of justice analysis is the one in whether or not it's disclosed -- whether or not the statements of the accused are disclosed to the government. I don't think it goes the way that you're pointing with the interest of justice side goes there. You control the -- for statements of the accused made in the -- and as you control the -- the door, right? You control the aperture.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Your Honor, I can't unring the bell of
what happened when that 706 was turned over. I think that
there is always an interest of justice consideration.

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I understand. Yeah. Okay. Do you have14 anything else? Let me ask you this one question.

15 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Certainly.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Do you have any case law that supports that 302 can't be -- that 302 prohibits consideration of the accused's statements on an interlocutory matter, any -- other than Clark?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: There -- as far as I am aware, there is no case law that says it applies one way or the other. So there's no case law that has found that it does not apply on interlocutory matters or that it does apply on interlocutory

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

matters. But the reading that it would apply to interlocutory
 matters, given the legislative history and the drafting of
 302, would be more consistent.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you. Anything else?
5 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Nothing, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you. Thank you for your patience,
Commander Jolly. Go ahead. Oh, pardon me. Not Commander
B Jolly. Forgive me.

9 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Character switch. Yes, Your Honor.10 Lieutenant Schwartz.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Sorry. All I saw was -- I -- forgive
me. I saw hair in a bun and I was looking out of the corner
of my eye. Please forgive me.

14 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: No problem, Your Honor.

15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Lieutenant Schwartz, go ahead.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Thank you. So just to clarify, I guess, a couple things. So in the manner in which the government received this information, the 706 which contained the statements, to clarify, it was also submitted by the defense to the Supreme Court which included the statements. They did not excise those from the form that was submitted with their filing. So to ----

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What was that issue on? What was that

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 submitted for? What was the purpose?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The defense submitted it with their
filing whenever they appealed and sent the case up to the
Supreme Court. In their attachment with the 706, they also
did not remove the statement ----

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What was the underlying issue of that 7 appeal?

8 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Habeas, Your Honor.

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

10 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: And so that's how the government --11 one of the ways in which the government was able to see it is 12 by the defense's actions of filing with the statements within 13 it. So I just wanted to put that on the record.

14 For 452C that the -- this commission found, it denied 15 the defense's request to return the long form. And it also 16 declined to make a finding on the issue of suppression because 17 the commission found that it wasn't ripe. And I believe the 18 commission's finding was it now appears that the government 19 only intends to introduce the accused's statements from the 20 706 for resolving a motion to suppress and not for a finding 21 of quilt or innocence.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

23 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: And as the defense just stated in

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 their argument, the pragmatic portion, was that we need to 2 stress the -- the language of the rule, which the rule says 3 302A, R.M.C. 706, the -- the accused has a privilege to 4 present -- prevent any statement made by the accused at the 5 mental examination ordered under R.M.C. 706 from being 6 received into evidence against the accused on the issue of 7 guilt or innocence or during sentencing proceedings.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Then let me ask you this. Does
9 the suppression or the admission of his statements go towards
10 his guilt or innocence?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: At this time, it's not the reason in which the government is seeking to use it. We're looking to impeach the -- we're looking to impeach the defense's argument about PTSD, which is the sole issue of 467. And so the biggest issue that we're looking at here is we have the 706 long form statement ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: To impeach the diagnosis of PTSD? Is
there a question about whether or not the accused is diagnosed
with PTSD?

20 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: We're not questioning whether the
21 accused was diagnosed with PTSD, Your Honor.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

23 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: We're looking to essentially refute

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 the diagnosis, I guess, as you would find it. But that's why 2 the government right now is looking at using this long form 3 with the statements, is not to on a finding of guilt or 4 innocence, not in sentencing, but to simply refute the 5 allegations that have been made by the defense in AE 467, 6 which that is the heart of the matter of 467, is PTSD. So 7 the ----

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

9 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- the government is having a hard
 10 time understanding how the -- the defense is moving their
 11 argument concerning the relevance of mental health ----

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, no.

13 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- to the ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Hold on. Remember, the rule states that when the defense introduces the issue of the mental -- of, you know, mental capacity or et cetera, that the government's only supposed to have the long form without the statements. Isn't that correct?

19 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: That is and that is what the rule says 20 and that's why ----

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That's what the rule says.

22 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Now, for some reason you have the --

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 this -- the long form that includes the statements.

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: As given by defense. Yes, Your Honor. 3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I know it was provided to you by the 4 defense by the order. However, does that mean that you still 5 get to use the statements that were ordered by the -- by the 6 commission that the accused essentially submit to and make these statements? Is that -- that's not the purpose of the 7 8 statements. The purpose of the statements was to determine 9 his mental capacity, correct? To answer the questions of a 10 706, not -- not to -- to be used by the parties to refute his 11 statements about his guilt or innocence, correct?

12 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor, and ----

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So why would I allow you to use his14 statements now?

15 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Because as -- understanding that the 16 rule says that the statements should be precluded from the 17 R.C.M. -- sorry, R.M.C. 706 long form, the government has the 18 statements. We understand that that -- just because we had 19 the possession of them does not by, in fact, mean that we can 20 use them however we -- we intend to. The government's 21 position is, at this point, is we intend to use them, not for 22 the finding of guilt or innocence, but to simply refute the 23 allegations that the defense has put at issue, which is PTSD,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 mental health, the heart of 467, to refute the -- the evidence
2 that the defense has put forward.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why do you need to use the statements when you have the long form? You've got the long form and its findings. That's the purpose of giving you the long form, which is what you're permitted to use in such situations. Not the statements of the accused, right?

