1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1348,

2 17 November 2017.]

MJ [Col SPATH]: These commissions are called to order.
All the parties who were present yesterday during our last
open session are again present. Mr. al Nashiri is present as
well. Thank you.

7 Colonel Aaron, a couple quick questions. You can8 come up here if you want to.

9 I know it's been an eventful few weeks. Really all I
10 want is an update on where the defense community is in
11 securing additional -- and I recognize we probably disagree on
12 the word I'm using -- but additional learned counsel for
13 Mr. al Nashiri.

DCDC [COL AARON]: Judge, I'm not sure how to answer that. I am not -- have not made an appearance here, do not represent any parties. I haven't been called as a witness, so I'm not sure what my standing is and what the purpose is for my being here.

I understand Lieutenant Piette attempted to file an
update with the court yesterday and that was rejected, so I
guess I'm at a loss to understand ----

MJ [Col SPATH]: You are the acting chief defense counselfor this proceeding according to General Baker.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DCDC [COL AARON]: I understand that, Judge. 2 MJ [Col SPATH]: He sent an e-mail. He said "I recuse 3 myself," and he said that you were taking on defense 4 counsel -- chief defense counsel responsibilities. And so 5 then I went and looked at what the chief defense counsel 6 responsibilities are, and you're supposed to resource this 7 team. And General Baker said he was securing learned counsel 8 because he had let one go. Again, I disagree with that, 9 obviously. 10 So I just want to know, are you securing additional 11 legal counsel -- learned counsel for Mr. al Nashiri? Are you 12 in the process of doing that? 13 DCDC [COL AARON]: First of all, Judge, I feel compelled 14 to at least put on the record my objection to the court 15 issuing an order for me to be here. I strenuously object to 16 the concept ----17 MJ [Col SPATH]: Feel free.

DCDC [COL AARON]: ---- that this court has the authority
to order any members of an independent organization who have
not entered an appearance in this case to appear in this
courtroom.

MJ [Col SPATH]: Well, I certainly can order witnesses.We've determined that, right?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 10984

1 DCDC [COL AARON]: No doubt, Your Honor.

2 MJ [Col SPATH]: And I am very comfortable that I can have 3 you as the chief defense counsel tell me if you're in the 4 midst of securing additional learned counsel. I more than 5 recognize that the defense community feels like they can ignore every order I give. I got that. And you are the same. 6 7 DCDC [COL AARON]: Your Honor, I do not speak for the 8 defense community ----9 MJ [Col SPATH]: Well, you do on this case. You are the 10 acting chief defense counsel. 11 DCDC [COL AARON]: I'm Acting chief defense counsel ----12 MJ [Col SPATH]: This seems like a pretty straightforward 13 question. 14 DCDC [COL AARON]: I'm sorry, Your Honor, I am the Acting 15 chief defense counsel ----16 MJ [Col SPATH]: Yep. 17 DCDC [COL AARON]: ---- for this case for the Military 18 Commissions Defense Organization. 19 MJ [Col SPATH]: Correct. 20 DCDC [COL AARON]: I am not -- I'm not sure what you're --21 Your Honor understands the defense community to be and I'm not 22 going to profess to speak for the defense community.

23 MJ [Col SPATH]: I'm speaking for your role as the Acting

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 chief defense counsel. You've read it, right?

2 DCDC [COL AARON]: Yes, Your Honor.

3 MJ [Col SPATH]: You know what your responsibilities are,4 right?

5 DCDC [COL AARON]: Absolutely, Your Honor.

MJ [Col SPATH]: The guy who was in your job last said
that he was going to secure additional -- no, he said "learned
counsel," because he purported to release the last one. I
obviously don't agree with that. I'm not asking you about
that.

Alls I'm asking is are you in the process of securing
12 learned counsel for Mr. al Nashiri? That's all.

DCDC [COL AARON]: And, Your Honor, I will confirm exactly
what was in Lieutenant Piette's attempt to file yesterday ----

15 MJ [Col SPATH]: I didn't know ----

16 DCDC [COL AARON]: ---- and that is we are proceeding in17 an attempt to secure learned counsel. Yes, Your Honor.

18 MJ [Col SPATH]: Seems -- that's it. That's all I want to19 know.

20 On Tuesday and on Friday of next week, I expect a
21 written update from the counsel who is representing
22 Mr. al Nashiri. I just want to know what you're doing.

23 Have you at this point identified any?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DCDC [COL AARON]: No, Your Honor.

2 MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. Have you made efforts to identify3 them?

4 DCDC [COL AARON]: Absolutely, Your Honor.

5 MJ [Col SPATH]: Are any of the ones you've identified, if
6 you know -- do they currently have a security clearance?

7 DCDC [COL AARON]: Your Honor, you're now getting into the
8 details that I do not feel comfortable getting into in a
9 public forum.

10 MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. Whether or not they have a11 security clearance?

12 DCDC [COL AARON]: Yes, Your Honor.

13 MJ [Col SPATH]: That's fine. I've gotten what I need 14 from you. Thank you so much. Sorry that that seemed to be 15 difficult as well. I really don't understand at this point. 16 DCDC [COL AARON]: Again, Your Honor, the most difficult 17 part of this is -- is the commission's belief that it can 18 order members of this independent organization to appear in 19 this courtroom when they have not entered -- they're not a 20 party, they have not entered an appearance for a party, and 21 they haven't been properly called as a witness.

MJ [Col SPATH]: The last time I tried to call one ofy'all as a witness, it didn't go very well, did it?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DCDC [COL AARON]: No, Your Honor, it didn't.

MJ [Col SPATH]: I'd like not to have to do that again.
DCDC [COL AARON]: I understand that.

MJ [Col SPATH]: So really that's what I'm trying to do.
And again -- I know you disagree with my orders -- it seems to
be a pattern.

7

All right. Thanks.

8 DCDC [COL AARON]: Yes, sir.

9 MJ [Col SPATH]: Lieutenant Piette, Tuesdays and Fridays
10 as we move forward, an update on where we are in the process
11 of identifying learned counsel for Mr. al Nashiri, okay?

12 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor.

MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. Why don't we call our witness, get
her sworn in, and then I will ask questions. I assume
Ms. Yaroshefsky is available, yes?

16 MATC [COL WELLS]: Yes, Your Honor.

MJ [Col SPATH]: All right. Then hopefully they'll know
they're coming up. All right. There we go. Can you all see
us?

20 WIT: Yes.

MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. Good. I assume then you can hear
us. I don't know what you see when I talk. I don't know
where I'm looking, so bear with me. If I'm not making eye

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	contact, it's not personal, it's because I'm not sure what
2	screen to look at. Okay.
3	Ms. Yaroshefsky, alls I'm going to do, I'm going to
4	have trial counsel swear you in as a witness. I've got some
5	questions for you, and then I'll let the parties, if they have
6	questions ask questions, and really hopefully get you on your
7	way pretty quickly. Okay?
8	WIT: Thank you.
9	MJ [Col SPATH]: All right. Colonel Wells, are you going
10	to take care of the witness, or Mr. Miller?
11	TC [MR. MILLER]: I'm just going to simply swear the
12	witness, Your Honor.
13	MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. If you would.
14	TC [MR. MILLER]: Thank you. Please stand. Thank you.
15	Raise your right hand.
16	ELLEN YAROSHEFSKY, civilian, was called as a witness for the
17	military commission, was sworn, and testified as follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	Questions by the Trial Counsel [MR. MILLER]:
20	Q. Would you state your name for the record, please.
21	A. Ellen Yaroshefsky.
22	Q. And where is your present location, ma'am?
23	A. Right now?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Q. Yes.

2 [MR. LUGER]: Virginia.

3 A. Virginia. I don't know the address here.

4 MJ [Col SPATH]: No worries. I think you're at the Mark
5 Center, just based on the video feed. Thanks, Mr. Miller.

6 Ma'am, I am going go ask you -- not that you have
7 spoken fast ----

8 TC [MR. MILLER]: Your Honor, before we begin can we
9 account for the other parties in the room? I believe there's
10 actually two lawyers and then I think there's one off camera.
11 MJ [Col SPATH]: That works. We can account for them if
12 you'd like to.