8 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: To an extent, Your Honor, yes, you are 9 correct. The government is seeking to use the statements 10 because the statements don't admit the guilt or innocence of 11 the COLE. There is separate collateral issues that have 12 been -- that were brought up. The statements itself, why 13 they're important, is whenever the 706 was being conducted, 14 those who were conducting the 706 were looking for any signs 15 of anxiety disorder and -- and various other mental health 16 disorders. And by the statements that they were observing 17 from the accused, they were looking at things like narcissism 18 and essentially failing to find any hint of a diagnosis for 19 anxiety, ultimately finding a diagnosis for PTSD, which is, 20 again, the heart of 467 why it's necessary.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. But that's not in dispute,
right? We've got the finding -- I can get to that -- I can
get to that information without having his statements,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 correct? And, in fact, you do so in your pleading, don't you? 2 Isn't that correct? Because you only refer one time to 3 statements of the accused made in the -- in the long form, 4 correct? 5 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Correct, Your Honor. 6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And it is a -- I won't say -- I'm not going to say what the statement is, but it is -- I'll just say 7 8 it's a low-impact statement, correct? 9 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Correct. 10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So ----11 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The -- another point ----12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why should I allow you to use otherwise 13 privileged statements, statements that he can prevent from 14 coming in, on an issue which you don't even need it? 15 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government wouldn't -- would not 16 concede that we do not need the statements. I believe that 17 the government does need the statements as, again, it goes to 18 the heart of the issue for the PTSD diagnosis and the events 19 and things that the accused has said which triggers said 20 diagnosis or condition. 21 And another point as well with the statements seeing 22 is -- so the 706 long form we have as well as the statements. 23 Within the long form, the accused statements, he is quoted

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 directly within the long form ----

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm aware.

3 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- therefore -- so if we can use the 4 long form itself ----

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Without the statements?

6 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- without the statements ----

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I don't know why you need the

8 statements.

9 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: I'm sorry, Your Honor?

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Why do you need the statements if you've got the entire -- if you have everything in the long form and I allow you -- and, you know, I permit you to use the long form, the long form itself, the conclusions about his mental condition, isn't that sufficient to refute the -- the allegations from the government in 467?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government would disagree by the way in which the defense has posed their argument for the reliance on PTSD and other diagnosed and undiagnosed disorders. The government believes that these are necessary in order to refute allegations made in AE 467.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. All right. Anything else?
ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: If I can have a moment, Your Honor.
MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You may.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Government ----

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Your Honor, nothing -- oh, I
3 apologize.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Sorry. I was waiting on you and then I5 interrupted you.

6 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: You're fine, Your Honor.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Go ahead.

8 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: I was going to say pending any9 questions, Your Honor.

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I have one.

11 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The question is: Is it fair for the commission to assume that, based upon your pleading in which you only refer to one statement, that that's the only one that you wish to draw the commission's attention to? You say that you need the statements to refute it, but you only point to one.

18 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: If I could have one moment, Your19 Honor.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Uh-huh.

21 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Your Honor, there is one statement as 22 you noted that the government refers to, but the government 23 also wants to make the commission aware that we will be

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 talking to Dr. Johnson who, in fact, conducted it about his 2 observations and things that he saw whenever he evaluated the 3 accused, which would, in fact, include other statements that 4 were made to Dr. Johnson. But correct that we only pointed to 5 one specific statement in our pleading, correct. But there is 6 a world of statements that was made to Dr. Johnson that we 7 would just want to discuss with him and get his observation 8 on, and whether certain statements would have led him to make certain findings one way or another. 9

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. I understand.

11 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Pending any other questions, Your12 Honor.

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I have none. Thank you.

14 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Thank you.

15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Defense?

16 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Just a few quick points, Your Honor.

17 It is a bit murky how this report got out. Unfortunately,

18 nobody on the defense -- and I do -- I recognize the

19 commission hears this quite a bit. No one on the defense when 20 this ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I think Captain Mizer was on the defense
team.

23 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: He was, and I was about to say had been

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

on the team for any period of time. When this happened, I
 believe it was his first hearing. So it was a few weeks,
 maybe a few months, at most, when he was here. There's just
 not a lot of institutional knowledge of how this got turned
 over, and perhaps -- and so when ----

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Let me ----

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- the government references that it was attached to a Supreme Court petition for habeas, that was actually different counsel, which was the basis for 452 originally is that it had gone to appellate counsel, not trial counsel. And so there's some back and forth in those pleadings when trial counsel points out, no, actually, you had turned it over to us ----

14 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- and had actually been a
16 long-forgotten fact. And so that's laid out in that whole
17 series.

18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm aware, yeah.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And so to the extent that this was an inadvertent disclosure at that time, we don't in any way view that as having waived. We are -- we are still asserting, and I do think the commission's analysis in 452C is appropriate and correct. But we are more than willing to reproduce a new

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 copy of that report with statements redacted. Perhaps that is
2 an offer we should have made earlier. I apologize. I do want
3 to offer that at this point.

As far as other communications between our client and Dr. Johnson, the rule in 302 does not contemplate that as far as those statements. We would assert privilege as to other communications outside of the report itself.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Say that one more time and clarify what9 you mean.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: At this point, everything that has been herefed and has been put at issue is the report itself, the statements contained within the report. What I just heard from government counsel -- and if I misheard ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yeah. She stated that during their
direct examination of Dr. Johnson, they intend to get into
statements that your client made during the 706 and why they
reached their conclusions based upon that.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: What I'm unclear on is are those
statements that are contained in the report or are those
statements ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I believe they were the statements
contained in the report because, otherwise, I don't know how
they would know of them.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, I -- I believe there
 might be clarification necessary there, to the extent that
 there are statements that are outside of the report.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What about the statements in the report?
Can they ask him about the statements made during the 706 that
led him to his conclusions?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: We would -- the defense position is no,
8 that the -- unless we trip that lever, those statements are
9 off the table.

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right.

Government, last -- Lieutenant Schwartz, just a clarification question. Do the statements -- the statements that you intend to discuss with Dr. Johnson, those only include the ones that are included in long form 706; is that correct?

16 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: That is correct, Your Honor.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you.

All right. I'll take that up under consideration. I
will very likely address this before we have Dr. Johnson on
the stand. Okay.

That takes us to AE 475, the government motion to
compel disclosure of the accused's behavioral health records.
In this proceeding, the defense asserted privilege on behalf

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

of their client. I believe I recall specifically Captain
 Mizer asserting that privilege, at least in a -- in one of the
 attachments in an e-mail; is that correct, Captain Mizer?
 Isn't that correct?

5 DDC [CAPT MIZER]: That's correct, Judge.

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: 513 dictates that a session that -- that 7 the military judge must conduct a hearing before ordering the 8 production of any records. So I'm going to conduct that. And 9 then the rules also indicate that if any party wants the 10 session closed to the public, because it's going to discuss 11 mental health records, that such session should be closed. 12 Does either party desire this hearing to be closed to protect 13 privileges under 513? Defense?

14 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I don't believe it's necessary, Your15 Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Does your client agree with that?
ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Your Honor, at this point we should not
be getting into the substance of any records, just the
existence, which would not necessitate disclosure.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Government, agreeing?
 21 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government concurs, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. All right. Lieutenant Schwartz,
is there a reason that I should not just provide -- conduct a

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

regular 513 hearing and analysis -- and apply the analysis and
a large amount of case law regarding 513 disclosures to
this -- to this motion?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Your Honor, I think that this is a bit
5 of a unique situation under 513 ----

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: How so?

7 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- and as exist. So right at this 8 point, there are numerous -- there are numerous facets of 9 mental and behavioral health records that have been -- that 10 have been either produced or created for the accused. At this 11 point, at -- right now, we have possession of the behavioral 12 health records but no permission to view the behavioral health 13 records. The government technically has possession of the 14 accused's behavioral health records. However, the trial team 15 has walled itself off from those records and, therefore, I 16 have not seen it. However ----

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. That's the special trial counsel18 has them, not you.

19 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Correct.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Separate counsel. Walled off. Not you.

21 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: This is the proceeding that I have
dictated or stated that is -- or confirmed is the correct

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

procedure in order to prevent disclosure of those records to
 you, but provided in full to the defense.

3 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: That is correct, Your Honor. And so 4 right now where we stand is that the defense has made numerous 5 arguments concerning motions to suppress and things as such 6 based on the mental health and issues of the accused, is 7 primarily in AE 467 as we stand for a diagnosis of PTSD and 8 allegations of learned helplessness saying that he is unable 9 to make voluntary statements. So at this time, the defense, 10 in the government's mind, has brought into issue the mental 11 health of the accused to include behavioral health, which is a 12 facet and subset of mental health, but we do not have those 13 records.

14 We have had testimony, and we're about to have more 15 testimony this week from Dr. Malone who created those 16 behavioral health records and I -- I'm not sure that she has, 17 from what I understand, has not reviewed them in anticipation 18 of her testimony. She's been called by the defense to testify 19 in support of AE 467, yet we are still not being granted 20 permission to view these records whenever she's about to 21 testifv.

And then they're also bringing in Dr. Crosby, who isanother expert that defense is bringing in to discuss 467 and

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

presumably has viewed -- and I'll allow defense to correct me
 if I'm wrong -- presumably viewed these records as well. Yet
 again, despite our numerous requests and filings, we have
 still been denied access to these records.

And so the government is having difficulty in refuting
allegations and bringing its proper position before this
commission whenever we are unable to be completely informed as
to the background of these witnesses who are testifying and
given their opinions and positions.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Uh-huh. So I understand that you -that -- let's go back to the question that I asked you.
Should I conduct a regular 513 hearing and apply the analysis
and rules and the case law that has come out of 513
litigation?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: I believe that the government has
successfully and adequately put forth its position under 513
for the exception of (7) when an accused ----

18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right, okay. Yes.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- offers statements or other
evidence concerning the accused's condition.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So should I go through the process of applying 513 and should I apply M.C.R.E. 513 or should I be further informed by M.R.E. 513 which is much more greatly

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 developed?

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government does agree that 3 M.R.E. 513 is much -- is much more developed. And at this 4 point, I believe that an analysis under 513 would be 5 warranted, given the fact that the government is posing, as it 6 does in its filing, that under 513(7), the defense has put the 7 issue -- the mental health at issue of the accused and the 8 government is still -- the government is, therefore, given the right to review all of the records either created by, which is 9 from Dr. Malone, or reviewed by Dr. Crosby, two witnesses just 10 11 this week that we're going to hear from from the defense that 12 we are, therefore, warranted to review these -- these ----

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

14 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- records.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So what's the test under 513 then, Counsel? I've asked this question more times -- many more times probably than you can imagine. What's the test under S13 for admissibility -- for your motion to be granted? What would that be?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: In determining whether or not there is a privilege to be claimed and determining whether there is a correct -- the person who has claimed the privilege is, in fact, warranted to do so and whether that then exception has

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 applied under 513(d), which we believe it has.