13 Questions by the Military Judge [Col SPATH]:

14 Q. Ms. Yaroshefsky, you have a couple attorneys with15 you?

16 A. I do.

17 Q. Okay. Are there two or three?

18 A. There are two attorneys. There's Mr. Asbill and19 Mr. Luger.

20 Q. Okay. Perfect. And then the third person or the21 party that's there? They're not an attorney?

22 SPEAKER: Escort.

A. I assume they're a military escort.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 10990

1 Q. All right. Thanks. 2 So I'm not suggesting that you've spoken fast; 3 however, it's easy to start talking fast, and we have to 4 interpret everything for Mr. al Nashiri. So just try to 5 remember to speak at a reasonably measured pace. I'll remind 6 you if I have to, okay? 7 I will try my best. Α. 8 All right. Can you tell me your current occupation? Q. 9 Yes. I'm a law professor. Α. 10 Q. Where? 11 Α. Hofstra Law School. 12 Q. And how long have you been in that position? 13 Α. Since last year. 14 Q. 2016? 15 Α. That's correct. 16 All right. And prior to that? Q. 17 Α. Prior to that I was a professor at Cardozo Law School 18 for 28 years. 19 Q. At Hofstra, what subjects do you teach? 20 I currently teach legal ethics, ethics in criminal Α. 21 advocacy and criminal procedure, and I direct the Freedman 22 Justice Program. 23 Have you served as an ethics consultant in -- other Q.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 than this case -- other cases, other criminal cases? 2 Α. Yes 3 In general, no exact number needed, but do you have Q. 4 any idea how many times? 5 Α. That I have been a consultant or that I've testified? 6 Q. Consultant first. 7 Boy, I -- in criminal cases, I would say -- in Α. 8 criminal cases only or in all cases? 9 Q. Criminal cases. 10 Α. I consulted -- in criminal cases? Several hundred 11 probably. 12 Q. And then in all cases? 13 Α. Oh. hundreds. 14 Q. Okay. I think you've already started to answer the 15 next part. You've testified before as an expert? 16 Α. I have. 17 Q. Across the board, criminal and otherwise, about how 18 many times? 19 Α. Maybe three or four. 20 Were they all in criminal cases or were they Q. 21 again ----22 Α. No. 23 Q. ---- a variety?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	[MR.	LUGER]: Let him finish the question.	
2	WIT	Sorry.	
3	MJ	[Col SPATH]: Oh, no worry.	
4	Α.	A variety.	
5	Q.	Okay. Were any of them in criminal cases?	
6	Α.	Yes.	
7	Q.	How many of those, about?	
8	Α.	One or two.	
9	Q.	Have you served as an ethics consultant or expert in	
10	a case u	nder CIPA, the Classified Information Protection Act?	
11	Α.	Testified?	
12	Q.	Let's let's start with that, sure.	
13	Α.	No.	
14	Q.	How about as a consultant?	
15	Α.	I think so. I'm not certain.	
16	Q.	In general, are you familiar with the the military	
17	commissi	ons?	
18	Α.	I don't I'm not sure I know what that means, "in	
19	general.	n	
20	Q.	Are you familiar with the Military Commissions Act?	
21	Α.	I wouldn't call myself an expert on the Military	
22	Commissions Act.		
23	Q.	All right. I want to talk now just about your	

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 involvement in the current case. I assume at some point you
2 were contacted by the defense community about this case; is it
3 true?

4 A. I'm not certain what you mean by "the defense5 community."

6 Q. Did one of the attorneys representing Mr. al Nashiri7 contact you?

8 A. I was contacted by Mr. Kammen.

9 Q. Do you remember approximately the time frame?

10 A. Yes. It was July of this year.

Q. When he reached out to you, what did he ask you orwhat did he tell you was his purpose?

A. He contacted me to ask whether or not I would be willing to be ethics -- provide ethics advice in a case he was handling at Guantanamo, and he asked whether or not, one, was I willing to do it; and secondly, would I be willing to get a security clearance in order for him to provide me with facts from which I could render an opinion.

19 Q. Prior to him reaching out in July of '17, did you20 know him?

A. I had met him once, but I had forgotten, actually,
22 that I had met him. I met him some years before that.

23 Q. Had you acted as a consultant or a witness in any

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 case that he was involved in?

2 A. No.

Q. After that initial contact -- I'm guessing the
4 security clearance piece didn't happen, is my guess.

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. Okay. Did he come back to you to get some kind of7 ethics opinion?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. When he came back to you, what did he explain kind of10 were the circumstances getting him to reach out to you?

A. He explained that there were intrusions into the
attorney-client communications, that he was unable to
communicate with his client, and that he was unable to explain
to his client why he couldn't communicate with him. But he
was circumspect about providing any information to me because
of the concern that it might be classified.

Q. And I think I've seen what he -- what he sent to you.
It appears that he sent you a timeline, not classified, where
he kind of gave at least his belief of what the intrusions had
been; is that fair?

A. I suppose. What happened was I asked him to provide
me with facts from which I could opine. Given the fact that I
was not privy to classified information, it was not even clear

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 that I could provide an opinion, but I asked him to provide me2 with the facts upon which he asked me to rely.

Q. And then, I know you don't have it in front of you,
4 but it appears to me he sent you basically a timeline from
5 late 2008 through June of 2017.

6 A. Judge, I was provided with my report as well as some7 documents. Would you like me to refer to those?

8 Q. Yes, that would be fine. Thanks.

9 A. All right. On -- in my letter opinion on page 3, I
10 note the factual basis upon which I rely, and those were the
11 facts provided to me by -- by Mr. Kammen. Also -- I'm sorry,
12 excuse me, they are also on page 4 -- page 3 and 4.

Q. Three and 4, okay. Outside of the -- kind of the
14 timeline that he provided, did he give you other -- any other
15 information?

A. In addition to the timeline, he provided Exhibit A
which is attached to my opinion, which was called
government -- "Governmental Interference with Attorney-Client
Communications, Intrusions into Attorney-Client Relationships,
Undisclosed Monitoring and Infiltration of Defense Teams."
Q. All right. I think we have the same exhibit here.

22 For the record it's Appellate Exhibit 339L.

23

And I know you will. If I make a misstatement,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 please correct me. I really, I am -- some days it feels like 2 I speak into the wind. I think we all know how that feels. I 3 really am trying to figure out the right answers in all this. 4 Is it fair to say that your opinion, the one that you 5 gave, the ethics opinion, is based on a presumption that the 6 information that Mr. Kammen gave you is true? 7 Α. Yes. 8 Q. Fair to say that the information he gave you -- I 9 mean, if it is different, if those facts aren't true -- and 10 I'm not going to go through them all -- but if those facts 11 aren't true, your opinion might be different? 12 Α. Might be. I would have to look at whatever facts --13 whatever other facts might exist. 14 I know in his -- in your opinion, I know that Q. 15 Mr. Kammen assessed the risk of intrusions to be substantial 16 and ongoing. Is that a fact that you accepted as correct? 17 I thought that that actually was given to him by --Α. 18 by the chief defense counsel. I thought he had received that 19 information. Perhaps if you could refer me to a specific 20 paragraph, it would be helpful. 21 Okay. I will. Just give me a minute to work through Q. 22 this. 23

So I've got Exhibit A in front of me.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT 10997

[MR. LUGER]: He's only referring to that [indicating].
Q. In Exhibit A, again, we have kind of the timeline,
for lack of a better term for it. How much weight would you
say that Exhibit A -- how much weight did you give it in
coming to your opinion?

6 I looked at all of the facts together. I can't weigh Α. 7 one particular fact or one particular set of facts. The way 8 that -- the way that Exhibit A is referenced in my opinion is 9 in the second bullet on page 3. It says, "The attached 10 Exhibit A," and then I give its name, "established that prior 11 to 2017 there was a significant history of actual and 12 attempted governmental intrusion into the attorney-client 13 relationships, including the placement of listening devices in 14 attorney-client meeting rooms."

15 That was a statement provided to me by Mr. Kammen as16 a result of Exhibit A.

Q. And fair to say that the information provided in
Exhibit A from Mr. Kammen, you assume all of those facts are
true and accurate?

20 A. I relied upon those facts.

Q. Did you visit -- did you attempt to visit the website
22 links that were in there?

A. No, I did not.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. My -- and again, I know you'll help me. My guess is
 if I were to say to you hypothetically, hypothetical, if you
 look on page 1 of Exhibit A, down to the third entry, 2011, if
 that were not true -- and that is actually -- I will tell you,
 based on my knowledge of this case, that's an accurate version
 of events.

7 A. It is or is not?

8 Q. It is. That is an accurate version of events.

9 A. Okay.

Q. But hypothetically -- just work with me on a
hypothetical. If that is not accurate -- right? Let's say
that is not true. Would that fact alone change your opinion,
or you wouldn't be able to answer that question?

A. I don't think I could -- I probably would not,
because the -- what I was relying upon was my bullet point,
which was Mr. Kammen's assessment of Exhibit A. I couldn't
assess Exhibit A on my own.

And so when it said that "There was a significant history of actual and attempted governmental intrusion into the attorney-client relationships, including the placement of listening devices in attorney-client meetings," I relied on that composite statement about Exhibit A.

23

So I don't know, sitting here, whether that alone

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 would change my opinion. I suspect it would not.

Q. And is it fair to say that in large part that the big
3 concern would be, of course, if there is an actual intrusion
4 by the government in an effort to listen to or get information
5 from attorney-client meetings?

6 Α. I'm sorry. I don't understand. Was that a question? 7 It is. I mean, is it fair -- I mean, I hate to make Q. 8 it sound simplistic, but it sounds to me like a big concern 9 would be -- frankly, hopefully for anybody, right? Judges, 10 ethics professors, everybody -- an actual intrusion into 11 attorney-client meetings by the prosecution or the government, 12 where they're listening and gathering information, that would 13 be a significant concern for you?

A. Well, certainly. Lawyers have an obligation toprotect client communications.

Q. So also is -- I mean, again, is it fair that if there
17 is not and has not been or haven't been this intrusion, this
18 listening-in or recording of attorney-client meetings, your
19 opinion might be different?

A. It might be. There are various ways one can intrude
upon the attorney-client relationship, and listening is one of
them. There are other mechanisms.

23 Q. And everyone was kind of using the word "intrusion."

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Let me ask you: When you use it, what do you mean?

A. I mean, any -- any way in which there is a violation
3 of the sanctity of the attorney-client relationship.

Q. And I more than recognize -- probably true for any
5 expert, right? You kind of rely on the facts provided to you
6 as you kind of work through your opinion, fair?

7 A. Absolutely. I'm not a fact-finder.

Q. And so again, this is a hypothetical, right? Maybe I
9 have it wrong. These days, I wonder myself. But if there is
10 no evidence of intrusion into this accused, Mr. al Nashiri,
11 and his lawyer -- if there is no evidence of intrusion into
12 those meetings, would that affect your opinion?

A. I'm certain it would affect my opinion. I'd want to14 see the facts, yes.

Q. Sure. If the evidence -- again if -- hypothetically,
if the evidence is there was no intrusion and nobody had
listened in on these meetings or recorded them or intruded, I
mean, as broadly as you want to define that term, fair to say
that would impact your opinion?

A. It would have an impact. I suppose that -- when you
21 say "is" -- "was," I also would add "is," because my
22 understanding of the facts that I relied upon was that there
23 currently -- there currently was such an intrusion.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. So maybe that -- and that helps. I think probably
 fair. Hypothetically, if there is no ongoing or current
 intrusion, that might have an effect on your opinion?
 A. Well, certainly additional facts would affect my
 opinion.

6 Q. And I will tell you, I -- one of the orders I've 7 issued, and I am attempting to get -- declassification is 8 important. It helps with transparency. I think everybody 9 hopefully in this room agrees with that. I am making an 10 effort, but I am not, of course, the classification authority, 11 so I am -- I am kind of at their mercy in some regard as we 12 try to go through this. I'm able to see it, which is helpful. 13 But I do -- it is important for the public to see it.

Now let's assume the intrusions occurred, everything
in Exhibit A is true and relate to this case and it happened.
So we get your opinion. As somebody who is an expert in
ethics, can you talk me through, then, the process for a
lawyer to get out of that attorney-client relationship?

A. A lawyer has an obligation to maintain that client
confidentiality, and when, in fact, the lawyer has
information, as I assume here, that they cannot -- they cannot
provide that level of confidentiality to the client, one, they
have an obligation to let the client know. They have a duty

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

of communication to the client, to tell the client what the
 situation is, and then they have an obligation to attempt to
 remedy the situation.

4 And so the lawyer would go through the necessary 5 steps which, from what I'm provided here, I assume the lawyers 6 did. They came to you, I believe -- I don't know if it was 7 you or someone else -- with the allegations of the intrusions. 8 They sought to have hearings. They sought to get to the 9 bottom, if you will, of the problem. And those motions were 10 denied. And so they went through all the available legal 11 remedies in trying to rectify the situation.

And at the time when they got to the point where,
unfortunately, the government intrusion was continuing and
they could not guarantee a client the fundamental -- it's
fundamental, as you understand.

16 Q. Absolutely.

17 Α. It's a bedrock principle that you can't communicate 18 with a client to represent them if you can't promise them 19 confidentiality. When that happens, then the lawyer has no 20 choice but to withdraw. They are mandated under the ethics 21 rules of every jurisdiction to withdraw when their conduct 22 would thereby violate the rules of professional conduct. 23 And so that withdrawal -- again, let's --Q.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

hypothetically, let's assume I have it wrong. Hypothetically,
 I order the attorney to continue with representation in the
 face of this. Again, hypothetically I've got it wrong; there
 were these intrusions. I order the lawyer to maintain that
 attorney-client relationship.

6 At least my reading of the Model Rule is that even if 7 you have good cause to withdraw -- right? They're listening 8 in, or whatever -- even if you have good cause to withdraw, if 9 a tribunal orders you to maintain the relationship, you have 10 to, or do I not -- what am I missing?

A. All right. I would refer -- it's not in my report,
but I would refer you to Model Rule and the rule of every
jurisdiction 3.4(c), which is a rule that says lawyers may not
disobey, essentially a lawful order of a tribunal. However, a
lawyer who believes that the order is not lawful has the
obligation to challenge that order and they must do so openly.
They can't just walk -- walk away and do nothing, right?

18 And so a lawyer is required to go through whatever19 open legal process there is to challenge that.

Q. And so, I mean, here we do have an appellate process.
We do have abilities to reach out to other courts. I think we
all know that. I mean, we can either go to the -- our
commission, military review process, or off to district

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 courts. I mean, there is a process. I assume that's what the 2 rule envisions, is ----

3 A. Yes, and ----

4 Q. Oh, sorry.

No, I'm sorry. I said yes, it's exactly what is 5 Α. 6 envisioned, and it's my understanding that's exactly what 7 occurred here; that at the time Mr. Kammen was ordered to 8 appear, he filed or his lawyers filed in the Northern 9 District -- one of the districts of Indiana, and they filed a 10 habeas petition and obtained an order. That's exactly what a 11 lawyer is required to do. That's what we want lawyers to do, 12 which is to use the legal process to challenge orders that 13 they do not believe to be lawful.

Q. Are you familiar with any jurisdictions where a
counsel can withdraw without making a motion to the court
before whom he is appearing?

A. Well, federal courts are certainly different than
this court. And so in the federal court, you certainly would
go to a judge and make -- make a motion. But that's not my
understanding, although that's beyond my expertise. I will
just tell you ----

22 Q. Sure.

23 A. ---- it's not my understanding of the law here.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. And then am I right, the Model Rule -- and it appears
 to be the same in Indiana, 1.16(c), but 1.16 does say that if
 ordered, the lawyer will continue representation,
 notwithstanding good cause for termination. I assume that
 means until this, whatever the appellate process is, plays
 out.

A. It does say that. But as I've explained, the lawyer
here, Mr. Kammen, went through the legal process. So even if
ordered, it has to be -- it has to be interpreted in light of
3.4(c), which is to say if the lawyer believes it's not a
lawful order, then they have an obligation to take action,
which is to say to go through some process, which is what -what happened here.

Q. Here, I mean, there is -- there seems to be some
communication with Mr. al Nashiri about kind of the facts
surrounding this. He's in the courtroom, and Exhibit A is
nonclassified and provided to him.

18 Is that something -- so let's assume, then, that
19 Mr. al Nashiri has some idea, right? I mean, everyone has a
20 guess as to what the worry is here, that somebody is listening
21 in on these conversations or intruding on these conversations.
22 Can the client waive that conflict?

23 A. A client can waive it with informed consent, but the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

language of informed consent means that there actually has to
 be a relatively robust way in which you can inform the client.
 And apparently here, because the information was classified,
 Mr. Kammen could not even inform his client of the reasons and
 the underlying intrusion; therefore, he couldn't obtain
 informed consent.

7 So at least for -- in this case, where we are in the Q. 8 process, if the underlying facts are declassified and 9 Mr. Kammen can talk with his client, that is something I 10 assume the client can waive if this informed consent occurs? 11 Α. I'm not sure I can opine about that without looking 12 at the nature of the information. One would -- it would be 13 very difficult to determine whether there was sufficient 14 information that Mr. Kammen could provide to his client in 15 order to obtain his informed consent.

Q. And then for CIPA cases, when you sign on to do one,
part of that is an understanding that there is going to be
information you can't share with your client, fair?