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So a specific credible factual basis --3 you must demonstrate a specific credible factual basis 4 demonstrating reasonable likelihood that the records or communications would contain or lead to discovery of evidence 5 6 admissible, under an exception to the privilege, that the 7 requested information meets one of the enumerated 8 exceptions -- you're claiming seven -- that the information 9 sought is not merely cumulative of other information, and that 10 you, the government, has made reasonable efforts to obtain the 11 same or substantially similar information through 12 nonprivileged sources.

Talk me through how you meet that test.

13

14 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: For the first prong, Your Honor,15 for under the factual -- the factual portion ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yes. Specific factual basis that it'sgoing to lead to evidence that is admissible.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: So at this point, we believe that there will be admissibility, especially given the litigation that we, one, have already gone through and are currently going through regarding motions that are seeking to suppress statements determining voluntariness for statements made in 20 2007 by the accused. We do believe that there is a -- there

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

is a reliable indication that there would be admissible
 evidence from the accused in his behavioral health records.
 He's been evaluated and has been claiming that he is unable to
 make certain statements due to his inability to make voluntary
 statements to law enforcement.

6 So the behavioral health records make an evaluation of 7 the mental state of the accused. And certain actions -- and 8 what they -- whether they rise to a certain mental health 9 condition, judging by his actions. The government's position 10 is those facts would be admissible and are necessary, and this 11 is all somewhat speculative, depending on what further 12 litigation comes at trial, that they would be admissible and 13 necessary in order to refute some of the allegations the 14 defense has made. Again, primarily set forth in AE 467.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Which -- which is it trying to refute?Mhich are you refuting?

17 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The PTSD. As would -- and I know
18 these are kind of conflated ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Is it PTSD? Is the PTSD a refutable20 issue, that he has PTSD?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: It's more so the things that
trigger -- the -- the potential, or I guess the -- the given
diagnosis of PTSD. I think there's some disagreement between

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

the government and defense as to what, in fact, is a
 triggering point for his PTSD, and, therefore, may affect his
 voluntariness to make statements. For example in 467, the
 shaming instance.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You have the evidence that he's 6 diagnosed with PTSD and that all of the events that happened 7 to him from 2002 onward happened to him and you know that he 8 made his statements in 2007, and you know the defense is 9 alleging that the statements aren't voluntary because of some 10 behavior that occurred then. And my issue is, is it necessary 11 for you to have those records to refute that allegation ----

12 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government's position ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- without the -- with the amount of expert -- I would just say that I'm sure that the government will have an expert called to discuss the voluntariness of the statements and whether or not -- and the impacts of PTSD on the ability to make a voluntary statement, correct?

18 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor. And I do intend to19 get into that in just one moment.

For why it's necessary, as you just requested from the government, we do believe it's necessary because within that -- we are presuming again, but within that, those reports for behavioral health records, it's going to indicate any

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 triggers that the accused might -- might suffer from regarding 2 his PTSD, whether it be shaving, showering, however -- however 3 he may be affected and what those triggers are, which would 4 therefore affect his ability, according to the defense, to 5 make a voluntary statement. And so it is necessary for the 6 government to see those, not to mention it's necessary for the 7 government to review those records in order to adequately 8 cross-examine the defense's witnesses. There are two this 9 week who have either reviewed or created, to the government's 10 understanding, behavioral health records and we have nothing 11 that we can cross-examine the details on for that.

We would like to know the underlying basis for
Dr. Malone of creating any behavioral health records, whether
there are specific instances, specific facts, actions that
would have arisen to cause a diagnosis ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That's a different question then, right?
That's a different question. The defense, I believe, stated
in their response that their experts only looked at the
records that they included at H, R ----

20 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Correct.

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, it's H. R is -- it's H. So
22 they've -- that's what they said that they relied upon and
23 will use in their testimony. I'm asking you for a specific

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

factual basis -- a factual basis that demonstrates that
 there's going to be -- that the records or communications have
 admissible evidence in them.

4 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: One of the issues, as you just stated, 5 with the attachments the defense made to their -- to their 6 filing, H, is that there are only very specifically selected 7 records that have been given to defense whenever we aren't 8 getting the whole picture. And so understanding that the 9 defense says Dr. Crosby or Dr. Malone have reviewed X, Y, Z, 10 and that's what their testimony is going to be, whenever you 11 have the doctor testifying who created the behavioral health 12 records, understanding that maybe not for this session she's 13 reviewed those, but she created them whenever she was doing an 14 evaluation, which is exactly what we're talking about in this 15 session.

16 So understanding they can say, no, we only had her 17 review X, Y, Z, well, she created all of these documents that 18 are relevant and necessary for the government that she's going 19 to be speaking on. So the government, understanding that she 20 may only review certain documents, still believes that it's 21 going to affect her testimony, especially the substance of it 22 and we would like the opportunity and believe that we're 23 warranted to have the opportunity to discuss that with her

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

whenever the basis of 467 are things that he has PTSD and
 can't make a voluntary statement whenever there has been an
 indication of nightmares or flashbacks as it relates to PTSD,
 these are all small factors that have a heavy impact on the
 government's position.