19 A. Correct.

Q. I'm not saying this is what happened here, but in
general, have you ever advised an attorney to simply
voluntarily abandon a client and refuse to appear in court
proceedings?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Well, no. But I've told lawyers that they may be Α. 2 required to withdraw, which is what I had to advise Mr. Kammen 3 here. There was no choice. He was mandated to withdraw. 4 Q. Based on the facts that he gave you? 5 Α. Correct. 6 MJ [Col SPATH]: Let me see what the parties have, and 7 then I'll see if I have other questions. 8 Thank you very much. Let me check with the defense 9 first. 10 WIT: Thank you. MJ [Col SPATH]: Defense Counsel? 11 12 DDC [LT PIETTE]: No questions, Your Honor. 13 MJ [Col SPATH]: All right. Trial Counsel, any questions? 14 MATC [COL WELLS]: Sir, I do have questions. Can I have 15 the ELMO turned on. sir? 16 MJ [Col SPATH]: Absolutely. 17 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** 18 Questions by the Managing Assistant Trial Counsel [COL WELLS]: 19 Good morning, Professor. Or good afternoon. Pardon Q. 20 me. 21 Good afternoon. Good afternoon. Α. 22 Q. My name is Colonel John Wells. I'm assigned to the 23 prosecution here. I have looked over your curriculum vitae,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 and I want to express my appreciation for your years of
2 service as a criminal defense attorney and also as an educator
3 in our profession.

We're struggling here because, I think, Mr. Kammen
knows more about this case than anybody. The many years that
he has represented Mr. Nashiri probably will pay off benefit
at trial. Have you had a chance to talk to Mr. Kammen after
he submitted his request for withdrawal?

9 A. No. After he submitted his request -- request? I
10 may have had a brief conversation, very brief. I'm trying to
11 remember. I don't -- I don't recall. If it was, it was very
12 brief.

Q. Are you in contact with him now by e-mail in anyregard?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Okay.

17 A. No.

Q. You provided your opinion to him. Was that as a
consultant, or did you provide it to him as a testifying
expert with the expectation that you would be called to
testify?

22 A. Only as a consultant.

23 Q. Okay. Ma'am, are you surprised to learn that he

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 submitted your opinion in a filing before this commission as 2 the basis for his withdrawal from representing Mr. Nashiri? 3 Α. No. 4 Q. I'm sorry, you're not aware or you're not surprised? 5 No, I'm not surprised. Α. 6 Q. Okay. If you provided the opinion just as a 7 consultant, did you expect your opinion to be relied upon by 8 this commission as the basis for Mr. Kammen to withdraw? 9 I understood that it could be -- he could submit it. Α. 10 I knew that once I provided my opinion to him, that he would 11 file a motion to withdraw. I did not know whether he would 12 actually provide the opinion or -- or not. 13 Q. Yes. ma'am. 14 Α. But I assumed that he could. 15 Q. Yes. And by providing that opinion, did you expect 16 to be called as a witness? 17 Α. No. 18 Q. Ma'am, I direct your attention to the first page of 19 the document. 20 Α. You're referring to my report? 21 Q. Yes. ma'am. 22 Yes. Α. 23 Q. And also the second page, second full paragraph.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 A. Of which page?

2 Q. Second page, second paragraph.

3 A. Okay.

Q. Where you say, "My qualifications to serve as an
5 expert witness on legal ethics are set forth below," and you
6 included your curriculum vitae?

7 A. That is correct.

8 Q. And -- but you still didn't expect to be called as a
9 witness on this matter; is that right?

10 A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Ma'am, this opinion that you provided was just
to Mr. Kammen, because on the front page it's just addressed
to Mr. Kammen, correct?

14 A. Correct.

Q. Are you aware that two other civilian attorneys
representing Mr. al Nashiri also submitted your opinion to
this commission as reasons for their withdrawal?

18 A. I subsequently became aware, I think only in the last19 week or so, that my opinion was submitted by other counsel.

Q. Did you give permission to Mr. Kammen to share your21 opinion with those other counsel?

A. I gave an opinion to Mr. Kammen for him to do with itwhat he chose to do.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Q. And if those other counsel contacted you, could you 2 have provided them a personal opinion, also? 3 Α. I'm not sure what you're asking. If they had asked 4 me to render ethics advice to them, would I have written a 5 letter for them? Is that the question? 6 Yes, ma'am. Q. 7 You know, if it was not a conflict of interest, I Α. 8 might have done so, but I would consider it. 9 Q. And you would have spoken with them just like you did 10 with Mr. Kammen, correct? 11 Well, I didn't actually speak with Mr. Kammen very Α. 12 much. I was provided with facts by Mr. Kammen. 13 I want to turn to page 3 of your opinion, the bullet Q. 14 points. You've covered point 1 and point 2, I believe. But 15 point 3 is a reference to a Supreme Court opinion. Do you see 16 that? 17 I'm sorry, I don't know what you're referring to. Α. 18 Page 3 of my opinion, the third paragraph says "on June." Ιs 19 it that one, on June 14th, 2017? 20 Q. Next one down, I apologize. The next one down. 21 Oh, yes. "As reflected in pleadings filed with the Α. 22 U.S. Supreme Court, defense counsel obtained information 'then 23 [REDACTED] contradicting the prosecution's assurances.'"

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. Yes, ma'am. Was that provided to you or did you
obtain that independently?

3 A. No, all of these facts were provided to me. I didn't4 obtain anything independently.

5 Q. Okay. Did you review all of that pleading to the6 Supreme Court?

7 A. I didn't review any pleadings. The only thing I
8 reviewed were the facts that are before you.

9 Q. Yes. And on that bullet, there was a sentence after
10 that statement but it's not included in your bullet. So what
11 I'm asking is: Did you just get this sentence, or did you
12 pluck it from the Supreme Court opinion?

13 A. No, this was provided to me by Mr. Kammen.

14 Q. And only that sentence?

A. I don't know what you mean by "only that sentence."
Every single fact contained in these bullet points came from
Mr. Kammen. I did not review any documents independently.

18

Q. Thank you, ma'am.

Also, the next bullet down, it talks about a
statement from the chief defense counsel. Only those words
that appear in your opinion were provided to you; is that
correct?

A. I'm -- once again, I'm not certain what -- what you

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 are indicating. That statement as well was provided to me by2 Mr. Kammen.

3 Q. But you did not review all of the chief defense4 counsel's comments that are referenced there, correct?

5 A. The only information upon which I relied is that6 which is contained on page 3 and 4, the facts.

Q. And then at the bottom there you outline a number of
actions that the defense team and Mr. Kammen have taken, a
series of motions to discovery, an evidentiary hearing, and
permission to inform the client; is that correct?

11 A. That's what it says.

12 Q. Yes, ma'am. Are those the only actions that you13 believe Mr. Kammen took to remedy this situation?

14 A. The only information I have is the information15 contained in this document.

Q. Yes, ma'am. In your years of representing clients -and I see that in the early '70s you worked in Seattle and the
West Coast there -- did you have an opportunity to meet with
clients in a jail setting?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And did you meet with them out in the recreation 22 yard?

23 A. No.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Q. And did you meet with them in a common area in a 2 cellblock? No would be the answer? 3 Α. Tn --4 Q. No would be the answer, correct? 5 Are you answering for me or are you asking me a Α. 6 question? 7 I am asking a question. Is the answer no? Q. 8 Α. Did I meet with them in a common area? I had 9 meetings with clients, not in the jail, but in prisons, not 10 meetings, but I talked to them; and then I had private 11 meetings with them as well. 12 Q. Yes, ma'am. And then did you ever meet with them in 13 their cell, holding area? 14 In any case that I've ever handled? Α. 15 Q. Yes, ma'am. 16 Α. At arraignments, certainly. 17 Q. Okay. In those circumstances it was the lawyer's 18 obligation to make sure that the circumstances provided 19 private or confidential communication; is that correct? 20 Α. Yes. 21 And if you saw anything that -- in those Q. 22 circumstances that was an intrusion into that relationship, 23 wouldn't you have an obligation to address that problem?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Generally, yes. I'm not sure what you're Α. 2 specifically referring to. And the reason I say that is there 3 are times in holding cells when you are arraigning a person 4 and you have no choice but to speak to them in that 5 environment. And so what you do in that environment is 6 attempt to get as little confidential information as possible 7 at that moment in order, for instance, to assure that they can 8 be released on bail.

9 But other than that, yes, you must do what you can.
10 You can go to systems. You can go to chief judges and try to
11 change that policy or that practice, but that oftentimes is
12 not successful.

Q. Yes, ma'am. And if the lawyer chooses to meet with
the client, say, in a recreation yard or a cellblock or the
cell itself, the lawyer is taking on the obligation to protect
those confidences, correct?