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: I'm going to try to crystallize what 7 your argument is there, because there wasn't -- you stated 8 that -- is it your argument that because the witness that will 9 testify on the selected documents created many more documents, 10 is your specific factual basis that there's more discoverable 11 and potentially admissible information on this topic?

12 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Correct. As she -- as the witness who 13 created these behavioral health records is testifying to the 14 basis of the behavioral health records, his mental health, 15 PTSD, the defense uses learned helplessness as another basis 16 in 467. This is exactly the reason that she's coming to 17 testify. Yet there are all these records that she has created 18 concerning this exact topic that the government has not had 19 access to.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. The second part of the test is that the requested information meets one of the enumerated exceptions. And you cite (7), which is when an accused offers statements or other evidence concerning their mental condition

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 in defense, extenuation or mitigation, under circumstances
2 that are not covered, as we previously discussed, by 706 and
3 302.

4 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor.

5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That's -- that's your -- that's your 6 position?

7 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor.

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Have they offered it in defense,9 mitigation or extenuation?

10 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: At this point we believe that they've 11 been offered in -- essentially I quess it would be best 12 classified as -- well, it's the crux of their case. It's --13 right now it is in defense. It's the crux of their case, is 14 that was unable to make voluntary statements whenever they 15 know that these statements are being admitted by the 16 government and they're saying that they need to be suppressed 17 because he was unable to make voluntary statements and, 18 therefore, didn't have the culpability to make those 19 statements to law enforcement.

So we do believe that because they're using his mental health as a -- as a defense at this point, that the government does trigger the exception under (7).

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. And the next question is:

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Is this information not cumulative of things that are
 otherwise available, such as the 706 long form, perhaps?
 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: We do not -- I apologize. We do not
 believe so, Your Honor. We believe that because these

5 documents were created by his treating psychiatrist at the 6 time, closer in time to the statements that were made, that 7 these are much more relevant to the time as -- I mean, defense 8 just stated, the evaluation in 2013, that by defense's own 9 words, had nothing to do and likely weren't -- weren't ----

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Were the mental health ----

11 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- constructive ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Were the mental health records of the accused not made available to the doctor who evaluated him in 2013 for the 706 board?

15 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government's understanding is --16 is yes, they were made -- they were made available. However, 17 as I said earlier, there are numerous pieces of mental health 18 records that are being viewed. And while they reviewed it in 19 coming to their conclusion, that's also part of the reason by 20 which we want to see them. As we stated earlier, defense 21 leans heavily on a diagnosis of PTSD, but in their filing in 22 467 also makes notions of learned helplessness, which we have 23 not seen a diagnosis of.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Therefore, we would like to be able to see behavioral
 health records, if there was an evaluation done for learned
 helplessness or any kind of observations made as to whether or
 not the accused, in fact, suffers from learned helplessness,
 as that has been raised by the defense in AE 467.

6 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So you don't have enough in the 706
7 board, which was conducted afterwards. The long form 706 that
8 you have is insufficient even though it took into
9 consideration all of these other behavioral health records -10 behavioral health records?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: That is the government's position.
And primarily that would be the attenuation of when those
records were created. Understanding that the doctor was able
to review those records, we believe that they are still
necessary to get the actual behavioral health records that
were created by Dr. -- by Dr. Malone.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Primarily, Your Honor, because whenever they're doing a 706, there were certain questions, as you know, certain things that they're required to look for in answering. And there are -- there is a possibility, at least in the government's mind, that in reviewing these documents whenever they are looking at answering these certain questions

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 and standards that there is certain information that may not
2 be included in an R.M.C. 706 form that would, in fact, still
3 be relevant and discoverable to the government.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And the last part of the -- the test that generally applies to 513 -- and again, I'm relying upon the procedures in M.R.E. 513 because I -- it has evolved beyond that of M.C.R.E. 513, because there's much less litigation regarding that in this format.

9 The last part of the test is the party, that's you,
10 have made a reasonable effort to obtain the same or
11 substantial information through nonprivileged sources.

12 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Yes, Your Honor. And so we received 13 the 706 obviously, as we've heard a lot about today. And I 14 have already -- I will rest on what I just said. I won't 15 repeat it for the commission. We still do believe that it is 16 necessary apart from the 706. There have been numerous 17 efforts in order to review these records, numerous filings --18 prior filings to review these records. And at this point ----19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, no, but that -- that's to get 20 privileged information.

21 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Understood.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The information from a nonprivileged
source. That's -- that's what you're required to demonstrate

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 as well.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Understood. And the government's position is there -- at this point, the government is not aware of another way in which we can get the information that is held within those behavioral health records that would satisfy the discovery that we believe that we are entitled to, given the defense's position in AE 467, raising the mental health of the accused.

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Anything else?

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Pending any further questions, Your
Honor, I believe that I will just rest on my filing.

12 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. Thank you.

Defense?

13

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Thank you, Your Honor. Defense
position is that Your Honor is correct in applying the
standard M.R.E. 513 analysis to this. This is a well-settled
area of military case law.

Just as an opening point, if the government didn't know what records existed, there's kind of this question, then, of how did they know that this was hand-selected? But to the point that really kind of is the overarching thing ----MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well, they don't have the -- I mean, the special trial counsel is segregated, does not -- it has not

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 passed this information on. The -- they're asking for the 2 records so that they can have them. The -- I don't know -- it 3 is -- you -- there are -- it does appear to be what you have 4 submitted in support of 467, do appear to be select documents, 5 correct? I mean, it's not the entirety of the record. 6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct, Your Honor. It just does

7 raise some questions. And I won't belabor the point ----

8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Counsel ----

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- but we did file an objection10 to ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- counsel makes this argument all the
time. They saw somebody. There must be a record of something
about it.

14 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Sure.

15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: And the argument generally fails. But16 because nobody has produced any part of the record.

However here, where we go back to essentially the
origins of 513 with your case, which was -- which wasn't a
government requesting an accused's mental health records case,
the -- here you have provided some of the records. You have
provided some.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Fair. And don't intend to belabor it.
Just wanted to note that we did object to the -- the special

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 trial counsel ----

2 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Understood.

3 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: ---- and rest on the pleadings.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Noted and ruled upon -- or will be ruled5 upon.

6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Understood. Again, M.R.E. 513 is the 7 appropriate legal paradigm as far as the defense is concerned. 8 What the government is asking for here is discovery. 513 is not a rule of discovery, it's a rule of privilege. So going 9 10 through those just factors. As far as whether or not this is 11 intended to -- or likely to elicit admissible information, and 12 I think I can tie this pretty closely to the government's 13 initial pleadings here, it's not -- it's not likely to result 14 in admissible information.

And I say that for a couple reasons. One, what you see in the defense's pleadings in 467 are numerous references to undiagnosed mental conditions. I'm not sure what the government thinks they're going to find, when the defense has conceded that these are undiagnosed. If they're undiagnosed, by their very nature they're not there.

Additionally, what we heard during the last set of
hearings from the senior medical officer, is that
Mr. al Nashiri was never evaluated for PTSD. There's no PTSD

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

workup at any point in his history. And so if they're looking
 for some type of evaluation, we've already had a fact witness
 on the stand to say that doesn't exist.

To the extent that they're looking for evidence to refute triggers, frankly, I just don't know that that's medically sound. If I'm a rape victim, you don't get to tell me that the perfume in the -- or the cologne in the BX is not triggering my memory or my flashback of the rape. But still, there's no reason to believe any of that evidence would be in there because, again, we know it was never an evaluation.

11 They mentioned the information about learned 12 helplessness. There's no DSM diagnosis of learned 13 helplessness. We heard that from Mr. Mitchell. So very 14 specific facts that this commission already has before it that 15 what the government purports to be looking for would not 16 exist.

What's been offered here is not a defense and
extenuation or mitigation of the charged offense. We're
talking about a suppression motion and a state of mind. We
are not talking about an insanity defense. We're not talking
about defense is putting on a mitigation expert ----

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: This is about voluntariness of the23 statement.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct, but that is not -- the defense 2 has not put the mental health records to say that -- has not 3 put his mental health records in play in that manner. And so 4 what you're looking at, Judge, when you're looking at those is 5 you're not looking at the mental health condition from a 6 treating provider. You're looking at those really as fact 7 records. You're looking at records that talk about the 8 factual basis of what happened, and that's what you're going to see in the testimony. 9

10 And, frankly, you have them before you. The defense 11 has attached every record that we intend to rely on. So when 12 the government stands up and says we have no idea what 13 Dr. Carr-Malone or Dr. Crosby are going to testify to this 14 week, that's not a fair statement.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Are they providing expert opinions?
ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Dr. Carr-Malone will not be. And
everything that she has seen, the government has. Dr.
Carr-Malone is a ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Not necessarily true. If she created more mental health -- behavioral health records than what you included, she's seen the ones that she created. You only attached the ones that you've provided her for review for this hearing.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And if I can just have one moment to 2 clarify, because I want to make sure before I say this to the 3 commission, but I believe I can represent something. 4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. 5 [Pause.] 6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: All right. And so just so I get the 7 nuance of this right. Recognizing that there are records that 8 we are provided with identities redacted. 9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Say that one more time. I apologize. 10 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Recognizing that there are records that 11 are provided with identities redacted, we have -- we have 12 included everything that we are aware Dr. Carr-Malone has 13 produced. So to the extent the defense knows that she 14 produced a document, we have included it. 15 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: If it comes out in testimony that she 16 produced more ----17 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I don't believe we ----18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: ---- in which -- hold on. 19 If it does come out that she produced more, would that 20 be discoverable then? 21 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: No, I don't believe so, Your Honor. 22 And because this isn't a rule of completeness thing. 23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Hold on. We'll get to that in a second.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

It's not a rule of completeness. I think that's analogous but
 not where I'm going with it, but go ahead.

3 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: No, I don't think so. Part of this, 4 Judge, is I mean we're playing this game with our arms tied behind our back a little bit as the defense. I don't know 5 6 that we have all the records. I don't know what records have 7 Dr. Carr-Malone's name potentially redacted on them. There's 8 a little bit of I don't know what I don't know here. So doing 9 our level best here. We provided everything. But, Judge ----10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Everything that you think that she

11 created?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Correct. And everything we've put at issue. But everything that we intend to elicit has been turned over. That fulfills our obligations under the rules. MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But that's not all the records you have obviously. Because you have all of the mental health records, correct, and behavioral health records?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: I will never concede that we have allof them. We have what the government ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You have more than what you provided in 21 this?

22 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Yes.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: But again, Judge, that's not the test
for 513. The 513 is are they admissible?

And then moving on to the, you know, are they
offered -- have they been offered in defense extenuation
mitigation, are they cumulative? They absolutely are.