17 A. If what they're doing is securing confidential18 information that's necessary for representation, certainly.

Q. And would those circumstances, in your estimation, be20 less secure of the confidentiality?

A. Which -- you mean if you're in a common yard? I
 don't understand the question, so maybe you could rephrase it.
 Q. Exactly. Would those circumstances in a common

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 yard ----

2 A. Which ----

Q. ---- in a cellblock or in a cell, be less secure than
4 in a dedicated attorney-client meeting area?

5 Well, assuming the dedicated attorney-client meeting Α. 6 area was not one in which there was intrusions, the answer 7 would be yes. But it would totally depend upon the facts. 8 Q. Yes, ma'am. If the jail pointed you to a room that 9 was an interview room, and in that interview room it had a 10 glass-pane wall, one-way mirror, it had conduits, it had a 11 camera in the corner, would you believe that that is a secure 12 environment to have a confidential communication with your 13 client?

14 A. It would depend where it is.

15 Q. What do you mean by "where it is"?

A. Well, what system you're operating in. Is it a
federal system? Is it a state system? Is it a military
commission? What are the history -- what's the history in
that environment of intrusions? There are a variety of
factors that would influence whether or not one would think
that was a secure environment.

Q. Okay. Absolutely. Let's assume that it was afederal system and you were in there and you had all of the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	matters, say, in Exhibit A that Mr. Kammen provided to you.
2	And that would be part and parcel of your thinking about
3	protecting confidentiality; isn't that correct?
4	A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
5	Q. Yes, ma'am. Let's just break it down then.
6	With the hypothetical that I provided to you about an
7	interview room with the camera in the room, conduit, and a
8	one-way mirror, would it be reasonable for the lawyer to say,
9	I don't feel comfortable meeting with my client here to
10	exchange sensitive information. I want this wall with the
11	one-way mirror blocked off. I want the camera removed. I
12	want sound-deadening material?
13	I hope that you will agree with me that those would
14	be reasonable steps that the lawyer could take to protect
15	confidential information, correct?
16	A. It would depend on the circumstances. In some
17	circumstances, yes, in others no. I really can't answer that
18	question without knowing the more precise detail
19	Q. Okay.
20	A of the circumstances.
21	Q. But the lawyer could say, I don't want to meet in
22	this room with the client. I'm not going to accept what the
23	government is offering me. I just will not meet here. Isn't

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 that an acceptable option?

A. It depends on the circumstances. I'm not really
certain why it is you're asking me these questions. I'm
testifying about ethics rules, not about jail procedures. And
what circumstances would give rise to assurances of
confidentiality, that's really not within my expertise.

7

Q. Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

8 Ma'am, in your opinion you cite ABA Model Rules of
9 Professional Responsibility 1.6, Confidentiality of
10 Information. I am going to place this on the overhead. This
11 is marked as Appellate Exhibit 389S, I believe, page 1 of 10.
12 Ma'am, can you -- can you see this up on your monitor?
13 A. I can see it.

Q. Okay. And, ma'am, I think you did in your opinion
cite 1.6(a) there, "A lawyer shall not reveal information
relating to the representation of a client unless the client
gives informed consent." Is that one of those bedrock
principles that you noted in your opinion?

A. It is. I'm a little concerned, though, what this
document is, because they're no longer called the ABA Model
Rules of Professional Responsibility; they're the Model Rules
of Professional Conduct. So this looks like an extremely old
version of these rules.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. Okay. Is it substantially different today?
A. No, but I'm just -- I'm just pointing that out to
3 you.

Q. Okay. Thank you. (c) there, that statement, is that
5 an accurate statement of the Rules for Professional
6 Responsibility?

A. "A lawyer shall make reasonable efforts to prevent
8 the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized
9 access to, information relating to the representation of a
10 client." Absolutely correct.

11 Q. Yes, ma'am.

12 [MR. LUGER]: When you're reading, we all tend to speak13 quickly when we read ----

14 WIT: Right. I know. Thank you.

15 [MR. LUGER]: Just for the court reporter.

16 MJ [Col SPATH]: Thank you. They'll -- they'll give me a17 sign, I promise. I'm watching the screen.

18 [MR. LUGER]: Thank you.

Q. In your opinion, Mr. Kammen described to you and you
recite that he had taken three actions: He had filed a motion
for discovery -- I think this is on page 2 -- or page 3,

22 pardon me.

A. It's on page 3, yes.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	Q. And he had asked for an evidentiary hearing, and he
2	asked for permission to inform his client. But did he also
3	tell you that he had requested from the court to use the
4	courtroom as a meeting space instead of the other meeting
5	space that the detention command had provided to him?
6	A. I do not believe that information was contained
7	within the facts that I was provided.
8	Q. Okay.
9	A. But I will say let me just add that when I'm
10	looking at page 4, apparently he received advice from the
11	chief defense counsel not to utilize attorney-client meeting
12	spaces in Guantanamo.
13	Q. Yes, ma'am. And that was in June, correct?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. All right. And then he filed a series of motions
16	after that, correct?
17	A. If it says that here, that's correct.
18	[MR. LUGER]: It's on page 3.
19	WIT: That's afterwards.
20	A. Yes, it's the last paragraph on page 3, correct.
21	Q. And so those three motions on page 3 that were
22	provided to you, that's what he communicated to you that he
23	had done to act reasonably to secure a confidential meeting

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 area, correct?

2 A. Those are -- those are facts contained within this,
3 ves.

Q. Yes. I want to draw your attention again to the
5 screen. Can you see this document? This is Appellate Exhibit
6 369AAA; it's page 1 of 16. And then do you see the caption?
7 A. I do.

8 Q. "Motion by the Defense to Allow Mr. al Nashiri to
9 Meet with His Counsel in the Courtroom and Enforce
10 Mr. al Nashiri's Right to Counsel and Privileged

11 Attorney-Client Communications." Do you see that?

12 A. I do.

13 Q. And the date?

14 A. August 14th, 2017.

15 Q. And then what is the date of your opinion, ma'am?

16 A. October 5th, 2017.

17 Q. Do you know if that motion had been ruled upon before18 you provided your opinion?

19 A. I do not.

Q. All right. I'm going to put back on the screen -21 here's a motion, Appellate Exhibit 3690000, page 1 of 2. It's
22 a ruling by the commission on the motion, 369AAA. Have you
23 seen this ruling before?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 Α. I have not. 2 In this ruling the commission says there's no need to Q. 3 make a decision on the motion, correct? 4 Α. I can't read it. I'm sorry. Perhaps you could make 5 it larger. 6 Q. Sure. How is the focus on your end? 7 That -- that's much better. Α. 8 Q. I'll give you a moment just to read it, please. 9 [Pause.] 10 [Conferred with counsel.] All right. That's the first page. Let me turn to 11 Q. 12 the second page. Hang on, ma'am. 13 [Pause.] 14 Q. Yes, I know, a little curious. Stay with me, please. 15 Α I don't understand this. 16 Q. But this is a motion -- all right. Hold on. 17 [MR. LUGER]: Let him ask the question. Let him ask the 18 question. 19 Q. Sure. The commission has ruled that his motion to use the courtroom as an alternate location has been mooted by 20 21 other rulings. Is this what this opinion says to you? It's 22 a fairly ----23 Α. I have no idea. I have no idea what this opinion

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 says. You know better than I do.

Q. Thank you, ma'am. In the footnote portion, and I
draw your attention to the third footnote, it says that "The
commission has no objection to the defense coordinating with
the guard force to obtain use of the ELC courtroom to meet
with the accused during such times in which the commission is
not in session."

8 And this ruling seems to provide an additional
9 location for Mr. Kammen to meet with his client. Isn't that a
10 fair assessment?

A. I -- I can only read what it says. I don't know
12 that -- what it means.

Q. And while this motion was outstanding and yet to be
ruled on by the court, if you had been provided that
information, would you have come to the conclusion that
Mr. Kammen must withdraw from representing Mr. al Nashiri if
he had not exhausted this motion yet?

A. I would have to look at this motion. I'm not sure I
understand it. I'm not sure I understand the ruling, and I'd
have to look at that and consider it carefully before I would
render an opinion.

Q. Yes, ma'am. Questions about your opinion: You
provided your opinion only in your personal capacity; do I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 have that correct? 2 Α. Yes. 3 Q. You were not a representative of Hofstra University? 4 Α. Not at all. 5 Nor were you representing the American Bar Q. 6 Association? 7 Α. No, I was not. 8 Q. I'm smiling with you, because I just have to go 9 through this. 10 You were not an official with any other federal agency or government? 11 12 Α. No. 13 Or the State of Indiana or ----Q. 14 Α. No. 15 ---- or Illinois? Q. 16 Α. No. 17 Q. Nor did you represent the National Association of 18 Criminal Defense Lawyers; is that correct? 19 Α. Correct. 20 All right. I am troubled by why we do not have an Q. 21 opinion on ethics from Mr. Kammen's state bar. Can you shed 22 any light on that fact? 23 Α. I don't know. It's not required. I mean, one -- I

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

render ethics opinions in various jurisdictions. One doesn't
 need a state bar person to render an opinion under Indiana
 law, under Indiana ethics rules as to a lawyer's obligation in
 Indiana.

And frankly, it's the same around the country. I
mean, the ethics rules on confidentiality, communication, and
necessary withdrawal are the same in almost every
jurisdiction, including the military commissions around the
country.

Q. So it seems that it would have been no problem to
11 obtain an ethics opinion from the State of Indiana or from the
12 State of Illinois.

13 A. I have no idea. It's not required.

Q. I understand it's not required. Is it advisable?
A. Not necessarily, no. People go to lawyers to get
opinions, and I've been consulted by a wide range of people in
a wide range of matters in various jurisdictions.

18 MATC [COL WELLS]: Sir, I have no further questions.

19 MJ [Col SPATH]: Defense Counsel, do you have any20 questions?

21 DDC [LT PIETTE]: No, Your Honor.

22 MJ [Col SPATH]: All right.

23

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	Questions by the Military Judge [Col SPATH]:
3	Q. Ma'am, let me ask in kind of the world of ethics
4	that's certainly why I wanted you to come testify. I don't
5	know if you're familiar with it or not, there's a case
6	<u>Rusinow</u> , R-U-S-I-N-O-W, <u>v. Kamara</u> , 920 Federal Supplement 69.
7	I don't know if you're familiar with it or not. It relates to
8	1.16(a), and again, this and (c), this withdrawal.
9	A. I'm not familiar with it.
10	Q. Okay.
11	A. It relates to mandatory withdrawal?
12	Q. It does. And here here's the I want to read
13	you the language and then just talk to you about it. Again,
14	understanding you didn't review it before you came in.
15	It recognizes the notion and again, it's a
16	hypothetical, so assume what I tell you is accurate, right?
17	"Even if withdrawal is otherwise appropriate, other
18	considerations must sometimes take precedence such as
19	maintaining fairness to litigants, preserving courts'
20	resources and efficiency."
21	Any quarrel with kind of that language? Any concerns
22	with that?
23	A. Yes. I'd have to look at the facts of that case.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

That -- that does not sound like a mandatory withdrawal
 provision. There's another provision of 1.16 that talks about
 permissive withdrawal, and that sounds to me like it refers to
 permissive withdrawal as opposed to mandatory.

Q. And here your advice, of course -- again, your
opinion, probably better -- better framed -- your opinion was
based on the representations to you that there had been and
there were ongoing intrusions; that's what made this a
mandatory withdrawal issue. Is that ----

10 That's relatively accurate. The only thing I -- I Α. 11 would caution is that I'm relying very specifically on the 12 language of what was presented to me, and because it was 13 mostly redacted. It was just that the chief defense counsel, 14 who's aware of the redacted facts described, recently stated 15 publicly "nothing has changed to cause me to change my advice. 16 Indeed, the more I learn, the more resolute I have become in 17 my position."

18 And that refers to the fact that there was ongoing19 intrusion into the attorney-client relationship.

Q. All right. And it seems -- I mean, it seems
reasonably evident to me, I just want to make sure I've got
it. If there was not an intrusion, if the facts that were
given to you were not accurate and there was no intrusion,

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 either past or ongoing in this case -- and I'm really focused
2 on this one specifically -- I assume your advice would be
3 different?

A. I'd have to take a look at that. I assume it would
5 but I would have to take a look at that, because it could be
6 intrusions in other cases that could have an impact upon this
7 particular case.

8 So I don't know. I don't render opinions lightly. I
9 look very carefully at the facts provided to me, and I'd have
10 to have a series of facts from which I could opine.

11 Q. All right. And again, you have to rely on the facts12 that you're given.

A. Correct.

14 Q. And so if they're inaccurate or different, it could15 lead to a different outcome?

A. It could. It would depend upon what the facts are.
Q. I don't think it will surprise you, in getting ready
to talk to you -- and I do appreciate you taking the time. I
do. I know there was a lot of movement as we got here, but I
really do want to thank you for taking the time.

21 Probably doesn't surprise you that I went and looked
22 into kind of who you were, of course, and what you've written.
23 A. Yes. I assume you would have.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

Q. I hope so. I'm not a litigant anymore, so it's - it's -- I don't often get time to go out and kind of prepare
 to ask questions.

I guess my question: There's a couple articles that
certainly appeared to be critical of the commission process,
but they also seemed to be pre-2009 when we got the new
Military Commissions Act from President Obama after the
Supreme Court clearly disagreed with the first set of rules.
A. That's correct. All my articles -- or the articles I
wrote were prior to the Military Commission Act of 2009.

Q. Have you -- have you reviewed -- from an ethical
standpoint, from your background as you look at ethics, have
you looked at the Military Commissions Act of 2009?

14 A. I have not.

Q. Okay. When people -- I'm probably -- you're probably
conflicted from me reaching out to you for an ethics opinion,
but in general do trial judges -- have trial judges used you
in that role?

A. Yes. You're welcome to, just not in this case.
Q. Yeah, my day job is Chief Judge of the Air Force.
I'm anxious to go back to it.

A. I imagine.

23 Q. Iam.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [Col SPATH]: I think that's it. Let's me just check, 2 make sure I didn't spark any other questions. 3 Defense Counsel, anything? 4 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Nothing from the defense, Your Honor. 5 MJ [Col SPATH]: Trial Counsel, anything? 6 MATC [COL WELLS]: No, sir. 7 MJ [Col SPATH]: I really do mean it, I appreciate the 8 work you did. I enjoyed reading things about the old act and 9 learning who you were. I'm sorry that it took kind of the 10 effort to get you here and all, and I hope it was at least 11 more pleasant than anticipated. 12 WIT: Thank you, Judge. I appreciate it. 13 MJ [Col SPATH]: All right. They will disconnect there. 14 Thank you so much. 15 WIT: Thank you. 16 [The witness was excused and the VTC was terminated.] 17 MJ [Col SPATH]: I've got some additional findings of fact 18 I'm going to give you. There aren't terribly many yet. There 19 will be a lot more. 20 What I plan to do is issue kind of a complete ruling 21 on 389 and close that series out. All of the findings of fact 22 that I put into the record on 31 October of 2017 are certainly 23 going to be part of it, and so these kind of developed as

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 we -- the week went forward.

In relation to Ms. Olson-Gault, she's a credible witness. She's been employed in her current job in the ABA for the last two years, and she's been with the ABA for quite a while, obviously. She made clear the ABA guidelines for the appointment and performance of defense counsel in death penalty cases, revised edition, are best practices. They're guidelines.

9 She referred to them as best practices. The Supreme
10 Court has made clear, and she agreed with this when she
11 testified, they're not some kind of talismanic requirement;
12 they're guidelines, and they have not been adopted in every
13 jurisdiction.

We've talked about one that stands out to me, of
course, the military, but there are others that have not
adopted them. And here in the commissions, they were adopted,
kind of, and I appreciated her testimony on this, and that's
why it's in my findings of fact.

19 She understands that in the context of military 20 commissions the ABA guidelines carry slightly more weight, in 21 her opinion, than in cases handled under the UCMJ. And she 22 based that on DoD referencing them and Congress referencing 23 them as these commissions came into being. And of course the

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 language in there that's critical for us is "learned counsel2 to the greatest extent practicable."

I've already talked a lot about the absence of
learned counsel here. All those findings went in the record
already. So from the 30th, just to be clear, I know we've had
a change-out in people who have been watching, but I'm not
going to go back through all of those.

But I would point out that we learned, of course,
that Mr. Kammen wasn't traveling down here on the 29th of
October, despite clearly the defense community knowing it for
quite some time before that. We were already on the airplane,
in fact, when the commission found out. Learned counsel has
failed to appear on 30 October as ordered, on 31 October, on 1
November.

15 On 1 November I issued an additional order for 16 learned counsel to appear, at least at the Mark Center. It 17 wasn't to tele-litigate or anything like that. It was because 18 he refused to come to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to represent his 19 client, despite the fact that he is required to be here and 20 has signed a contract of employment to be here and has not 21 been properly released yet.

And, of course, in response to that, he got a stayfor that order and voluntarily determined he wasn't going to

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 come help his client. I made clear in the order it could lead2 to a contempt proceeding. We'll see where we go with that.