6 And Your Honor had asked government counsel a number 7 of questions about the 706 report. That's one thing that they 8 may be cumulative with, yes. The 706 report is there, the 9 government has that. The government has the fact that the 10 mental health records were foundational documents to compiling 11 that.

But drawing your attention to the government's own pleading, the government very quickly dismisses the defense's allegations or the defense's assertions in 467 by saying they're easily refuted in the more fulsome DIMS records.

16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The DIMS records.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: So the government is able to quickly, by their own words, dismiss everything that we have raised by records that are already entirely within their possession in unclassified way, which ties in very closely to the fourth prong about are they able to do this with nonprivileged sources? Yes, they are able. They already have the material to do so. And they can.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

You know, and frankly, Your Honor, I really think
 that's the point here. We recognize we have certain
 obligations. If we are going to call an expert, we are going
 to have to turn over what that expert has relied on. We are
 not calling Dr. Carr-Malone as an expert. She is being called
 as a fact witness. We do not ----

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But you are calling Dr. Crosby as an8 expert, correct?

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Yes, and we have ----

10 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: What has she reviewed? Has she not 11 reviewed the entirely of the behavioral health records in the 12 formation of her opinion?

13 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Over the course of her contact with our 14 case, she has reviewed all of -- most, if not all. However, 15 in the -- what she is testifying to is a discrete issue and 16 everything that she is testifying to, those records have been 17 disclosed. And she will not be -- and just to be clear, Your 18 Honor, just to be entirely clear about Dr. Crosby's testimony 19 this week, it actually has -- does not have to do 20 Mr. al Nashiri's mental health records.

21 Dr. Crosby's testimony this week is entirely limited 22 to her treatment as a internist, as a medical provider, not in 23 any way her review of his mental -- if I could have a moment.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 [Pause.]

2 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: It will not be -- it will not be
3 touching on his mental health records.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: So none of her opinion will have
5 anything to do with her review -- but ----

6 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: This week.

7 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Not does it have anything to do with it.
8 Did she review that in the formation of her opinions that
9 she's going to provide?

10 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Not this week. She will not be 11 providing any opinions this week that have anything to do with 12 the review of her -- her prior review of any mental health 13 records. It is an entirely discrete issue that she will be 14 testifying as to this week.

And I'm not being coy with the commission. She'll be
16 testifying as to the validity of what the government
17 euphemistically calls rectal feeding.

18 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Called what?

19 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Rectal feeding.

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Oh, okay.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: So that has nothing to do with mental
health. So it will just be on ----

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: That's all she's talking about?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: That is all she's talking about, Your2 Honor.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Have you not as the defense sent --4 waived the privilege in this by providing portions of the 5 mental health record and saying this is what we need to 6 support this and then waive the privilege to the remainder of 7 the records by stating we're relying upon these mental health 8 records to make our point in defense mitigation? Because if 9 this isn't defense to try to keep out his -- his statement, 10 I'm not sure what it is.

And then if you -- have you not waived it, then, by using portions of it and then picking your portions that you want to use and saying, well, you can't use the rest because it's privileged? Are you not trying to use 513 as the -- as the shield and a little bit of a sword there?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Your Honor, it's not a balloon, right? Privilege isn't a balloon. It doesn't pop. You know, we are able to provide limited waiver as to certain records. We -it is our position that any release of records is narrowly tailored. We are not required to turn over his full mental health history. It is ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Well, they're not asking for the full.
They're asking until 2007, the same portion of which -- I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 mean, let's be clear. The defense is asking for 2007 and
2 no -- I mean, pardon me. The government is asking for up to
3 2007 and no further.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And again, Your Honor, the defense's
position is it still does not meet the criteria under 513.
There ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Even you're using the same mental health records to make your point doesn't permit them to have the remainder of the mental health records which might contradict your own positions that we can only assume -- I don't think you went through his records and picked out the -- the stuff that wasn't most helpful to your client, right?

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Fair, Your Honor. But again, the
government still has a requirement to prove that there would
be admissible evidence within there.

16 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Under ----

17 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And ----

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: But you proved that there's admissible evidence in there because you presented it. There's admissible -- you said, hey, this is evidence that's admissible on this topic. There's admissible evidence in these records. Here's some of it.

23 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Sure. Your Honor ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: The rest of it, though, we don't want
you to look at.

3 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Again, my client controls the4 privilege.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Right. To the point to where it's
waived. I mean, there is no privilege when you're using it.
The rules simply state there is no privilege when you're
offering it in defense extenuation and mitigation.

9 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And, Your Honor, the defense's position
10 would be that our obligation begins and ends with 705, that we
11 are required to provide anything our -- our -- our experts are
12 relying on.

13 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Experts are relying upon.

ADC [MS. MORGAN]: And Dr. Carr-Malone is not an expert. Dr. Carr-Malone is not opining as to the ultimate question of our client -- she is not testifying to our client's defense extenuation or mitigation. She is not opining on the ultimate questions of his capacity to make a voluntary statement. She is testifying as a fact witness. And so it does not fit within the ambit of 513. It does not waive the privilege.

21 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Thank you.

22 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. I believe that covers

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 everything that we had on the schedule today.

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Your Honor, if I may just briefly.
3 I'm sorry.

4 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Yeah, sorry. I just heard the voice and5 I didn't know where you were. Go ahead.

6 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Apologies. Just very briefly, Your7 Honor.