3 On 31 October the chief defense counsel at the time, 4 General Baker, refused to testify under oath or explain how he 5 found good cause shown on the record for approving the release 6 of learned counsel, or about any matter, despite his activity 7 in the case. He also refused to rescind what I determined was 8 an unlawful order in releasing learned counsel, who aren't 9 detailed, and the two detailed civilian counsel. And he 10 refused an order to facilitate the travel of the learned 11 counsel to GTMO for what has been a long-scheduled hearing.

12 From 1 November until now, learned counsel has13 remained absent from the commission hearings.

Learned counsel's request that he meets in the courtroom has been granted by the behavior of the confinement facility, over and over and over. They've also offered up a meeting place in AV-34, where I work, and the defense counsel has been able to take advantage of those, as I've asked about on the record, and I will follow up on about in a little while. And yet learned counsel still refuses to appear.

Mr. Kammen submitted his notice of appearance in this
case, and his agreement, and noticeably, unlike notice of
every other counsel who's been detailed -- if you go look

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

through the filings, there's no memo from the chief defense
 counsel. He made his own appearance -- all the others come
 through the chief defense counsel because learned counsel are
 different -- on 23 December 2008.

5 And he signed his affidavit and terms of agreement, 6 including statements, most importantly, "Learned counsel will 7 work cooperatively with detailed defense counsel to ensure 8 coordination of efforts and to ensure each counsel is capable 9 of conducting the defense independently, if necessary," 10 suggesting, yet again, learned counsel to the greatest extent 11 practicable, right there in his employment contract.

Nothing in the agreement allows him to disregard
13 laws, rules, regulations, or instructions regarding the
14 handling of classified information or any protected
15 information.

After executing this affidavit and entering a notice
of appearance, Mr. Kammen, according to him, has spent
10,000 hours representing Mr. al Nashiri over nine years.
And, of course, his bar rules state that even if good cause is
shown, if a tribunal orders your continued representation,
you're required to continue, even if good cause has been shown
on a record or on the record.

23

In the ruling -- in the discussion of the law I will

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

make clear -- there seems to be some confusion out there - I'm not suggesting the Rules of Court trump the Rules of
 Military Commissions or the Manual. I never said that in the
 ruling. I never cited the Rules of Court.

5 What I said -- and again, it feels to me to be basic, 6 basic statutory interpretation. The statute is ambiguous for 7 many reasons. When a statute is ambiguous, it's up to the 8 court to interpret it, right? This is law school 101. What's 9 the first place you look?

Any principles, right, set out by the people who
drafted the statute. Well, there aren't many from Congress on
that.

What they said, of course, is, well, look to the
Manual for Courts-Martial for areas where there's confusion.
That should be your guiding principle. So that's what I did.
And you know what it says about release of counsel? Of course
it's trial judge, the same as it is in every jurisdiction
across America.

19 There is no order from any judge severing the 20 relationship. The order in Indiana is that he doesn't have to 21 travel to represent his client on a writ for habeas for 22 someone to whom no -- no effort has been made to detain him, 23 apprehend him, arrest him or anything else.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1	So that's where we're at at this point. I still find
2	learned counsel is available to the greatest extent
3	practicable. He's detailed to the or I'm sorry, he's
4	appointed to the case. He hasn't been severed from his
5	relationship with Mr. al Nashiri yet.
6	And there's no suggestion yet about how
7	Mr. al Nashiri feels about any of this, because nobody put his
8	agreement to this in the record, unlike every other defense
9	counsel who has been severed, save one, we'll talk about in a
10	minute, Commander Mizer.
11	Every other time Mr. al Nashiri severed the
12	relationship by signing something consenting to it.
13	If you believe General Baker's interpretation on the
14	eve of findings in a commissions case after ten years before a
15	jury comes in or the members come in and announce a verdict,
16	he could sever an attorney-client relationship. And if you
17	read it, he could do it without good cause shown because on
18	its face it doesn't make sense, hence the reason it's
19	ambiguous.
20	But again, that's where we're at. And the defense
21	community, frankly, refuses still to bring other attorneys in
22	to meet with their client.
00	

23

Lieutenant Piette, on Wednesday we were not in

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 session. Did you have an opportunity to meet with your 2 client?

3 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor.

4 MJ [Col SPATH]: And I don't know where the meeting was.5 Was the meeting in a suitable location?

6 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Considering the purposes of that7 meeting, yes.

8 MJ [Col SPATH]: Did you -- did they offer up AV-34 to9 you?

10 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor.

11 MJ [Col SPATH]: Did you take advantage of that?

12 DDC [LT PIETTE]: No, Your Honor.

MJ [Col SPATH]: Okay. Today were you able to meet with
your client before we started? I don't know if you even
needed to or wanted to, I ----

16 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes, Your Honor, we had that17 opportunity.

MJ [Col SPATH]: And was that here in the courtroom?
 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes. And additionally in the holding
 cell outside.

MJ [Col SPATH]: We don't need to discuss it today. Just
so we're tracking, AE 337, I know it was mentioned at some
point. I just -- what I need to know is what protective

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

orders you all are still seeking, if any. AE 353 was the
 strike package discovery. At some point we need to get an
 update on if discovery has been completed. And then AE 369,
 there was some discovery issues in there. Alls I need to know
 is if there are any left and where we're at.

6 Come January, my understanding is Mr. al Darbi will
7 still be here. I will yet again offer the defense an
8 opportunity to cross-examine him. What you do with that
9 opportunity is up to you, but it gives you another couple
10 months to prepare on top of the many, many months you've
11 already had.

12 The other thing I need from the government is what 13 preadmission we're going to start working through that week, 14 more 207 or 324, 325, or 326. We will stay in preadmission 15 except for Mr. al Darbi, who again, since he will be available 16 by all accounts, We'll see if we have any questions.

17 Before I ask Mr. al Nashiri anything, let me just
18 check. Trial Counsel, are there any other matters from you so
19 far?

TC [MR. MILLER]: No, other -- excuse me, no, other than Your Honor, we will provide the court in early December a list I think, of what is remaining on 207 for planning purposes so that the court knows, you know, how we're going to proceed.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 But we will do ----

MJ [Col SPATH]: Right now it's a two-week session ---TC [MR. MILLER]: Yes.

MJ [Col SPATH]: ---- and that is my plan. I mentioned
maybe December, that is still on the table, the week of
December 11th if the other case that I think was going to be
here isn't, so the courtroom will be empty. I would have come
anyway, but if it's empty it's even easier for us. We still
might come down here.

I am waiting to see what the convening authority does in relation to the contempt finding with General Baker and if the federal judge does anything additional. That will help me figure out the road ahead likely in relation to the two civilians who are different than learned counsel. But just keep your calendars open.

16 TC [MR. MILLER]: For planning purposes however, we
17 wouldn't be putting on any 207 or similar-type witnesses. It
18 would be just to handle those matters?

19 MJ [Col SPATH]: That would be it. It would be a very20 short session, probably.

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

22 MJ [Col SPATH]: Thanks.

23 Defense Counsel, you know what I am going to chat

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 with your client very quickly here, but anything else? 2 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Your Honor, I would like to be able to 3 make a record based some on the findings of fact that you 4 stated. Should I do that now or wait until after you talk to 5 Mr. al Nashiri? 6 MJ [Col SPATH]: You can do it after or in a pleading. 7 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 MJ [Col SPATH]: I'll double check. Mr. al Nashiri, 9 here's my question. It has to do with Mr. Kammen. Clearly he 10 hasn't been here for the three weeks. You know that. I know 11 you know that. 12 Do you want him released from representing you or 13 not? And I'll let you chat with your counsel. 14 [Conferred with counsel.] 15 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: I believe he chose to leave this 16 case, and I support him. 17 MJ [Col SPATH]: What about Ms. Eliades? Do you want her 18 to remain on your case? 19 [Conferred with counsel.] 20 ACC [MR. AL NASHIRI]: All the attorneys are free to have 21 their own opinion, and I support them. In other words, I 22 cannot force anyone to come here. 23 MJ [Col SPATH]: Clearly neither can I.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

All right. That does not end the inquiry, as we
 know. I'm going to work through 389, because even if somebody
 wants their lawyers to be released, which that was not a
 statement quite as clear as that, that doesn't end the inquiry
 after nine years and 10,000 hours of effort, as we enter into
 preadmission of evidence and have moved well past motions of
 law.

8 I'm going to put -- would you do me a favor? Would
9 you hand this to somebody to put up on the display? It's been
10 cleared. It's from 389 -- or I'm sorry, 348. It's from 348.
11 348, page 14.

So 348L was a motion for me to sever an attorney-client relationship, and I granted it. And I granted it based on what the facts were, and that is that Mr. Kammen would represent his client as learned counsel. When facts change, I can reconsider.

17 The benefit of Commander Mizer is that Mr. al Nashiri
18 didn't want him released, and he's learned. He said as much
19 over and over again when he testified. I don't know what
20 authority I have, but we're going to test it.

21 The convening authority is ordered to work to bring 22 him on orders, at which point he can represent his client 23 again. He's learned, he knows the case, he's got a security

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 clearance.

At this point I'm not severing the relationship
between Mr. Kammen and Mr. al Nashiri. We'll see how that
order goes.

5 When I got this I took it very seriously, but again, 6 with Mr. Kammen sitting there, after spending at that point 7 almost eight years on the case, I couldn't envision he would 8 just walk away from a client. That seems like a significant 9 factual change underlying that motion. A reservist certainly 10 can be brought back on active duty. And again, we have the 11 testimony in the record demonstrating his expertise, his 12 knowledge, his skill set, and his relationship with his 13 client. So that's the order to work with the convening 14 authority on.

I'm sure we'll get a fight. I'm sure there will be motions filed. But it would be nice if the defense community would work with Mr. al Nashiri to get him representation, instead of sitting here with lawyers detailed and appointed and cleared, having Lieutenant Piette sit by himself. So communicate that to the convening authority.

21 We're about done. Colonel Wells.

22 TC [MR. MILLER]: Nothing from the government. Thank you,23 Your Honor.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 MJ [Col SPATH]: Thank you. Lieutenant Piette?

2 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Thank you, Your Honor. If I could just
3 have the brief opportunity to respond to a couple things that
4 I haven't yet had a chance to respond to.

5 On the first, regarding the findings of fact that you 6 just read, as far as Ms. Olson-Gault's testimony, as I heard 7 it, and I'm sure you'll review this before you issue your 8 written findings of fact, but she didn't say that they were --9 she explicitly didn't say that the ABA guidelines were best 10 practices. She called them the floor or the minimum standards 11 and not best practices, just so that is clear; essentially 12 stating that the minimum, not the best practice, but the 13 absolute minimum is that learned counsel be available at all 14 stages of the proceedings.

15 The other thing is you mentioned that every other 16 time that an attorney has been severed, besides the Commander 17 Mizer situation, was with Mr. al Nashiri's approval. However, 18 I would turn Your Honor's attention to AE 083 in which -- this 19 was brought up a little bit I think earlier this week or maybe 20 last week about Michel Paradis. It appears there the chief 21 defense counsel unilaterally undetailed Michel Paradis from 22 the case without Mr. al Nashiri's input.

23 MJ [Col SPATH]: Without comment.

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 DDC [LT PIETTE]: As far as over the course of the last 2 few weeks, you've talked about defense strategy and the risk 3 of that strategy. And I want, at least, the record to be 4 clear that, again, defense, our position is that this is not a 5 strategy; that we had no choice. Particularly the defense 6 team as it is constituted now truly had no choice, and that we 7 do understand, are fully aware of the risk of not 8 participating.

9 And frankly, just so the record is aware, it is a
10 terrifying risk. We can read the cases, too. It's scary,
11 because Mr. al Nashiri's life is on the line, and, frankly,
12 right now it's in our hands, my hands and the three other
13 attorneys who are working diligently in support. But because
14 of our adherence to those minimum standards of the ABA
15 guidelines ----

MJ [Col SPATH]: In the face of a ruling from the court that you're not guaranteed learned counsel at every stage. I know you understand that. And the opportunity to continue to attack foundational evidence; there's not a court member in sight. I just -- the record is clear what we're doing currently.

22 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes.

23 MJ [Col SPATH]: I've said it and I'm going to say it

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

again. "Greatest extent practicable" means what it says. My
 intention is not to seat a panel without you having learned
 counsel, unless -- not you. I recognize that while we may
 disagree about it being a strategy, I recognize the position
 you're in. I've said it. I have great empathy.

My frustration is a defense community that supports
you that really has been quite dismissive of my authority. We
heard it again today. I can't even ask a simple question
without pushback from the people that are there to support
you. Even that's difficult.

11 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Right. Your Honor, I understand.

MJ [Col SPATH]: So I'm doing what I can. Like I said, I
debated asking questions of the foundational witnesses. My
goal -- look, she was pretty honest about her writings about
the commission, right?

My personal opinion about commissions doesn't matter.
My feelings about it don't matter. Congress and the President
and DoD gave it to us. Right?

19 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Understood.

MJ [Col SPATH]: My job is to follow the law. No one out
there will ever know my personal opinions about any of this
because none of it matters.

23

I -- my goal is that your client gets a trial that is

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

1 fair and impartial, because that's what the law says, in this
2 process. If our country thinks that's the process, that's the
3 process. And I'm doing what I can.

But I am frustrated, and I think that shows in the
lack of support you're getting, and, frankly, the lack of
ability for the defense community to even be civil to the
commission. It's reasonably shocking. But I don't know if I
have full contempt authority yet, so we're going to wait.
We'll figure it out.

I appreciate the position you're in, though. I do. And that's why we are going to go through the basic blocking and tackling of evidence admission, real evidence, until we get somebody up to speed. And I'm hoping who we get up to speed is somebody who told me what a great relationship they had with Mr. al Nashiri and somebody who recognizes the process and has a clearance.

17 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Yes.

18 MJ [Col SPATH]: And frankly, I couldn't even get an19 answer on that, right?

Are you looking for people with security clearances?
21 Oh, I'm not comfortable telling you that. Really? That?
22 You're not comfortable telling me that? What, is that
23 privileged, too? Confidential?

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

I mean, this is craziness. I haven't seen anything
 like it. In my entire professional life, I haven't been
 treated that way and I haven't treated others that way in a
 courtroom. But we are where we're at.

I -- absolutely, if you all want to submit any
additional findings. The government did obviously in 389
brief with at least a proposed road ahead. And you are more
than welcome to put any findings you want to in writing in the
record, absolutely, in response to the government's brief. I
encourage you to.

11 DDC [LT PIETTE]: Understood, Your Honor. And again, I 12 can't speak for the chief defense counsel or the acting chief 13 defense counsel, but only for Mr. al Nashiri in this limited 14 scope that I think I can right now. And I understand that by 15 not participating we are running that risk that a higher court 16 is going to view this as strategy. But by participating, we 17 are guaranteeing to be providing representation, if you could even call it that, that is below the floor, the minimum 18 19 standards for representation in a capital case set by the 20 American Bar Association.

So our only hope, Mr. al Nashiri's only hope is that
a higher court will recognize and understand the basic
blocking and tackling are exactly where the assistance of

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

learned counsel is necessary. Our only hope will be that a
 higher court will recognize that no counsel would withdraw and
 disregard court orders, putting their livelihood and perhaps
 their freedom on the line all to avoid a cross-examination or
 to affect some far-flung strategy.

6 We agree with this court. We think declassification
7 of the underlying issue will be very helpful. I think we
8 disagree on how it will be helpful, but I think if a higher
9 court can see that, that ----

10 MJ [Col SPATH]: They can.

11 DDC [LT PIETTE]: ---- that is Mr. Nashiri's hope.

12 And I think, you know, our only hope,

13 Mr. al Nashiri's only hope is that a higher court will
14 recognize that Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to
15 apply the ABA guidelines and he did so by removing the
16 "whenever practicable" language. And that is why we have
17 taken the position that we're not taking a position or did not
18 take a position during these proceedings.

I just want that on the record. Thank you.
MJ [Col SPATH]: No, I appreciate it. It is critical that
sooner than later some people, your client included, by the
way, and everybody who has an interest in this gets some
closure one way or the other. It is an ongoing, long, painful

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT

process for everybody who is a part of it. And that is not
 efficient administration of justice. We know that.

And so I am doing the best I can to guard your client's rights, safeguard what I think is a process that clearly has due process in it if anybody is honest about it, given the amount of money, time, effort, et cetera, to resource a defense team.

8 I was reading last night. It costs approximately
9 \$500,000 for a capital defense case outside of the
10 commissions. We're well past that in resourcing the defense
11 community. That's a good thing. But people seem to ignore
12 it. And now we have a learned counsel again in the face of a
13 court order to represent his client, refuses to.

And so I know you recognize I'm -- we will never agree, I know, on the ultimate ruling. I've got that. But I know you know this. I am trying to navigate these waters in a way that preserves this process, preserves your client's rights and gives the other side their day here. So we'll see where we're at.

20 I know I'll see you in January. Maybe we'll see you21 before. These commissions are closed.

22 [The R.M.C. 803 session recessed at 1528, 17 November 2017.]

23

[END OF PAGE]

UNOFFICIAL/UNAUTHENTICATED TRANSCRIPT