8 For the documents that -- understanding that maybe 9 defense has limited what is being reviewed by these witnesses, 10 whenever -- whenever a witness is being called, though, as we 11 know with Dr. Malone here, she also created these documents. 12 Understanding, as you pointed out, she may not have reviewed 13 them, she created them. And, therefore, the government does 14 believe that that warrants the government's ability to review 15 these records just because the defense isn't having her review 16 them prior to her testimony in this session.

17 The defense counsel also just said that -- that they 18 are speculating that we are seeking the documents to be used 19 for fact, which we'll hear from witnesses this week. That is 20 the problem, is they are saying those documents include 21 certain facts which we can then rely on the testimony from 22 these individuals. But that is the problem, because now we 23 have them saying we're not having them review any of the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

records that happened, you know, ten years ago, but then we're
 going to have them testify to the facts and just rely on that
 when we have nothing else to look at. So that's another issue
 that we see.

5 The other issue about they have given everything that 6 they're aware of, the government's position is it is their 7 client, it is their record, they have the ability -- if 8 they -- if they can say with certainty, listen, there are no 9 behavioral health records that were created by Dr. Malone, 10 okay. But at this point for them to say, well, we don't know 11 what's out there. Well, it's their client's records.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No, no, no. Their position -- I'll 12 13 clarify that for the defense. First of all, I -- I don't know 14 that the accused -- I'm not going to speculate about whether 15 or not he knows who created what records. When they say that 16 they've provided all of the records created by Dr. Malone, 17 that's because that's all -- and I'm going to take counsel at 18 her word, that that's what they have. Her -- her speculation 19 about other mental health records not being produced as a 20 result of litigation regarding the production -- other 21 production of records in the past. So that's why ----22 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: And I was speaking -- yes, Your Honor,

23 I was speaking primarily ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Because if it ----

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- to Dr. Malone.

MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Because if that special trial counsel has other mental health records that haven't been produced to the defense and that you then end up with after -- if I were to order the production of those records, that would be highly problematic. Do you understand that?

8 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Agreed. Absolutely, agreed.

9 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay.

10 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The biggest thing that the government 11 just wanted to touch on was this -- the 706. So we've talked about the 706 a lot today. Defense counsel just said -- and 12 13 we were informed, whenever they told us that Dr. Crosby was 14 testifying, we were informed she reviewed 467, the 15 attachments. One of the attachments to 467 is the 706. 16 Within the 706, as we just discussed and I think we all agreed 17 upon, one of the things relied upon in making that document 18 are behavioral health records, as noted in the enclosures to 19 the 706. You can see in the 706 ----

20 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Who attached -- who attached it, though?
21 You attached it.

ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: The government did. But the biggest
thing -- but they just said that they had the ----

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: No.

2 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: ---- 706.

3 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: You don't get to create the -- the -4 okay. I understand your argument but that's -- that's an
5 argument. I don't know if it's a circle that ----

6 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Well, the defense is posing that we 7 have this other -- this other evidence as one of the -- is one 8 of the factors, that we have the 706; therefore, this is 9 cumulative and we don't need this.

Well, the 706, in part, is relied upon and includes the review of, as we've discussed, these -- these records from this time frame. And so while we have the blanket document, it was created, and we have a witness who has reviewed it and may have an opinion about it, but we don't have the underlying basis of what the 706 was created on. And the government did just want to -- just want to note that for the record.

17 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. Thank you.

18 ATC [LT SCHWARTZ]: Thank you.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. I think that covers what20 we're going to cover today.

Tomorrow we're scheduled to take up argument on 461, a 22 legal issue, and then we'll take -- we have one witness, which 23 we anticipate is going to take two hours on direct in open

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 session. Government, on cross, I know -- I'm going to 2 estimate that you'll probably take about an hour, hour and a 3 half, correct? Is this yours, Mr. Miller? 4 TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes, Your Honor. 5 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. About an hour, hour and a half: 6 is that correct? 7 TC [MR. MILLER]: That's fair, Your Honor. 8 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. And then because of the -- the 9 good questions that you always ask on cross, I'm sure that 10 that will elicit another hour or so from -- potentially 11 from -- from counsel on the defense. 12 So what I anticipate is doing the open session all in 13 the morning before lunch. And then the closed session when we 14 come back at -- after lunch, we'll do the closed session with

15 that witness, and then we'll get into the next set of issues.
16 Because I don't think any of the issues regarding the mental

17 health records comes up until Thursday; is that correct?

18 ATC [LCDR JOLLY]: Yes, sir.

19 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Thank you, Counsel.

20 And defense, do you agree?

21 ADC [MS. MORGAN]: That's right, Judge.

22 MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Okay. All right. All right.

23 Okay. Is there anything else to take up before I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	recess the commission for today until tomorrow at 09 when
2	we'll start with argument on 461 and then we'll take up our
3	witness, McFadden, immediately after that for open session
4	before lunch, go into closed session after lunch. And
5	obviously, if he goes long on the on the open session,
6	we'll take a break and then come back and and pick back up.
7	We're not going to we're not time limited with that. We
8	should have ample time to take that up.
9	Any other issues, Government?
10	TC [MR. MILLER]: No, Your Honor. He is here the week, so
11	if we have to go into Wednesday, that's fine too.
12	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: Perfect.
13	Defense?
14	LDC [MR. NATALE]: No, Your Honor.
15	MJ [COL ACOSTA]: All right. With nothing else that's
16	come up, the commission is in recess until 09 tomorrow.
17	[The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1513, 25 July 2022.]
18	[END OF PAGE]
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT