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PROCEEDINGS
THE COURT: Your Honor, this morning this is In Re: Salahi versus Barack Obama, et al. This is Civil Action Number 05-569. I'd ask the parties to step forward and identify yourselves for the record, please.

MS. SHAMSI: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Hina Shamsi and together with my co-counsel, Dror Ladin, Nancy Hollander and Art Spitzer. I represent Mohammadou Ould Salahi.

THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. FOLIO: Your Honor, Your Honor. Joseph Folio on behalf of the Government. I'm joined at counsel table by Rodney Patton and Terry Henry of the Department of Justice, and Jason Foster of the Department of Defense.

THE COURT: Okay. We're here on petitioner's motion, so you may proceed.

MS. SHAMSI: Thank you, Your Honor. And if I may, just what I hope is a brief housekeeping matter --

THE COURT: Sure.
MS. SHAMSI: -- which is that we had moved for admission pro hac vice of my colleague, Dror Ladin. We'd like him to do part of the argument, if that is acceptable to the Court.

THE COURT: That's agreeable. I didn't realize there is an outstanding motion. If I haven't granted it,

I will.
MS. SHAMSI: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay.
MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, the question we've asked you -- we've put before you today is a purely legal one, which is whether the Defense Department can subject Mr. Salahi to ongoing indefinitely executive detention under the AUMF without providing a timely review of whether that ongoing detention serves any lawful purpose.

And if it's all right with you, I'd like to begin by framing the issue for you and discussing Mr. Salahi's entitlement to a Periodic Review Board or PRB, as a matter of law. Mr. Ladin will then address this Court's habeas jurisdiction to determine that entitlement. And Ms. Hollander will address Mr. Salahi's conditions of confinement claims. THE COURT: All right.

MS. SHAMSI: Thank you, Your Honor. As a threshold matter, Your Honor, we wouldn't be here before you today if at any point over the last four years the Defense Department had provided notice to Mr. Salahi of his PRB hearing. As soon as the Government provides that notice, this matter goes away.

Mr. Salahi has now been held at Guantanamo for 14 years and he's repeatedly tried throughout that time to show that his detention is unlawful and that he should be released. He thought he would be released after Judge

Robertson granted his habeas petition, but the Government appealed and the case was remanded and it's been pending before this Court.

Mr. Salahi has pressed for a PRB hearing over and over again. As you know, Your Honor, President Obama mandated that process for Mr. Salahi and others like him back in March 2011 for internal Defense Department delays that year came and went. And, finally, in July 2013, the Defense Department sent notice to all counsel informing them of the process, and virtually immediately my co-counsel wrote to the Defense Department, and said: Tell us -- tell us when Mr. Salahi will be scheduled for a hearing. Is he set for a hearing? We want to be prepared.

We got no answer. We were told that we would be informed, but no further answer in 2013 and in 2014. In 2015, my co-counsel wrote to the PRB secretariat, which is the body that administers the PRBs and we literally implored it to set a date. We said in April of this year that we would be forced to come to this Court if we had no notice of even when the hearing would be held. And we haven't had a response.

Your Honor, Mr. Salahi's --
THE COURT: Are there other hearings going
forward --
MS. SHAMSI: There are.
THE COURT: -- with other detainees?

MS. SHAMSI: There are, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So there's no explanation for why not here?

MS. SHAMSI: No, Your Honor. And this, in essence, this in itself is arbitrary, it's a black box. We have no idea what criteria are being used to determine who gets scheduled when. When notice might happen. And this means an ongoing delay. And, Your Honor, the Defense Department said in its papers, it's essentially accusing us of a line jumping. Now, that might have some traction if they had told us that Mr. Salahi was Number 10 and we came to you and said to move him to Number One.

But, again, this is black box of a process. No criteria, no schedule. And after four years, no indication of whether Mr. Salahi will get a hearing next month, two months from now, a year from now or more than that. That's really what we want is a timely and prompt hearing.

THE COURT: What does the Executive Order say? It says annually?

MS. SHAMSI: It does. President Obama instructed the Defense Department to begin hearings, and it said no later than a year, and it established an entire process. And I think what is critical hear is that it established a process to determine whether ongoing detention is warranted because of the determination of whether the detainee presents a
significant security threat or not. Before you talk to that particular Executive Order, Your Honor, I think that there have been 18 PRB detainees scheduled, some of them have had their review twice. A number are still scheduled, but I believe it's four. But I think, Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. A number of what?
MS. SHAMSI: Have been scheduled for hearing, I believe four of them. Your Honor, Mr. Salahi's case is rather unique, we believe. I just want to tell you why we think that is. He wasn't captured on a battlefield. He voluntarily turned himself in to authorities in Mauritania. He never fought against the United States. There's no allegation that he ever did.

He was subjected to one of the most brutal torture regimes at Guantanamo, but as his book shows that we submitted to you, he bears no animosity to the United States. He has had no disciplinary infractions in his 14 years. Former Guantanamo guards have contacted us asking to testify on his behalf at the PRB hearing. We know from senior officials in his home county, Mauritania, that they want him back.

There should be no security concerns about his release there. Just three weeks ago, the only other Mauritanian detainee at Guantanamo was released there. And so Mr. Salahi wants to put all of this and more before the PRB, and each day that he cannot do so -- each day he can't do so,

Your Honor, his despair grows.
With respect, Your Honor, to Executive Order 13567, as we've said, we think that that has the force of law because it is issued pursuant to the President's powers and in accordance with the Congressional statute, the AUMF. And it is, therefore, mandatory. It also -- and I'll come to this as well -- it also implements the suspension cause requirement of a meaningful review of Law of War detention, it creates a protected liberty interest, and it recognizes -- and I think this is critical -- it recognizes and implements a key legal requirement for ongoing detention under the AUMF as informed by the Laws of War.

Now, the defendants don't truly contest that the Executive Order has the force and effect of law, nor do they dispute that they haven't complied with it. What they contest is whether Mr. Salahi can ask you to enforce this mandatory process so that it is timely for him.

As Mr. Ladin will explain, the D.C. Circuit made clear in the Aamer case, Aamer versus Obama, that this Court has broad habeas jurisdiction over claims brought by Guantanamo detainees that some aspect of their detention is unlawful. So we don't think we need a Private Right of Action, that's entirely beside the point. Mr. Salahi has the ability, through this Court's habeas jurisdiction, to ask you to order the Government to do what President Obama has
mandated it to do. And, Your Honor, I think it's critically important that the Executive Order, I think, represents the President's recognition that he is complying with international law. It doesn't have to create a new source of rights or an underlying right because that underlying right already exists. So, if I may, I'd like to discuss why we think that underlying right exists under the AUMF as informed by Law of War authority.

Your Honor, the Supreme Court, just as a starting point, the Supreme Court has held over and over again that the AUMF has to be informed by the Laws of War, it said so in Hamdi 2004, it said so in Hamdan in 2006, it said so in Boumediene in 2008.

The Laws of War clearly require that for people who are not POWs, prisoners of war, there must be periodic review in order to ensure that ongoing detention for security purposes is warranted. And I think two points here. One is that critically in the Hamdi case, as far back as 2004, when the United States was unquestionably engaged in active hostilities in Afghanistan, Justice O'Connor warned, even then, that the traditional understandings of the Laws of War that inform detention authority under the AUMF could unravel if this war turned out to be unlike any other in duration. We're now here 11 years later. This claimed war authority has lasted longer than World War II, it's lasted
longer than Vietnam, and that's why, in addition, we think that Mr. Salahi has a Law of War entitlement to a prompt hearing to make his case for release.

Now, there are a number of --
THE COURT: What in international law is the best authority for saying periodic review is required by international law?

MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, there's both treaty authority and there's customary international law authority. Treaty authority under the Geneva Conventions relevant to civilian persons. There's also authority under customary international law interpretations of Common Article 3. And the weight of authority -- international authority, including from the authoritative ICRC, says that there is in fact a requirement for timely review to ensure that detention is warranted.

But I think in order to answer your question a little bit more fully, I'd like to clear away some of the underbrush that might have been created in the briefing.

We and the defendants agree that the law that applies here is the law of non-international armed conflict, meaning when a conflict is between a nation state and an armed group. We agree that the law in this area is not as well-developed. For the purposes of this motion, we agree with the Government, and now I'm quoting from their March 2009

Memorandum on Detention Authority to this Court.
For the purpose of this motion, we agree, quote:
Principals derived from Law of War rules governing international armed conflicts must inform the interpretation of the detention authority that Congress has authorized. We also agree with the Government, for the purposes of this motion, that the AUMF is informed by the Laws of War, which include, and again I quote: A series of prohibitions and obligations that have developed over time and that have either been codified in the Geneva Conventions or are customary on international law.

We also agree with the Government, Your Honor, that it is invoking analogous rules to inform AUMF authorities to justify detention under the end of hostilities. And those analogous rules, Your Honor, come from Geneva Convention III, which applies for prisoners of war. But, of course, the government hasn't accorded prisoner of war authority to anyone, it's by analogy and that has been recognized by the courts.

What we're saying is that the same Law of War rules that inform the Government's authority to detain also contain safeguards against arbitrary ongoing detention. So, Your Honor, we're using "inform" in exactly the same way that the Government is. And, as I said, there are analogous Law of War rules that inform whether ongoing detention is warranted.

Geneva Convention IV, applicable to civilians -and I'll just footnote here, Your Honor, that the use of the term of art "civilian" or any other term shouldn't be a distraction. Geneva Convention IV applies to people who are held in security internment, which is the closest analogy that we have for Mr. Salahi here.

And Article 43 of the Fourth Geneva Convention says that people subject to security internment shall be entitled to have that action reconsidered as soon as possible by an appropriate court or an administrative board. And ongoing detention must be reviewed periodically and at least twice yearly. That requirement, Your Honor, is reflected in the Executive Order.

Under the Government's approach there is only cherry-picking. The Government seeks to apply only the most permissive aspects of the Geneva Conventions while seeking to ignore what it acknowledged earlier that there are also obligations. And that's problematic both because of the framework that is rendered illogical. But it's also problematic because it renders this entire framework scheme arbitrary in the Government's favor.

The Government, again, claims the authority to detain until the end of hostilities applicable to POWs, but disclaims that it has an obligation that is enforceable that requires ongoing review. But that obligation, I think, is
reflected in the Government's -- in the Department of Defense's own Law of War Manual in Section 8.142, which says that there must be prompt initial reviews as well as ongoing review.

And I think that it's also important to take into account the admonishment or the recognition or the concern that Justice O'Connor in plurality had that as detention goes on, there must be a way, consistent the Laws of War to account for whether it is legitimate and serves any lawful purpose whatsoever.

Your Honor, if you have questions about that -I think one thing that might -- the Government has cited various different cases in this circuit that it has said seek to limit this Court's jurisdiction. And I think in that context I would just say that a number of cases, including ones that you have yourself decided, Your Honor, such as Warafi, were older cases. And whatever might have been true in 2009 and 2010, surely must be very different now in 2015, otherwise, the Supreme Court's recognition that authority may unravel would never be tested or heard by any court.

Most recently, I think the D.C. Circuit said in Ali -- in the Ali case in 2014 -- again, that detention may last for duration and that the judiciary's role is not to devise a novel standard. But for that particular sentence or couple of sentences, the D.C. Circuit cited to Hamdi, and

Hamdi already said what I have conveyed to you, Your Honor, that the traditional understanding may unravel.

THE COURT: I take it the precise question before me has not yet been presented to any other judge; is that correct?

MS. SHAMSI: That's my understanding, Your Honor. We haven't seen any issue coming up before anyone else. So, Your Honor, I think, you know, just to be very, very clear, we think you have the authority with this jurisdiction to order this relief under the Executive Order under the AUMF as informed by the Laws of War. We also think you have the authority under the Constitution, under the suspension clause in the due process clause.

And I think, you know, at a very fundamental level, that's because in every single context in which the Executive seeks to hold people without charge, there's a key question, constitutional question, which is: Is that detention necessary? And I think that the PRB is set up to answer that question.

So if you rule for us, either under the Executive Order or under the AUMF as informed by the Laws of War, you don't need to reach the constitutional questions. But we still -- I just want to take a couple of minutes to talk about why they still matter and why we still have these constitutional rights.

And I think at the heart of the suspension clause analysis is what the Supreme Court said in Boumediene, which is that detainees have to have a meaningful opportunity to demonstrate that he is, quote, being held pursuant to erroneous application or interpretation of law. And we think that it would be erroneous interpretation of law to say that Mr. Salahi's detention can go on without any kind of review of whether it serves a lawful purpose, for the reasons that I've talked about with respect to both the AUMF and international law.

Hamdi, very importantly, to summarize it, the Supreme Court made clear that detention authority is not static. That, in fact, even for people captured on the battlefield it may at some point unravel. And, of course, Mr. Salahi is not in that position. Critically, Your Honor, Boumediene -- the Supreme Court in Boumediene, tied the length of detention to the scope and timing of meaningful review in a case in which the detainee had been held for less than half the time that Mr. Salahi has been held.

And the Court was concerned in that case that six years had passed without judicial oversight through habeas or an adequate substitute. And the Court rejected the Government's argument that it should follow the Defense Department's time line or a DTA process, and said ultimately that the costs of delay can no longer be borne by those who
are held in custody. And as time goes on, we think, the suspension clause imposes greater requirements, which is why again we're here before you today. We think that you can provide that hearing through the process that the Government has set up itself, a timely and prompt requirement. But, again, you don't need to reach that question if you provide it in another context.

Your Honor, do you have questions about my suspension clause argument or may I address the due process clause briefly?

THE COURT: No, but I'm curious as to the petitioner's position of -- if the Government is willing to do this with other detainees and the President has mandated it in the Executive Order, what is the petitioner's, I guess, expectation of why the Government is standing here before me today doing this?

MS. SHAMSI: Respectfully, Your Honor, I hope you will ask the Government --

THE COURT: I will.
MS. SHAMSI: -- that question. We've done everything we can. We've asked repeatedly. I think you have before you Ms. Hollander's declaration that sets forth the correspondence. I think part of the Government's argument is that this is a discretionary process. Mr. Salahi has no right to it. That this Court does not have habeas jurisdiction.

And we're answering all of those questions, but to us and to anyone else in Mr. Salahi's shoes, not here before you, but I don't think it should trouble you that there are people other people in his shoes, this is a black box. The Government hasn't provided any information, and it is now four years later.

And just on that point, Your Honor, I'm reminded of what Judge Hogan did back in 2008 after the Supreme Court ruled in Boumediene and he set a schedule once he had been assigned to coordinate all of the cases, and he set a schedule mandating 50 returns a month and so on. And the Government came to him after a period of -- on the eve of the deadline, and said, we can't do it, making arguments -- potentially very similar to arguments that they may make before you today. Difficult time constraining, you know, sensitive national security information, the range of arguments.

And Judge Hogan said, I'm going to give you that one extension. Right? And he did that. This was just a period of months. But the Supreme Court has instructed me, he said, that the detainees cannot bear the cost of delay. And he held the Government's feet to the fire and he set a schedule and he set regular status hearings. In that case it was a matter of months, involving many hundreds of men. In this case we're talking about four years.

Your Honor --

THE COURT: I did have one other question. MS. SHAMSI: Sure.

THE COURT: I did not go back and read either the Court of Appeals opinion or see what happened after the remand, but I take it that I could, on remand, address the merits of the question and then all of this wouldn't matter?

MS. SHAMSI: It's true, you could.
THE COURT: But it may be to the petitioner's advantage, as I've seen in other cases, to not have the court do that because that's a final way that may be harmful to the petitioner's interest in trying to get a transfer to another country if the Court makes certain findings. Am I off base there or --

MS. SHAMSI: Well, let me break that down a little bit, Your Honor, which is that you have pending before you a couple of motions, both from the Government and from us. And I'll talk about what I'm able to know about them because aspects of them are not public, so I can only talk about -and my security-cleared counsel, Ms. Hollander, might address the rest.

THE COURT: All right.
MS. SHAMSI: But essentially, Your Honor, the
Government sought -- it filed a motion with you for expedited judgment essentially asking for two bites at the apple. That if we can show, they say to you, based on the limited amount
of information evidence, that Mr. Salahi is detainable, then that's what we'd to do, but if we lose, then we'll have a full merits hearing. And we had opposed that because we don't think it's fair. Fundamentally, we don't think it's fair for the Government to have two bites at the apple. And we also opposed it because it would be devastating to Mr. Salahi, who continues to suffer PTSD from his torture, to have to go through that again. And we also asked you for discovery related to his merits case and related to the Government's motions.

Your Honor, those motions have been pending for three years now, so if and when we get a ruling on those motions, and we hope, obviously, that you'll rule against the Government and allow for a full merits proceeding to go forward, then we think both the merits proceeding could go forward, so could this Executive Branch process. And we don't -- and I just want to make sure I'm distinguishing between the two for you so that I'm not creating any confusion. The issues before the Court in Mr. Salahi's separate proceeding is whether his initial detention was lawful.

THE COURT: Right.
MS. SHAMSI: And we've argued that it isn't. We think for the same reasons that Judge Robertson ruled for us in 2009, even under the Circuit Court's new standard, we think
and hope we will prevail. And we're ready for that case to go forward. But, separately, there is a process that the Executive has established to determine whether, even if that initial detention was justified, is this ongoing detention lawful? And that's the separate issue that we are here before you asking you to order.

THE COURT: I understand.
MS. SHAMSI: So, Your Honor, very quickly, with respect to the due process clause, we think, at a very fundamental level, this follows from Boumediene. We think that the Boumediene test for extraterritorial application is met here because there are no additional economic or procedural burdens that the Defense Department would have to face beyond what it's already having to face, providing a hearing, attending these habeas proceedings. Nor would a timely and prompt PRB interfere with the military mission or cause any friction with any other government.

Now, the Government has said, and there are in fact D.C. Circuit cases in which there is language to the effect that the due process clause does not apply at Guantanamo, and I'm talking about Kiyemba and a couple of cases of yours, Your Honor, subsequently, that have followed Kiyemba. And I want, if I may, talk about why this case is different. THE COURT: Okay. MS. SHAMSI: First of all, Your Honor, I think

Kiyemba presents a different factual context as well as a different set a legal issues. In that case the issue was the detainees seeking an order compelling their entry into and release into the U.S, and as the Circuit Court put it, doing so outside the framework of immigration laws. That's not what Mr. Salahi seeks here.

I think what is also important is that the D.C. Circuit in Kiyemba never actually went through the Boumediene analysis, which obviously the Supreme Court requires. And, in our view, subsequent D.C. Circuit cases have narrowed Kiyemba to its fact. We think Aamer does that, a D.C. Circuit case back in 2014, which considered whether a challenge -- and I know you're familiar with this because you've dealt with a similar case, which contracted whether a challenge by petitioners, the right to be free from unwanted medical treatment could be heard in habeas.

The Court examined in detail, as you know, the Circuit Court examined in detail, as you know, whether the Government's force feeding of hunger striking detainees violated a liberty interest. And it is hard to see where that liberty interest would come from, if not from the due process clause.

And I think that if the Court in that case had agreed with the Government's reading of Kiyemba, the one that it's advancing before you here, it wouldn't have so carefully
analyzed the petitioner's claims. And it wouldn't have left to the District Court to determine whether force feeding procedures were necessary or warranted or not.

So we think that Kiyemba becomes limited to its fact. We also think that the D.C. Circuit's 2014 decision in Al-Bahlul points in the same way. I say that, Your Honor, because it was the most recent decision before the Circuit addressing the extension of constitutional protections to Guantanamo detainees. And it is telling there that in the en banc panel, Judge Henderson wrote separately to say that the Supreme Court's decision in Rasul barred extending the Fifth Amendment to Guantanamo detainees and, therefore, she reasoned, the ex post facto clause didn't apply to the military commissions.

But the majority of the en banc court disagreed with Judge Henderson. And I would point you, Your Honor, to Judge Kavanaugh's decision where he states that all of the seven judges on the en banc court for this case, five agree in light of Boumediene that the ex post facto clause applies at Guantanamo. And, respectfully, Your Honor, we think that that again also narrows Kiyemba, and that applies equally here, where there is no reason that the Boumediene test with respect to the application of the due process clause to Mr. Salahi, in this particular instance and broadly, that that test cannot be met -- that that test cannot be met here.

And I note, Your Honor, that in some of your cases, in Rabbani, for example, you've addressed these issues. You've withheld final decision. But I think here in this instance, for the reasons we've talked about, we do think -we strongly believe that Mr. Salahi has due process rights. But, again, I will end by saying that you don't have to find for us on the constitutional claims if you find for us on the others.

THE COURT: All right.
MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, unless you have questions. THE COURT: Now, there's an en banc hearing set on a commission case; is that right?

MS. SHAMSI: Al-Bahlul. But I believe it addresses a separate question going to Article 3 authority.

THE COURT: So it doesn't have any relevance here?
MS. SHAMSI: I don't believe so, no.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MS. SHAMSI: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. LADEN: Good morning, Your Honor. I'd just
like to briefly address the Government's jurisdictional objection. The Government basically argues that because the relief sought here is not necessarily an order that would immediately release or shorten Mr. Salahi's confinement, that it's beyond this Court's habeas jurisdiction.

Your Honor, the Government's argument is wrong. It's wrong for three reasons. First of all, Mr. Salahi, as Ms. Shamsi just explained, is arguing here about a lawful requirement for his detention, and as such, this is a core habeas claim, as I'll explain. But beyond that, Your Honor, the D.C. Circuit's decision in Aamer makes very clear that the Government's very limited view of this Court's habeas jurisdiction is incorrect.

And, finally, Your Honor, even if there were a narrow limit on what this Court could order in habeas, this Court's conditionable release authority would still cover the type of release sought here.

So, Your Honor, I think the reason that the Government might be confused about this Court's habeas authority is because it draws on a series of cases that arise in the criminal context. But this is the executive detention context. And as the Supreme Court and the D.C. Circuit have made clear over and over and over, habeas is broadest in cases of executive detention. The Supreme Court told us that in INS v. St. Cyr, they told us then in Boumediene and the D.C. Circuit told us then in Aamer.

THE COURT: Remind me what Aamer was again.
MR. LADEN: Sure. Aamer v. Obama was a case
involving force feeding. In that case --
THE COURT: Okay. Okay.

MR. LADEN: And I'll get to that case. But I think perhaps the case that is most closely analogous here and most easily shows the flaw in the Government's argument is INS v. St. Cyr. So that's a case in the executive context. That is a case of immigration detainee. In INS v. St. Cyr, the relief sought by petitioner was extremely similar to the relief that Mr. Salahi seeks here, that the Government argues is not available.

The petitioner there was asking for access to a process. For the right to be considered, in that case, for discretionary release. It was under an immigration program called 212C, it's not relevant here, but the fundamental point was the petitioner did not come to the Court, and say, I need to be released.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. LADEN: What he said was, the Executive is failing to consider me for release and that is a violation of my rights. And the Government argues --

THE COURT: They're holding me in custody, so I can do it in habeas.

MR. LADEN: Exactly right. Exactly right. And the Government there, just as it does here, told the Court, well, that's not within the core of the Court's habeas authority. And that case, in fact, involved the real historical core of the Court's habeas authority. The Supreme Court was
evaluating the writ as it existed in 1789 because it was looking under the suspension clause. And as I'll explain in just a moment, here your authority is much broader than that. But even under that very, very limited suspension clause authority, the Supreme Court said that there was no obstacle to the fact that both the petitioner and the Government agreed that there was lawful authority to hold the petitioner, and that both of them agreed that the Executive was refusing to exercise its discretionary authority. What the Supreme Court said is that that failure to exercise discretionary authority was independently actionable under habeas and that it had been for decades. They cited an old case, Accardi, that showed that. And then the Supreme Court evaluated the petitioner's claim, and in fact ordered that he be provided with the process that he sought.

St. Cyr is still the law, Your Honor. And the thing that's really critical to realize is that the cases the Government cites instead in the criminal context, they don't purport to limit habeas in any way. So the Government cites a series of cases that arise in what's called the habeas channeling context those involve criminal detention where the scope of the writ is much narrower because you've already had a judicial sentence, you've already had a judicial finding of guilt. And then there's all these protections already set up in the system for you.

So for those particular people, there's still a question when they raise claims that lie at the very core of habeas, whether those claims must be brought in habeas or whether they may be brought permissively under a civil rights statute.

What the Government has repeatedly tried to do from those cases is discern a principle that says that habeas jurisdiction is limited in the same way that those habeas channeling cases limit civil rights cases -- limit civil rights actions. And on this point, they site a case called Wilkinson v. Dotson, a concurrence by Justice Scalia in that case. And then a separate Supreme Court case called Skinner, and the D.C. Circuit's case in Davis v. Sentencing Commission.

Your Honor, if the there were any doubt raised by those habeas channeling cases as to whether a claim like Mr. Salahi's was available under habeas, the D.C. Circuit's decision in Aamer extinguished that doubt and it extinguished it in two ways. First of all, it emphasized the proper way in which to read those habeas channeling cases. The D.C. Circuit said over and over -- so in Aamer, Your Honor, which is a conditions of confinement case --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.
MR. LADEN: -- so the petitioner was held at
Guantanamo, came through habeas to the Court, and said, the conditions of confinement that have been placed upon me
violate my rights, and I'd like the Court to evaluate that. The Government said the exact same thing it's saying here. It said: You cannot challenge in habeas any claim that is a part from either the fact or duration of confinement. They even cited the same passaging from Wilkinson v. Dotson in their briefing to the D.C. Circuit in Aamer.

The D.C. Circuit conclusively rejected that, and it said two things. It said, first of all, you can't read those cases that way. None of those cases purport to set the limits of habeas. They are all civil rights cases. They all just check to see whether it's a core habeas claim and, therefore, must be brought in habeas. But none of them purport to limit habeas to those core claims.

So they rejected entirely a reading of the habeas cases that suggest that they place limits. And that's entirely in accord with the Supreme Court's own statement in those cases, all of which say, we're evaluating only the civil rights claim. All of which say they don't move the line on habeas in any way. But, second, and this is maybe even more critical, the D.C. Circuit said, it doesn't even matter if it is a core habeas claim, fundamentally, because we're not in the suspension clause universe here that we were in St. Cyr.

We're now looking at Guantanamo where the writ of habeas -- the statutory writ, 18 U.S.C. 2241, applies in its entirety. So there's no limitation to core claims. And the

Court said, sure, conditions of confinement claims, they wouldn't be actionable at the historical core of the writ. But that's irrelevant, they are available in full to Guantanamo detainees, and that's because the writ has, as the Court said in Rasul, statutory habeas has expanded over the past 200 years far beyond the writ as it existed in 1789. So even if this were -- even if St. Cyr did not make it abundantly clear that a question about entitlement to a process for someone in executive detention was core habeas, this would still be well within the scope of writ as the Aamer court recognized.

And the last thing on that point, Your Honor, is that it's very telling that the Government doesn't cite D.C. Circuit authority for restricting habeas, instead, it cites a Ninth Circuit case called Nettles. Your Honor, it's true that Nettles supports their view, but the Nettles majority itself acknowledged that it was incompatible with the D.C. Circuit authority. They cite Aamer. They say that Aamer got it wrong.

What Nettles said is conditions of confinement claims do not spell speedy release, so they are categorically unavailable in habeas. That position is 100 percent incompatible with the way the D.C. Circuit reads the habeas power, that that Aamer is the one that is controlling here.

Finally, Your Honor, just very, very briefly.

The D.C. Circuit has been abundantly clear that it doesn't do formalistic line drawing with habeas. That habeas is a broad remedial power that's available to courts to do justice when someone is being held, particularly in executive detention.

That said, if this Court were to agree that there was some limit on its ability to order an injunction to force the Government to comply with its own legal obligations for holding Mr. Salahi, there's still, beyond an injunction, a very clear path for a remedy for this Court, and that's that this Court, as we explained in our brief, can order conditional release. Conditional release is not an immediate release, it just says that the Government must comply with the particular condition or else release will be ordered. And the Court has made clear that's appropriate in Aamer and Boumediene. And if this Court finds that there is a limitation on its remedial power, it should order it through that process.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. LADEN: If there are no questions, Your Honor, thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Hollander.
MS. HOLLANDER: Good morning, Your Honor. Thank you for allowing us to break this up. I have the task of talking a little bit about the facts here, now that my co-counsel have explained the law.

And I want to explain -- I want to talk about the issues we've raised that Mr. Salahi still does not have all of his legal documents and why that is, and his other property. And I have to go back a little bit. I've represented Mr. Salahi since 2005. And for the past several years I've always visited with him in his cell where he lives. So although I can't describe all of it, I did describe it to the Court in the classified pleading declaration.

After they no longer tortured him, they started at GTMO to try to rehabilitate him. And one of the ways they did that was they left the computer that they had brought for interrogation purposes with him, and it was actually one of his interrogators who gave him his first programming book so that he could continue to use it. As the years went on, he recovered to some extent. He recovered psychologically. He recovered physically. He became friends with his guards. They would come and watch TV with him. Things in terms of his imprisonment got much easier.

Then all of a sudden, for reasons only known to Guantanamo and perhaps to the Government, in October they decided to move him. Now, of course, they can make that decision, but no one told him why. No one told him what was happening. They simply came in and moved him and terrorized him. He was absolutely terrified that this was because they thought he had done something wrong.

Because when they moved him they took everything away from him. All of his years of family photos. Years of letters from his family that he read over and over again. They took all of his books, many of which we had bought him over the years. Books that the guards had dedicated to him. They took the computer. They moved him to a different place.

Now, the other problem that happened at that time besides the fact that he was terrified and they didn't bother to tell him why, and we've heard different reasons why, it doesn't really matter, that's a prison decision. I've seen his new cell, it is somewhat smaller, but not that much smaller. But at the same time, it appears quite clearly that they took all of his legal documents which he had, and the nonlegal documents and some other documents that, through an agreement we have had with DOJ, the guards would hold and he could ask for and then take back but were not to be left with him, they just dumped them all together. It wasn't inadvertent, it was intentional, or at the very least negligent.

So then he kept asking for them and not getting anywhere. At the same time, a one point, they brought him three envelopes. And the three envelopes clearly read: Do not leave with the detainee. And he panicked again because he thought they were trying to set him up. And he kept asking that they take them back. We asked that they take them back,
for months.
Well, it wasn't until after we filed our reply that they brought him what they said were all of his legal documents. Now the problem then is that that was after Colonel Heath's declaration, which was just false, because his declaration says he has them all. After we showed that that was false, it's somewhat inconceivable to me that the Government is still relying on it, but they are, they then brought him the legal documents and gave him some time to look through them but he didn't have time to completely look through them.

So that's one problem. But that's how this all started. So let's go to now. And we have their status report that they filed --

THE COURT: That's one reason I set this for a hearing because it looked to me like there was a factual dispute and I was going to need to take testimony, but you can -- in light of the new filing by the Government, I don't know if that's now correct or not.

MS. HOLLANDER: Well, Your Honor, you are correct that there's a factual dispute, and it's actually between Colonel Health, Andrew Warden from DOJ and from me, because I'm the one who's been there. And some of it is in the classified pleading, but some of it we can talk about. The Government, in their status report, still relies on Heath's
declaration, the unclassified version, and relies on a September 2014 e-mail from Andrew Warden at DOJ, but they're completely inconsistent.

Mr. Warden says that Mr. Salahi would have two bins. And I brought a bin, and you probably don't want to make it an exhibit, but I did want to show it to Your Honor. They keep referring to these as 15 -quart bins, and that is what it is. But it's not holding water, it's holding documents, and it doesn't hold very many. I just think it's important to visualize what it is they're talking about. So Mr. Warden says in his e-mail, that the Government attaches as its Exhibit C -- I'm sorry -Exhibit B. Every detainee will get two 15-quart plastic bins and an unlimited number of additional ones. And no JTF personnel will have access to them, there will be some special people. And they will also get them, if they want, they can have two in their cell, and if they want more they will be replaced and it shouldn't take more than 48 hours.

Colonel Heath says they get one bin and a maximum of four. Well, he's the one in Guantanamo. Now, if they get a maximum -- if he has as a maximum of four of these bins, what have they done with the rest of his documents -- because we have 10 years' worth of litigation. Mr. Salahi writes all the time. He writes on the pleadings. He writes a couple pages of notes when we go to see him so he'll remember. He
writes notes when we leave.
I suspect his notes alone would fill a bin. But he also writes all over the documents. And we're concerned now because they still have not provided his notes. After September, when we still didn't have everything, Mr. Patton requested that when I go to Guantanamo, which I did October 13th and 14th, that I ask Mr. Salahi to make a specific request, that his requests were too general. I want my books, I want my legal pleadings. So we did. And I helped him write them.

He requested his notes. He requested two specific books, a programming book that we had bought him when he finished the one his interrogator gave him, and another book called Grace and Gravity, and that was a book that a guard had dedicated and written in for him. Now, he was told by the administration in Guantanamo that the books that were taken out of his cell were all in the library, that the new administration -- it used to be that we could gives books to our clients, now you give them to the library, that he just had to ask for them.

When he asked for them, it was on October 14th. I have a letter here that I brought with me, that is unclassified, from November 5th, which just came into Washington a few days ago, saying he's had no response to either request. The Government says: Well, there are a few
notes missing. We're not talking about a few notes missing. And my other concern is where were they for 11 months and who was going through them? Because Colonel Heath says, well, it's now difficult to figure out what's privileged and what isn't because they lumped them all together. So somebody is going through them, and my concern about that is not just because I think it.

When they brought the documents in September, Mr. Salahi went through as many as he could, but he didn't get through all of them. They left them there for a long time but there are a lot of documents. He kept one to show me, and it's a binder, and I saw it in October. In the middle of this privileged binder was a piece of paper stuck in it. That piece of paper is a form, it's a police or government form for chain of custody. What is it doing in the middle of privileged documents? I didn't put it there. My client didn't put it there. Somebody put it there. Somebody who's going through these.

It's very distressing to him and to me that we can no longer count on the privilege. And he's frightened. He's afraid to have anything in his cell now. And so that's the concern about the legal documents. I don't think that the Government's status report is accurate, and I'm concerned that they have two exhibits that are contrary to each other and that they're still relying on Colonel Heath who was patently
lying when he told them earlier that Mohammedou had everything when he didn't. So that's the issue with the legal papers. Does that make sense to Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes. No, it doesn't make sense, but I understand what you're saying.

MS. HOLLANDER: It doesn't make sense, right, and that dog won't hunt, but it is what the situation is. And the other issue is the issue of his other property. We believe, and my co-counsel has argued, that the prison cannot just be arbitrary and capricious in the way that it deals with Mr. Salahi. Colonel Heath says in his declaration, well, we had to take things because he's in a smaller space. He is in a smaller space, but it's not so small, believe me, that he can't have the little box of photographs and letters, all of which have been cleared for years.

And now Colonel Heath says, well, he can ask for them and we'll see if they are appropriate. That to me is completely arbitrary. The fact that a guard dedicated a book to him ought to be his. And the fact that they took the computer -- the problem is that the way they are treating him now, for years he at least had something to do all day. He had his computer, he had his books, he had his letters.

Now, for reasons that are totally unclear, we believe they've lost some of them because they're not responding. The programming book they simply told him they
didn't have. They never inventoried his property. They told us how many books there were in their classified pleading, but they didn't ever make a list of them. And they're not responding to him. The other problem is, they wouldn't respond to me.

I was in Guantanamo -- and always in the past the SJAs have been very accommodating. If I had a question and I'd go in and say, can I speak to somebody, they could come usually to the camp. We'd sit down and talk about whatever the issue was. This time I made a request in writing, they denied it, but they came at night and saw him and he felt very threatened by that. What does your lawyer want? It's very threatening.

They've left him now with very little to do. He doesn't have his computer, he doesn't have most of his books. All he can do is watch Russian TV, which they have conveniently for him to watch. They even took away some of the TV stations because they were expensive. But what we're asking from this Court, to be very clear, is we want them to bring him all of his legal documents, everything -- everything they have. Maybe they should just bring everything and give him time to go through them, so it's not the SJA going through them.

We also asked the a privilege review team to go through them, and they said, no, it's not their problem.

So we want him to do it so that he can designate them, he can put them into the binders. And we would like -- I would like some lawyer to state under oath what happened to these legal documents. Who has gone through them? Where they've been. What they've done with them. Because Mr. Salahi has no confidence in his privilege anymore. And every day that goes by now we're back to the fear he had in 2004 and 2005. He's back to being extremely depressed as a result of this. And he actually was afraid for us to have this hearing. And one of the reasons we didn't complain for several months at the beginning of the year was that he kept hoping he would get them back because he is afraid now of repercussions from this hearing.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Hollander. MS. HOLLANDER: Thank you, sir.

MR. FOLIO: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph Folio for the Government. And just to let Your Honor know how we were going to divide the arguments as well. I'm going to address the issues regarding petitioner's motion for Periodic Review Board hearing, and my colleague, Mr. Patton, is going to address any and all issues regarding legal documents or other documents that Mr. Salahi claims he's deprived of.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FOLIO: With regard to the request for a more
timely PRB hearing, I'm going to follow the order that
petitioner's counsel presented in her argument, but I'm happy to address any specific issues the Court has along the way, in order or out of order.

What petitioner is asking the Court for is an order regarding the sequencing of PRB hearings. And he's effectively asking that he receive a PRB hearing before every other Guantanamo detainee who is set to receive one.

THE COURT: That's not what he -- he just asked me for a date. He doesn't have a date. He didn't say he has to be put before anybody else. But the Government won't even say when they're going to do it.

MR. FOLIO: Your Honor, I think he's asked for two different things. So in his motion --

THE COURT: So I took it from that, a list would satisfy what he just asked me for.

MR. FOLIO: Your Honor --
THE COURT: A list of when he's going to be up.
It's been four years. He wants to know when it's his turn. I think that's all he asked me for.

MR. FOLIO: Your Honor, that's what they have asked for today at the hearing, it's not how they framed the issue in their briefing.

THE COURT: I understand, but I'm going on what they asked me.

MR. FOLIO: That's fine.

THE COURT: What's wrong with giving him a date? MR. FOLIO: I think what they're asking for, Your Honor, first off, is they're asking for unprecedented judicial intervention to the --

THE COURT: Well, I can't even get to the point whether I have authority to do it. If I have authority, what would be wrong with it? The President said it in his Executive Order. You get it once a year. He hadn't done it in four years.

MR. FOLIO: Right.
THE COURT: Why hasn't the President done it?
MR. FOLIO: To be clear, Your Honor, I think the enforceability of what they're asking for is a significant hurdle. I think to find in their favor on the legal issues --

THE COURT: I understand. I understand. I'm assuming I have jurisdiction. Assuming I have jurisdiction, explain to me what the Court would -- what you would say to the Court that had jurisdiction.

MR. FOLIO: I think just to be clear, not only jurisdiction, but there was an enforceable right under the Executive Order that there was some sort of due process that --

THE COURT: So he has no rights. That's your position. He has nothing.

MR. FOLIO: No. Our argument is that he has the
right to bring his habeas corpus proceeding, he's done that. That's the vehicle he's driving in right now.

THE COURT: Okay. But you won't argue just jurisdiction and tell me I have no power to even ask the question? That's what you want to tell me, right?

MR. FOLIO: Your Honor can certainly ask the question and I'll tell you -- I'll describe more about the PRB process and why the PRB is where it is. But as a matter of law, we're saying that he does not have an enforceable right for this Court to issue an order addressing anything about scheduling, whether it's making him first or requiring the Executive to publish something. This is far from the habeas proceedings that Judge Hogan presided over in 2008 and 2009 after the Boumediene decision, because that decision found that detainees had a right to petition this court for habeas. THE COURT: Right.

MR. FOLIO: Here what petitioner is trying to enforce is something he claims he has a right for under the Executive Order or under these other panoply of legal authorities he cites. The problem is, throughout the argument they're conflating these distinct legal issues and mixing them up and trying to come up with some sort of legal right that is contrary to establish precedent both from the Supreme Court as well as the Court of Appeals and contrary to decisions that Your Honor has made regarding, for example, the applicability
of the due process clause.
So with regard to the $P R B$ and where the process is right now, that Executive Order was issued in 2011 and the process did not begin until October 2013. And the Department of Defense has explained along the way --

THE COURT: Why was that?
MR. FOLIO: The Department of Defense explained along the way, and we cited to the October 9th, 2013, Department of Defense press release in our briefing papers, that explained that working through these processes required the Government to address a number of complex issues associated with building a comprehensive process.

So to understand what the Executive Order required, it required the Executive Branch to establish an interagency process for the review of all of the detainees and to determine whether or not the detainee posed a threat to U.S. national security interests. That's a very different question, as counsel acknowledged, and what we're addressing in the habeas proceeding.

So the first step was to establish the process to allow that interagency review to occur. I'm sorry. The initial step was setting up the PRB process itself, which was set up through a Department of Defense memorandum which established what the PRB would do and how it would do it. Then for the PRB to undertake its work, it had to --

THE COURT: This is all supplemental to the review that Matt Olson and his team did?

MR. FOLIO: Correct, Your Honor. Just to be clear, it --

THE COURT: It had nothing to do with this because this is just setting up PRB reviews?

MR. FOLIO: It's a follow-on review, Your Honor. Just to be clear, I think throughout petitioner's argument they made the mistake of implying as if he's not receiving any sort of meaningful review from the detention. That could not be further from the truth. He continues to have the right to pursue his habeas case in this court, to argue that he is unlawfully detained.

In fact, two of the three reasons he said he needs his PRB hearing more immediately are reasons that he can raise in the habeas case. He argues his place of detention should somehow be considered or there's no lawful basis for his decision. Those are all arguments that he could raise in pursuing the habeas case. The PRB is focused specifically on whether or not a detainees continues to pose a threat for detention.

I'll just let Your Honor know the decisions that have been made about petitioner over the years have been, first, the initial decision to detain him. Second, the decision in 2004 by the CSRT that he was in fact a member of
enemy forces and therefore lawfully detained.
After the CSERT there were three ARB hearings, Administrative Review Board hearings that were established by the Bush Administration, that were effectively similar these PRB hearings and that they evaluated whether or not ongoing detention was lawful. He received three of those, and each of them decided that he was someone that should be detained as a member of al-Qaeda.

Then the task force review that Your Honor referred to occurred at the beginning of President Obama's Administration, and it also determined not only that he was lawfully detained, but it referred him and I think 35 other detainees for prosecution.

So petitioner has received numerous reviews over the year, and he also retains his ongoing right to pursue all of these claims in habeas. So, just to be clear, it is not as if petitioner languishes in Guantanamo without any legal recourse about the lawfulness of his detention or whether or not he poses a threat -- Guantanamo without any right to review.

And as I've noted before, he remains in line, like dozens of other detainees at Guantanamo, to receive a PRB hearing. So I think that one of the first points Your Honor raised is that we must look at what the Executive Order says, and I think that's very important. There are certain parts of
the Executive Order that we should tease out before begin the legal analysis.

Most important is at the end of the Executive Order, in Section 10, it says that the order itself was not intended to and does not create any right or benefit substantive or procedural, enforceable law or in equity by any party against the United States. Petitioner does not breathe one word in their brief today about that provision in the Executive Order.

The Executive Order also says that it establishes as a discretionary matter a process to review on a periodic basis the Executive Branch's continued discretionary exercise of existing detention authority in individual cases. Section 8 of the order says: The process established under this order does not address the legality of any detainee's Law of War detention. Again, the focus of the PRB is to determine whether or not a detainee poses an ongoing threat to the United States.

And one of the other fundamental reasons it would be problematic for the judiciary to intervene and to start setting schedules for this internal executive review process, is the fact that the review process is the way the Executive is determining whether or not individual detainees pose a threat to U.S. national security interests. The Supreme Court, as far back as Ludecke, said that determining a
detainee's potency for mischief is not the role of the judiciary.

So, in essence, they're asking you to intervene into the administrative processes and issue these orders and make these scheduling requirements in an area of law the Supreme Court has been quite clear, and I think the Court of Appeals in Awad has agreed, should be left to the discretion of the Executive.

Turning to the Executive Order itself, which petitioner's counsel has argued, provides a Private Right of Action. They argue that not only does it provide a Private Right of Action, but somehow it also implements the suspension clause. It creates some sort of liberty interest, which is going to due process, and it also implements requirements under the AUMF and international law.

Now, this is the perfect example of how their argument conflates very different legal concepts. Each of those needs to be broken out and dealt with separately. The Executive Order implements none of those. As I noted before when we were walking through the important sections of the Executive Order, it says: As a discretionary matter, it is establishing the periodic review. It said: As a discretionary matter, it is establishing the periodic review. So the Executive Order itself did not say that it was doing it as a matter of law, but as a discretionary
matter. And the first question you have to ask, under the Executive Order, whether or not the Executive Order itself creates a privately enforceable right. There are two questions.

The first question was whether or not it's issued under statutory authority. We did not agree with petitioner's counsel that they had met that prong. Rather, in our brief we simply said, even assuming that first step had been met, we focused on the second step whether or not there was a privately enforceable right. And the important part of the Executive Order that says it creates no such rights, the part that was not mentioned by petitioner's counsel, has been dispositive.

And the Court of Appeals held in the Meyer case that an Executive Order that does not create any prior right is not subject to judicial review. The Court of Appeals also reaffirmed a similar decision in Women's Equity Action League, which we said it in our briefs, saying even indulging without approving the notion that the Executive can create a Right of Action, we find no evidence of an intent to create the one plaintiffs describe. In that instance the Executive Order did not contain the express disavowal of a Right of Private Action. Here, however, we have that.

And I think that if you look at a number of Court of Appeals cases that have -- and I think one case from the

District Court that have looked at Executive Orders that contain that express language, they each have upheld there's no Private Right of Action created under the Executive Order. So, bottom line, the petitioner cites to no case in which a court has ignored the express provisions of the Executive Order saying, there's no Private Right of Action here, to find that one does exist.

So I think breaking up the arguments, the next we should look at is the suspension clause argument. So in the suspension clause argument, a notable part of the Executive Order is Section 1.B in which it states that the detainees at Guantanamo have the constitutional privilege of the right of habeas corporate, and nothing in the Executive Order is intended to affect the jurisdiction of Federal Courts to determine the legality of their detention. The Executive Order suspends nothing.

And as the Court of Appeals found in Kiyemba, although it was a different challenge, the petitioner made a suspension clause argument, so long as the petitioner has the right to come to this court and pursue his habeas corpus case, there is no suspension of anything, let alone a suspension clause violation that justifies intervention into the internal review of the Executive and the PRB.

Turning to the due process argument made by petitioner. Again, petitioner faces an uphill battle. The

Court of Appeals in Kiyemba held that the due process clause does not apply to aliens detained at Guantanamo who have no property or presence in the sovereign territory of the United States.

That decision has been followed by a number of judges on this court, including Your Honor most recently in the Rabbani decision. And you described it in the Rabbani decision as wishful thinking on the part of the petitioner, that because this Circuit placed no such limiting qualifications on its assertion, that the due process clause does not apply to aliens like him. That's exactly the -THE COURT: So how do you explain Aamer?

MR. FOLIO: Excuse me.
THE COURT: How do you explain Aamer then?
MR. FOLIO: How do we explain Aamer?
THE COURT: Right.
MR. FOLIO: When Aamer addressed this issue, Aamer assumed, without deciding anything, and that language couldn't be more important, again, it wasn't mentioned at all by petitioner's counsel. What petitioner's counsel is asking to do is to somehow look to Aamer and other cases, they point to Al-Bahlul, as implicitly overruling the direct clear guidance from the Court of Appeals, and that's not something this Court should engage in.

Again, the law cannot be more clear from Kiyemba,
and several members of this court have followed it in the Al-Rabanni decision, as well as the Al-Wirghi decision. Judge Huvelle in the Ameziane decision, and Judge Walton in the Boston decision.

And I think that the argument that somehow Boumediene, and this is their argument from Bahlul, somehow Boumediene addressed the extraterritoriality of more than the suspension clause. It is also something that has been squarely addressed by the D.C. Circuit in the Meyers decision. Not to mention --

THE COURT: In Boumediene, Judge Kennedy just said, we'll leave it all to the District Court, they can figure it out. They didn't do anything. Very helpful.

MR. FOLIO: He certainly did, Your Honor. But I think Boumediene itself was very focused like a laser on the suspension clause. So that decision should not be read to do anything more than it did there, and that's exactly what the Court of Appeals said in Myers, that it only addressed the suspension clause. So, again, the argument petitioner is asking you to accept is simply too much.

So turning to their final argument that they think is a source of rights for you to issue an order regarding the administrative procedures of the $P R B$, they point to the AUMF and international law. They effectively argue that because the Executive detention authority informed by the Law of War
principles, periodic review is required. But, again, they're asking you to do way too much and reading way too much into the law.

By their own terms, the third and the fourth Geneva Convention, only Common Article 3 applies to the armed conflict against the Taliban, al-Qaeda and their associated forces. What petitioner does is construct a false dichotomy between Geneva Convention -- the Third Geneva Convention, which addresses PoWs, and the Fourth Geneva Convention, which addresses civilians. And they argue that, well, if he's not a POW, he must be a civilian. It's the same argument this Court considered in 2009 and rejected on the Government's detention authority briefing.

I think it was in the Hamiliy case that Judge Bates said, the Geneva Conventions do not award civilian status by default. And in Gherebi, Judge Walton said that such a result would cripple the states' ability to fight enemy forces in a non-international armed conflict.

As the Government pointed out in its March 13th, 2009, detention authority brief, it's well-settled that individuals who are part of a private armed force but do not otherwise qualify for PoW status because they failed to adhere to the Laws of War, should not qualify civilians by default. That simply makes no sense. It would undermine the fundamental purpose of the Geneva Conventions, which is to
afford privileges to combatants who follow the Laws of War. So rather than this artificial distinction between the Third Geneva Convention and the Fourth Geneva Convention, and leaving no room in between, the key distinction is between combatants and civilians. And members of al-Qaeda certainly were combatants.

Petitioner's next argument was that Common Article 3 somehow requires periodic review. Again, this simply reads too much into Common Article 3, and it effectively makes Common Article 3 a backdoor for the Fourth Geneva Convention and all these other international law principles. Your Honor asked what the best international law authority they had, and they mentioned treaties, but the treaties directly on point, as I just explained, the Geneva Conventions tell you exactly what should be provided.

And each time petitioner, in their brief, cites to law that should apply to the interment of people, that's law that applies to civilians under the Fourth Geneva Convention. And when they talk the periodic review, that was a review that was provided again to civilians who were detained for security purposes, which might otherwise evaporate, given the passage of time, as opposed to enemy forces who can be detained, as the Court of Appeals has held, for the duration of act of hostilities.

And the last argument, I think, they made on the
international law front, Your Honor, was that somehow the circumstances the Supreme Court referenced in Hamdi of detention authority unraveling have been met. But I think, simply, Your Honor's recent decision in Al-Warafi, which was from July 2015, as well as Judge Kollar-Kotelly's decision in Kandari, rejected those arguments, and said, those conditions just haven't been meet today. The U.S. continues to be engaged in acts of hostilities. And if there is a time of unravel, it certainly is not today.

Unless Your Honor has any questions on the Executive Order, I was going to turn briefly to the jurisdiction argument and then turn the podium over to my colleague, Mr. Patton.

THE COURT: I will ask you to same question I asked the petitioner. Why is it that the President has not done anything about setting this for a determination? All you want to say is "national security"?

MR. FOLIO: I'm sorry. Setting --
THE COURT: Well, I asked them: Why do they think the President hasn't done anything to ensure that his Executive Order is carried out? Why hasn't DoD done anything to get this scheduled? And they said they can't figure it out; ask the Government. So I'm asking the Government. MR. FOLIO: I think it would be an unfair characterization to say the Executive is not doing anything to
make sure the --
THE COURT: Well, in four years he hadn't scheduled a PRB.

MR. FOLIO: Well, that's only for petitioner.
THE COURT: I understand. He scheduled 18 out of all of them down there?

MR. FOLIO: The statistics that I have, which I believe are current as of today, is that there have been 28 total PRB hearings. There have been 19 initial reviews -initial full reviews. Six file reviews. And three post file full reviews with hearings. And the results of those have been 15 reviews resulted in transfer determinations. And to date, four of those detainees have been transferred. We have two PRB hearings scheduled for December, next month. So that's all to tell you that process is working and the process is moving forward.

THE COURT: Slowly.
MR. FOLIO: The petitioner is in line. Yes, Your
Honor. And I think, as I hinted before, the reason why the process moved slowly is because the Executive had to establish the process in the first place.

THE COURT: That was by 2013.
MR. FOLIO: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: That was done by 2013.
MR. FOLIO: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now we're in 2015.
MR. FOLIO: Correct, Your Honor. And I think that
that process --
THE COURT: 28 instead of 18.
MR. FOLIO: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So we've done 28 instead of 18 out of
150 or whatever?
MR. FOLIO: So I believe there are 107 detainees left at Guantanamo. I think that the 28 total --

THE COURT: How many?
MR. FOLIO: 107.
THE COURT: Seven -- okay.
MR. FOLIO: 107.
THE COURT: So at this rate, how many years is it going to take to finish the PRBs -- the first PRB for each person?

MR. FOLIO: I'm not sure, Your Honor. I think that the difficult part to assess is that each detainee's case is different and the $P R B$ process itself requires a lot of -- has a lot of moving parts. So the initial --

THE COURT: You're talking about several more years at this rate?

MR. FOLIO: Your Honor, I'm not sure. I think that would probably be a fair assessment, but I'm not sure. I can't speak to that. What I can speak to is that after the
initial time period it took to establish the PRB process, then we now can look at this process, see what it involves, and see why it's taking more time than perhaps originally anticipated.

I think that what the Government needs to do is, across agencies, it needs to collect information on a detainee, and again, that information is not like we address here in habeas, was that person lawfully detained, but the information goes to whether or not that person continues to present a threat to U.S. national security interests. And then that information must be presented to the detainee, the detainee's personal representative, and if appropriate, the detainee's counsel for the PRB process.

And the Government has learned that it needs to give the detainee an ample opportunity to review the information, to prepare a response, a written response, perhaps consider calling witnesses, and to then schedule hearings, which have to be scheduled across the interagency since personnel from different executive departments participate in them and have reviews, and in conducting that, all at the same time staff is still working to present the information on other detainees who are sort of percolating up through the queue.

The Government does continue to work on multiple cases at one time. It's not as if the Government focuses just on one detainee and slowly pushes that person through. The

Government works on multiple cases. And the key point is that once the Government is able to present the unclassified information presented to the PRB to the detainee, that's when things can start moving forward.

Bottom line, again, petitioner is in line like dozens of other detainees, and at this point it's just a matter of time.

THE COURT: Well, we're not going to tell you where you are in line?

MR. FOLIO: That's right, Your Honor. I don't think there is any clear line. To use the line -- we use the word "line" colloquial, but I think it sort of just depends on a lot of different moving parts and factors.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. FOLIO: On the jurisdiction argument, Your Honor, I just want to address this briefly to say that petitioner misconstrues the jurisdiction argument. This is not an Aamer argument about core or non-core habeas. This argument is, he has presented a claim that does not sound in habeas. And Aamer tells you if the claim doesn't sound in habeas, there's no jurisdiction because $2241(e)(2)$ is viable.

So the reason why petitioner's claim doesn't sound
in habeas is because he is asking you to issue an order regarding an administrative executive process, namely, sequencing. Whether it is to put him at the head of the line
or to oversee scheduling, and that could not be further from the purpose of habeas, which is to effect release from detention.

As courts have summed it up, what habeas addresses is the fact, the duration or the quantum of detention. So quantum would cover conditions of confinement. This is neither of them. I think the most on point Supreme Court case is the Muhammad against Close case from 2004. And in that case a prisoner challenged an alleged procedural defect in a prison's administrative process regarding good time credits. And because the petitioner challenged only administrative determinations, he raised -- the Court held -- he raised no claim on which habeas relief could have been granted on any recognized theory.

Now, petitioner's counsel is quick to disparage the Supreme Court's holding in Skinner and Dotson, and while admittedly they do occur in a different context, namely, the interplay between habeas and 1983 lawsuits. They provide very important guidance about what cases are habeas and what may not be habeas. So the quote from the Supreme Court's decision in Skinner, the Supreme Court said it is aware of no case in which the Court has recognized habeas as the sole remedy, importantly, or even in available one, where the relief sought would neither terminate custody, accelerate the future date of release from custody nor reduce the level of custody.

And the majority opinion went on to state that, in Dotson, declared that in no uncertain terms that when a prisoner's claim would not necessarily spell speedier release, the claim does not lie at the core of habeas and may be brought, if at all, under Section 1983.

So those lawsuits did not hold firmly like Muhammad did, that these tangential challenges are not habeas, but Muhammad did hold that. And the D.C. Circuit has recognized the sea change. And this is important, as matter of jurisdiction, Your Honor, because this is a court of limited jurisdiction. And I think what petitioner is asking is for effectively turning habeas into a vehicle where any and all legal claims can be brought, and it simply would make the writ unmanageable.

The last point I'll make on the jurisdiction argument, Your Honor. I think that when looking for analogies, I think Muhammad is the best case, but I think Dotson is an interesting case as well. So what Dotson was challenging was eligibility for a parole hearing. So insofar as one is willing to draw a analogy between a PRB hearing is like a parole hearing. This question is one step further removed from that. Here the Executive has already determined that petitioner is eligible and will receive a PRB hearing. So, in effect, what he's trying to challenge then is the sequencing procedures as to how that will happen.

I think that demonstrates, again, the removal from -- like the Dodson-type challenge to what he's challenged and why this is even a more clear case, that this is a case that simply does not sound in habeas.

Finally, Your Honor, petitioner's counsel acknowledged that the Ninth Circuit's decision in Nettles is on our side, but noted it was only the Ninth Circuit. I think my first response to that is to point to the Court of Appeals' decision in the D.C. Circuit in Davis in which it acknowledged the Skinner decision -- the importance of the Skinner decision. And based on Skinner it suggested that habeas might not even be available for probabilistic claims, such as parole hearings.

Also, Nettles did not acknowledge that there was a problem with Aamer. All Nettles, the Ninth Circuit's decision stated, was that Aamer went to the circuit split about whether or not conditions of confinement can be brought in habeas, and there continues to be that circuit split. Notably, Nettles said that Aamer was decided and it didn't even mention Skinner.

We're talking about a different area of law. We're talking about Skinner and Muhammad, and those are cases that have to do with administrative determinations and procedures and nothing do with the even the possibility of release, simply don't sound in habeas. If Your Honor has no
further questions, I'll --
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Folio.
MR. FOLIO: -- turn the podium over to Mr. Patton. Thank you.

MS. PATTON: May it please the Court. Rodney Patton on behalf of the respondents. I'll be addressing, briefly, the legal materials issues and the conditions of confinement issue. To be honest, I'm a little baffled, I thought we had put the legal materials issue to rest. From respondent's perspective, petitioner is in full control of access to all of his legal materials. He understands, as petitioner's counsel has told us, the process. The one for one bin exchange that we've explained to Your Honor before. He keeps a one 15-quart container in his cell and the rest of the materials are kept in bins in storage for him and he can request them any time he wants. And Ms. Hollander mentioned the four containers --

THE COURT: And currently he -- the limit of four is wrong?

MS. PATTON: Right. Mr. Hollander mentioned that Colonel Heath -- and, certainly, that is very, very typical. Mr. Salahi has a lot of legal materials. In fact, he has a lot of property down there or a lot of items that he's accumulated over the years. He has nine. He has a lot of this.

So the answer to the question of: Where are they? Well, they are in legal bins that he has gone through and put them in subsequently numbered. Ms. Hollander said, after a long discussion about legal materials, what we want is for them to bring petitioner all of his legal materials so he can go through them. Done. That was done on September 17th.

Why it wasn't done before was, well, we didn't hear about there being a legal materials issue at all until May 2nd. And then we provided response that he had access to all of his legal materials. The day of or the day before the motion was filed, we were asked for our Rule 7 M conference, and we said, well, what do you mean he doesn't have his legal materials, we've already gone through this. They didn't want to wait, so they filed the motion.

We provided Colonel Heath's declaration, believing at that point in good faith that this had been a communication problem, them believing -- why hasn't he got all of his legal materials in the cell, and our position being, well, he has access to all of is legal materials and there's this process. It became clear on September 14th when petitioner filed their response, and a few days before that, that there was still a problem, the parties appeared to be talking past each other. So we moved promptly, the same day, to try and resolve this. Three days later all of his legal materials were brought to him, as the best solution to his. To just
say, look through, find what you want to keep in your bin and in your cell, and if you want other legal materials you can exchange them out. That's what petitioner did. What we then did was facilitate a phone call and find out -- making sure everyone was on the same page.

We have no interest, obviously, in keeping him from his legal materials. What we have an interest in is not unnecessary motions practice. So we want to resolve this issue, and believe that we have. He's reviewed all his legal materials. He understands the process of how to request them. They're there for him. So Ms. Hollander said that it wasn't just the missing notes from 2009. In my conversations with opposing counsel, that's all that was mentioned before.

Obviously, he, again, is in control of how to access his legal materials. If he believes that he doesn't have the legal materials that he wants. He can ask for a one for one exchange. He can go through and sort through that. He can do that nine times and go through all the materials. I'm not aware of anything else missing.

As for who is going through these legal materials, I'm not aware of anyone. We provided both to the petitioner and to the Court, that neither the guard force nor the Staff Judge Advocates go through and review all these legal materials. They're kept in storage as identified in
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report. So the issue with regard to legal materials is done. We're happy to work with petitioner's counsel, if they believe there are any other outstanding issues. But from our perspective, we believe that that issue is completely put to rest.

With regard to the conditions of confinement, neither in their briefs nor here today do petitioners explain to you what authority you would have to start to micromanage what items the petitioner can have in his cell, what items he can't have. That's the Commander's responsibility. That's the administrators at Guantanamo. The law is very clear on this.

What items we can have and what items he cannot have. They must show, first, that he has a constitution right not to be deprived of the item, and that the constitutional right was infringed. And if they've proven those two, that respondent's decisions are unreasonable, and the burden is on the petitioner here, it's not on respondents, as set out in the Hatim case on Page 60 of that opinion.

They ignore the law as far as those two requirements, but they're absolute prerequisites. They cite, again, as they do often, to Aamer, the D.C. Circuit case, and Hatim. But they said, as my co-counsel mentioned, they assume without deciding the constitutional right. In Aamer it was the constitutional right to be free from unwanted medical
treatment. We shall, for purposes of this case, assume without deciding, they said on Page 1,039.

In Hatim, it was the detainee's right to habeas. The question was whether there was a right to representation by counsel. We assume, without deciding, the D.C. Circuit said, on Page 59 of Hatim. This case is much more like Dhiab, which was Judge Kessler's decision, and Your Honor's decision in Rabbani versus Obama, which was 76 F. Supp 3d, Page 21, the pinpoint cite at Page 25, where the Court specifically discusses the constitutional prerequisites that must exist before we get into Turner versus Safley analysis.

In their briefs --
THE COURT: I recall Rabbani well. I understand that.

MS. PATTON: Right. In their briefs they go straight to the Turner analysis. Here they dispense with any law whatsoever and discuss only the facts. But to follow what petitioners are asking you to do would give this Court and every other judge on this bench a free-floating reasonableness task to decide, not only the overlying policy that a Commander has a right to decide what's contraband and what's not contraband, but that you would have to decide each one, whether this particular item is contraband, whether that particular item is contraband. That is not what the law says at all.

And just to put factual context on it, petitioner himself has moved from a larger cell to a smaller cell. Not everything that he has can fit in there. He has five foot lockers full of items that are in storage. What he has in his cell is laid out in the declaration -- I'm sorry -- in the Exhibit B to Colonel Heath's declaration. That is a classified exhibit, but it lists all the things that he has in his cell.

However you want to describe it, it certainly couldn't be described as spartan. But he has five foot lockers worth of material. He can request those items back so long as they are not contraband. Same process. And as is described in the classified declaration how that occurs.

These items, Ms. Hollander said, are vital to him. I would note that it was eight months before this brief was filed after the move occurred. So whether or not they're vital to him, he can get these items back so long as they're not contraband. A determination of whether they're contraband or not is for the Commander, not for this Court.

If Your Honor has any other questions?
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Patton.
MS. PATTON: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Petitioner gets the last word.
MS. SHAMSI: Thank you, Your Honor. I'm going to
very briefly address just a few of the points and not all of
them, which I think were addressed in our previous arguments or our papers.

First of all, Mr. Folio recited the alphabet soup of agency reviews that Mr. Salahi has obtained. I just wanted to emphasize that Judge Robertson was the only independent person who reviewed all of the evidence in this case, and he came to a decision that Mr. Salahi was not detainable. We understand it's been overruled in the "part of" factor, but Judge Robertson is the only independent person.

With respect to the task force review. Your Honor, I think one thing that's important to emphasize is the task for review was mandated by the President to be done within a year and it was done within a year. And here that is very much not the case. And with respect to the --

THE COURT: Obviously, if the President cared, he could get this done in a year.

MS. SHAMSI: I think the President has said -- I won't speak for the President, but I will take the President at his word that he is concerned about closing Guantanamo. That he is --

THE COURT: This isn't any way of showing it, is it?

MS. SHAMSI: But I think, Your Honor, blaming only the President is to disregard the accounts that have come out about delay -- admitted delay by the Defense Department by
itself, an admission of delay by the Defense Department, and bureaucratic bumbling in some sense. All of which, Your Honor, the critical point is you --

THE COURT: All of which the President should straighten out, shouldn't he?

MS. SHAMSI: He could but --
THE COURT: You're asking the Court to do it.
MS. SHAMSI: That's because the courts have a role, and a critically important role, that is what the Supreme Court has said, and that's why we're here before you today. We think we are entitled to this process. We think that entitlement requires it to be timely. We think that that is a legal entitlement.

We don't think that the Executive Order, as the Government says -- we're not arguing for a Private Right of Action, we've explicitly told you that. We've said that we don't need one because there is a habeas jurisdiction that exists. Your Honor, whatever the Executive Branches do, the courts have said over and over again that they have a critical role to play as a co-equal branch to ensure that the detainees do not bear the cost of delay. And that, I think, is critically important.

Just a couple of other points, Your Honor. The Government, very dramatically, pointed out with respect to the suspension clause, you know, that it suspends nothing. We're
not asking -- we're not saying that it suspends anything. We are in fact saying that the failure to provide a process, and again, it's mandated by the President, but it's the Defense Department that carries out the President's order, and that that process is a violation of the suspension clause.

With respect to the Government's arguments about Kiyemba, Bahlul and Aamer, we are not asking you to overrule Kiyemba, we obviously know you can't do that. We're asking you to follow two other panels that have narrowly read Kiyemba. And in Al-Bahlul, as I said, where Judge Kavanaugh said that majority of the court would apply Boumediene, just as we're asking you to do.

And, Your Honor, under the Government's reading of Aamer, the case finding conditions of confinement claims in habeas. Under their reading, the D.C. Circuit engaged in a purely advisory exercise, which surely would come to a surprise -- as a surprise to the panel. And we don't think you should take their extreme reading of Aamer to heart.

Very quickly, in Boumediene, with respect to a focus on the suspension clause analysis by the Supreme Court, absolutely. But I think it's important to recognize that in arriving at its conclusions about the extraterritorial application of the suspension clause, the Supreme Court also looked to the extraterritorial application of other constitutional provisions, including the due process clause,
and certainly did not exclude them.
And couple of very quick points. I don't think anyone should get bogged down in the issue of civilians under the Laws of War, that is a term of art. Under the Geneva Conventions you have prisoners of war and civilians can include alleged enemy combatants, that we all understand in accord. So using the word civilians is a pejorative word, I think makes very little sense, and I just want to be very clear that we are arguing from recognized Law of War authority that exists under the Geneva Conventions, under the ICRC and other authoritative guidance.

Your Honor, with respect to the view of habeas jurisdiction under Aamer, they are two competing views. The one that you heard from today, again from the Government, was the view of the Ninth Circuit in Nettles, and it was the view of Justice Scalia, a particular footnote in Skinner, as my co-counsel pointed out. Aamer rejects that view. So I think that there, the direction of where you need to go with respect to your habeas jurisdiction is very, very clear. I can elaborate on that in a bit, but I think the point is very simple. Their view is rejected. Aamer is the law.

I wanted to clarify a factual issue. I think you might have been left with the impression that when counsel said that there have been 28 people or 28 file reviews, that's 28 individuals, I don't think that that's the case.

I think there are 19 individuals.
THE COURT: Oh, okay.
MS. SHAMSI: Who have gone through PRB review, some have gone through it twice through a file review and some have gone through otherwise.

THE COURT: Some people get two before he gets one. MS. SHAMSI: Exactly. And, at bottom, Your Honor, that's where we're left. You asked the Government to provide information and they still essentially came back to you with a black box.

THE COURT: None of my business.
MS. SHAMSI: Right. But it's very much your business, Your Honor. It is very much your business under this Court's habeas jurisdiction. And it's very much your business because we're asking you to apply the law. We're not asking you to read in new frameworks or new sources of authority. We're asking you to do what the Supreme Court has said you can do and what the D.C. Circuit leaves you with the room to do.

And, Your Honor, we adamantly think that you can rule for us, that you've got the habeas jurisdiction to rule for us, Executive Order, AUMF. What we're asking you to do, it seems to us, is at a minimum, to enforce what the Government has said itself it will do, to call them in for status hearings, as Judge Hogan did. Judge Hogan put their
feet to the fire. And it cannot be that a process that should have been started within one year, the Government now stands before you today and says, we don't know, might take years. Because Mr. Salahi has a right not to have that take years, otherwise, his detention is unlawful.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. The motion is submitted. I'll rule as promptly as I can. END OF PROCEEDINGS AT 12:15 P.M.
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although [2] 31/7 49/18
always [2] 31/6 38/6
Am [1] 18/12
Amendment [1] 22/12
American [2] 1/16 1/21
Ameziane [1] 51/3
amount [1] 18/25
ample [1] 57/14
analogies [1] 60/17
analogous [4] 11/13 11/15 11/24 25/2
analogy [3] 11/18 12/5 60/20
analysis [6] 15/2 21/9 46/2 66/11 66/16 70/20
analyzed [1] 22/1
and 2009 [1] 42/13
and 2010 [1] 13/18
Andrew [2] 33/22 34/2
animosity [1] 7/16
annually [1] 6/19
another [3] 16/7 18/11 35/13
answer [5] 5/14 5/15 10/17 14/18 63/1
answering [1] 17/1
anticipated [1] 57/3
any [36] 4/9 $4 / 19$ 9/23 12/3 13/9 13/20
14/4 14/7 15/7 17/5 19/18 20/17 20/17
23/15 26/19 27/14 28/3 28/19 39/21
40/2 44/9 45/17 45/19 46/5 46/6 46/15
48/15 54/10 58/11 59/13 60/12 62/16
65/3 66/16 67/20 68/21
anybody [1] 40/10
anymore [1] 39/6
anyone [5] 11/18 14/7 17/2 64/21 71/3
anything [12] 36/21 42/10 49/21 50/18
51/13 51/17 54/16 54/20 54/21 54/25
64/19 70/1
anywhere [1] 32/21
appealed [1] 5/2
Appeals [11] 18/4 42/24 47/7 48/14
48/16 48/25 49/17 50/1 50/23 51/18

## 53/23

Appeals' [1] 61/8
APPEARANCES [1] 1/14
appeared [1] 63/22
appears [1] 32/12
apple [2] 18/24 19/5
applicability [1] 42/25
applicable [2] 12/1 12/23
application [5] 15/5 20/11 22/23 70/23 70/24
applies [8] 10/21 11/16 12/4 22/19
22/21 28/24 52/5 53/18
apply [8] 12/15 20/20 22/13 50/2 50/11
53/17 70/11 72/15
approach [1] 12/14
appropriate [4] 12/10 30/14 37/17 57/11
approving [1] 48/19
April [1] 5/18
ARB [1] 45/2
arbitrary [5] 6/5 11/22 12/21 37/10 37/18
are [56] 5/22 5/24 6/1 6/6 7/4 9/15 10/4 11/10 11/24 12/4 12/17 16/1 17/3 18/18 20/5 20/12 20/18 28/10 29/3 29/21 30/19 33/8 33/20 35/25 36/11 36/24 37/17 37/20 37/23 44/15 44/18 45/25
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## B

books... [4] 35/18 37/22 38/2 38/15
borne [1] 15/25
Boston [1] 51/4
both [9] 10/8 12/18 15/9 18/16 19/15
26/6 26/8 42/23 64/21
bother [1] 32/8
bottom [3] 49/4 58/5 72/7
bought [2] 32/4 35/12
Boumediene [19] 9/13 15/2 15/16 15/16
17/9 20/10 20/11 21/8 22/19 22/22
24/20 30/15 42/14 51/6 51/7 51/11
51/15 70/11 70/19
box[5] 6/5 6/13 17/4 37/14 72/10
Boyd [1] 2/1
branch [3] 19/16 43/14 69/20
Branch's [1] 46/12
Branches [1] 69/18
break [2] 18/14 30/23
breaking [1] 49/8
breathe [1] 46/7
brief [7] $3 / 1830 / 1046 / 848 / 752 / 20$
53/16 67/15
briefing [5] 10/19 28/6 40/22 43/9 52/13
briefly [7] 16/10 23/21 29/25 54/11
58/16 62/7 67/25
briefs [4] 48/18 65/7 66/12 66/15
bring [4] 38/20 38/21 42/1 63/5
broad [3] 1/17 8/20 30/2
broader [1] 26/3
broadest [1] 24/18
broadly [1] 22/24
broken [1] 47/18
brought [15] 8/20 27/3 27/4 28/12 31/11
32/21 33/3 33/9 34/5 35/22 36/8 60/5
60/13 61/17 63/25
brutal [1] 7/14
building [1] 43/12
bumbling [1] 69/2
burden [1] 65/17
burdens [1] 20/13
bureaucratic [1] 69/2
Bush [1] 45/4
business [4] 72/11 72/13 72/13 72/15
by 2013 [2] 55/22 55/24
C
CA [1] 1/4
call [2] 64/4 72/24
called [6] 25/12 26/20 27/10 27/12
29/15 35/14
calling [1] 57/16
came [9] 5/7 6/11 17/12 27/24 31/23
35/23 38/11 68/7 72/9
camp [1] 38/9
can [46] $4 / 6$ 8/16 15/7 15/25 16/3 16/21
18/18 18/25 25/19 30/10 31/21 33/18
33/24 34/16 36/19 37/16 38/8 38/16
39/1 39/1 42/6 44/15 48/19 51/12 53/23
56/25 57/2 58/4 60/13 61/17 62/15 63/5
64/2 64/16 64/17 64/18 65/9 65/13 67/3
67/11 67/17 71/5 71/19 72/18 72/20
73/7
can't [10] 7/25 17/13 28/8 31/7 37/14
41/5 54/22 56/25 65/10 70/8
cannot [9] 7/25 17/20 22/24 22/25 28/3
37/9 50/25 65/13 73/1
Capital [1] 1/22
capricious [1] 37/10
captured [2] 7/10 15/13
cared [1] 68/15
carefully [1] 21/25
carried [1] 54/21
by 2013[2] 55/22 55/24
carries [1] 70/4
case [59] 5/2 7/8 8/19 9/18 10/3 13/22 15/18 15/20 17/22 17/24 19/9 20/1
20/23 21/2 21/11 21/14 21/23 22/18
23/12 24/23 24/24 25/1 25/2 25/4 25/5
25/10 25/24 26/13 27/10 27/12 27/12
27/13 27/21 29/15 44/12 44/16 44/19
48/14 48/25 49/4 49/20 52/14 56/18
59/7 59/8 59/9 59/21 60/17 60/18 61/3
61/3 65/19 65/22 66/1 66/6 68/6 68/14 70/14 71/25
cases [30] 13/13 13/15 13/17 17/10 18/9
20/19 20/21 21/10 23/1 24/15 24/18
26/17 26/20 27/7 27/9 27/9 27/15 27/19
28/9 28/9 28/10 28/15 28/17 46/13
48/25 50/21 57/24 58/1 59/19 61/22
categorically [1] 29/21
cause [2] 8/7 20/17
cell [13] 31/6 32/11 34/17 35/17 36/21
62/14 63/18 64/2 65/9 67/2 67/2 67/5
67/8
certain [2] 18/12 45/25
certainly [7] 42/6 51/14 53/6 54/9 62/21
67/9 71/1
certify [1] 73/11
chain [1] 36/15
challenge [6] 21/12 21/14 28/3 49/18
60/24 61/2
challenged [3] 59/9 59/11 61/2
challenges [1] 60/7
challenging [1] 60/19
change [1] 60/9
channeling [4] 26/21 27/9 27/15 27/19
characterization [1] 54/25
charge [1] 14/16
check [1] 28/11
cherry [1] 12/15
cherry-picking [1] 12/15
circuit [35] 8/18 13/13 13/21 13/25
19/25 20/19 21/4 21/8 21/10 21/11
21/18 22/7 24/17 24/21 27/19 28/6 28/7
28/20 29/14 29/15 29/18 29/23 30/1
50/9 51/9 60/8 61/7 61/9 61/16 61/18
65/22 66/5 70/15 71/15 72/18
Circuit's [6] 22/5 24/6 27/13 27/16 61/6 61/15
Circuit's 2014 [1] 22/5
circumstances [1] 54/2
cite [4] 29/13 29/18 65/21 66/9
cited [5] 13/12 13/25 26/12 28/5 43/8
cites [6] 26/18 26/19 29/15 42/20 49/4
53/16
civil [8] 1/16 1/21 3/3 27/4 27/9 27/9
28/10 28/17
civilian [4] 10/11 12/3 52/11 52/15
civilians [9] 12/1 52/10 52/23 53/5 53/18
53/20 71/3 71/5 71/7
claim [13] 24/5 26/14 27/15 28/3 28/11
28/18 28/21 58/19 58/20 58/22 59/13
60/3 60/4
claimed [1] 9/24
claims [17] 4/15 8/20 12/22 22/1 23/7
27/2 27/3 28/13 28/25 29/1 29/21 39/22
42/18 45/16 60/13 61/12 70/14
clarify [1] 71/22
classified [5] 31/8 33/24 38/2 67/7 67/13
clause [31] 14/12 14/13 15/1 16/2 16/9
16/10 20/9 20/20 21/22 22/13 22/19
22/23 26/2 26/5 28/22 43/1 47/13 49/9
49/10 49/19 49/22 50/1 50/10 51/8
51/16 51/19 69/25 70/5 70/20 70/23 70/25
clear [25] 8/19 10/18 14/8 15/12 24/6
24/18 29/8 30/1 30/9 30/14 38/19 41/12

41/19 44/3 44/8 45/16 47/6 50/22 50/25 58/11 61/3 63/20 65/11 71/9 71/19
cleared [2] 18/19 37/15
clearly [3] 9/14 32/12 32/22
client [1] 36/16
clients [1] 35/19
Close [1] 59/8
closely [1] 25/2
closest [1] 12/5
closing [1] 68/19
co [8] 3/7 5/10 5/16 30/25 37/9 65/23

## 69/20 71/17

co-counsel [7] 3/7 5/10 5/16 30/25 37/9
65/23 71/17
co-equal [1] 69/20
codified [1] 11/10
colleague [3] 3/21 39/20 54/13
collect [1] 57/5
colloquial [1] 58/12
Colonel [10] 33/5 33/22 34/19 36/3
36/25 37/11 37/16 62/21 63/15 67/6
COLUMBIA [1] $1 / 1$
combatants [4] 53/1 53/5 53/6 71/6
come [11] 5/19 8/6 11/15 21/21 25/13
31/17 38/8 42/22 49/20 68/24 70/16
coming [1] 14/7
Commander [2] 66/20 67/19
Commander's [1] 65/10
commission [2] 23/12 27/13
commissions [1] 22/14
Common [5] 10/12 52/5 53/7 53/9 53/10
communication [1] 63/16
compelling [1] 21/3
competing [1] 71/13
complain [1] 39/10
completely [4] 33/10 34/3 37/18 65/4
complex [1] 43/11
complied [1] 8/15
comply [2] 30/7 30/12
complying [1] 9/3
comprehensive [1] 43/12
computer [6] 2/25 31/11 32/6 37/20
37/22 38/15
computer-aided [1] 2/25
concepts [1] 47/17
concern [4] 13/6 36/2 36/6 36/22
concerned [4] 15/20 35/3 36/23 68/19
concerns [1] 7/21
conclusions [1] 70/22
conclusively [1] 28/7
concurrence [1] 27/11
condition [1] 30/13
conditionable [1] 24/11
conditional [2] 30/11 30/11
conditions [11] 4/15 27/21 27/25 29/1
29/20 54/6 59/6 61/17 62/7 65/6 70/14
conducting [1] 57/19
conference [1] 63/11
confidence [1] 39/6
confinement [12] 4/15 23/24 27/21
27/25 28/4 29/1 29/20 59/6 61/17 62/8
65/6 70/14
conflates [1] 47/17
conflating [1] 42/21
conflict [4] 10/21 10/22 52/6 52/18
conflicts [1] 11/4
confused [1] 24/14
confusion [1] 19/19
Congress [1] 11/5
Congressional [1] 8/5
Connecticut [1] 1/22
consider [2] 25/17 57/16
considered [4] 21/12 25/10 44/17 52/12
consistent [1] 13/8
$\square$
constitution [3] 2/15 14/12 65/14
constitutional [11] 14/17 14/22 14/25
22/8 23/7 49/12 65/15 65/24 65/25 66/10 70/25
constraining [1] 17/15
construct [1] 52/7
contacted [1] 7/18
contain [3] 11/21 48/22 49/2
container [1] 62/14
containers [1] 62/17
contest [2] 8/13 8/15
context [11] 13/15 14/15 16/7 21/1
24/16 24/17 25/4 26/18 26/21 59/17
67/1
continue [2] 31/14 57/23
continued [1] 46/12
continues [6] 19/7 44/11 44/20 54/7
57/8 61/18
contraband [7] 66/21 66/22 66/23 66/24
67/12 67/18 67/18
contracted [1] 21/14
contrary [3] 36/24 42/23 42/24
control [2] 62/10 64/14
controlling [1] 29/24
conveniently [1] 38/17
Convention [12] 11/15 12/1 12/4 12/7
52/5 52/8 52/8 52/9 53/3 53/4 53/11
53/19
Conventions [8] 10/10 11/10 12/16
52/15 52/25 53/15 71/5 71/10
conversations [1] 64/12
conveyed [1] 14/1
coordinate [1] 17/10
core [13] 24/4 25/23 25/24 27/2 28/11
28/13 28/21 28/25 29/2 29/9 58/18
58/18 60/4
corporate [1] 49/13
corpus [2] 42/1 49/20
correct [7] 14/5 33/19 33/20 44/3 55/25
56/2 73/12
correspondence [1] 16/23
cost [2] 17/20 69/21
costs [1] 15/25
could [18] 9/22 18/5 18/7 19/15 19/16
21/16 24/10 31/14 32/16 35/18 36/9
38/8 44/10 44/18 59/1 59/13 68/16 69/6
couldn't [2] 50/18 67/10
counsel [25] 3/7 3/12 5/9 5/10 5/16
18/19 30/25 37/9 40/1 43/18 47/10 48/7
48/12 50/20 50/20 57/12 59/15 61/5
62/12 64/13 65/2 65/23 66/5 71/17
71/23
count [1] 36/20
country [1] 18/12
county [1] $7 / 20$
couple [7] 13/25 14/23 18/16 20/21
34/24 69/23 71/2
course [3] 11/16 15/14 31/21
court [100]
Court's [16] 4/13 8/24 13/14 13/19
19/25 22/11 23/25 24/7 24/11 24/14
25/23 25/25 28/16 59/16 59/20 72/14
Courthouse [1] 2/14
courts [6] 11/19 30/3 49/14 59/4 69/8 69/19
cover [2] 24/11 59/6
create [5] 9/4 46/5 48/15 48/19 48/20
created [2] 10/19 49/3
creates [4] 8/8 47/13 48/3 48/11
creating [1] 19/18
credits [1] 59/10
criminal [3] 24/16 26/18 26/21
cripple [1] 52/17
criteria [2] 6/6 6/14
critical [6] 6/23 8/10 26/17 28/20 69/3 69/19
critically [5] 9/1 9/18 15/15 69/9 69/22
CSERT [1] 45/2
CSRT [1] 44/25
curious [1] 16/11
current [1] 55/8
currently [1] 62/18
custody [6] 16/1 25/19 36/15 59/24 59/25 59/25
customary [3] 10/9 10/11 11/10
Cyr [6] 24/20 25/4 25/5 26/16 28/22 29/7

## D

D.C [28] 8/18 13/21 13/25 20/19 21/7

21/10 21/11 22/5 24/6 24/17 24/20
27/13 27/16 27/19 28/6 28/7 28/20
29/14 29/18 29/23 30/1 51/9 60/8 61/9
65/22 66/5 70/15 72/18
date [7] 5/18 40/9 40/9 41/1 55/13 59/24 73/17
Davis [2] 27/13 61/9
day [7] 7/25 7/25 37/21 39/6 63/10
63/10 63/23
days [3] 35/24 63/21 63/24
DC [3] $1 / 5$ 1/23 $2 / 15$
deadline [1] 17/12
deals [1] 37/10
dealt [2] 21/13 47/18
decades [1] 26/12
December [1] 55/14
decide [3] 66/20 66/21 66/22
decided [4] 13/16 31/21 45/7 61/19
deciding [4] 50/18 65/24 66/2 66/5
decision [35] 22/5 22/7 22/11 22/17
23/3 24/6 27/17 31/22 32/10 42/14
42/14 44/18 44/24 44/25 48/17 50/5 50/7 50/8 51/2 51/2 51/3 51/4 51/9 51/16 54/4 54/5 59/20 61/6 61/9 61/10
61/11 61/16 66/7 66/7 68/7
decisions [3] 42/24 44/22 65/17
declaration [10] $16 / 2231 / 8$ 33/5 33/6
34/1 37/11 63/15 67/5 67/6 67/13
declared [1] 60/2
dedicated [3] 32/5 35/15 37/18
default [2] 52/16 52/23
defect [1] 59/9
Defendant [1] 2/6
defendants [3] 1/7 8/13 10/20
Defense [18] 2/12 3/14 4/6 4/19 5/7 5/8
5/10 6/8 6/21 15/23 20/13 43/5 43/7
43/9 43/23 68/25 69/1 70/3
Defense's [1] 13/2
delay [7] 6/8 15/25 17/20 68/25 68/25
69/1 69/21
delays [1] 5/7
demonstrate [1] 15/4
demonstrates [1] 61/1
denied [1] 38/11
Department [20] 2/7 2/12 3/13 3/14 4/6
4/19 5/7 5/8 5/11 6/8 6/21 13/1 20/13
43/4 43/7 43/9 43/23 68/25 69/1 70/4
Department's [1] 15/24
departments [1] 57/18
depends [1] 58/12
depressed [1] 39/8
deprived [2] 39/22 65/15
derived [1] 11/3
describe [5] 31/7 31/7 42/7 48/21 67/9
described [3] 50/7 67/10 67/13
designate [1] 39/1
despair [1] 8/1
detail [2] 21/17 21/18
detain [3] 11/21 12/23 44/24
detainable [2] 19/1 68/7
detained [8] 44/13 45/1 45/7 45/12 50/2
53/21 53/23 57/7
detainee [14] 6/25 7/23 15/18 25/5
32/23 34/13 40/7 43/16 46/17 57/6
57/10 57/14 57/25 58/3
detainee's [6] 46/15 47/1 56/18 57/11 57/12 66/3
detainees [23] 5/25 7/3 8/21 15/3 16/13
17/20 21/3 21/19 22/9 22/12 29/4 42/15
43/15 44/20 45/13 45/22 46/23 49/11
55/13 56/8 57/21 58/6 69/20
detention [46] 4/7 4/9 4/24 6/24 8/8 8/11
8/21 9/16 9/22 10/15 11/1 11/5 11/14 11/22 11/25 12/11 13/7 13/22 14/17 15/7 15/12 15/17 19/20 20/4 20/4 24/4
24/16 24/19 26/21 29/9 30/4 44/10
44/16 44/21 45/6 45/18 46/13 46/16
49/15 51/25 52/12 52/20 54/3 59/3 59/5
73/5
determination [3] 6/25 54/16 67/18
determinations [3] 55/12 59/12 61/23
determinations [3] 55/12 59/12 61/23
determine[8] 4/14 6/6 6/24 20/3 22/2
43/16 46/16 49/15
determined [2] 45/11 60/22
determining [2] 46/23 46/25
devastating [1] 19/6
developed [2] 10/24 11/9
devise [1] 13/24
Dhiab [1] 66/6
dichotomy [1] 52/7
did [27] 7/13 17/8 17/18 18/1 18/3 25/13 $29 / 731 / 731 / 1034 / 635 / 635 / 943 / 4$
$44 / 247 / 2448 / 648 / 2151 / 1451 / 1760 / 6$ 29/7 31/7 31/10 34/6 35/6 35/9 43/4
$44 / 247 / 2448 / 648 / 2151 / 1451 / 1760 / 6$
60/7 60/8 61/14 64/3 64/4 71/1 72/25
didn't [17] $3 / 2422 / 1332 / 833 / 1035 / 5$
36/9 36/16 36/17 37/2 38/1 38/3 39/10
40/9 51/13 61/19 63/7 63/13
different [16] 13/13 13/18 20/23 21/1
21/2 32/6 32/9 40/13 43/17 47/17 49/18
56/19 57/18 58/13 59/17 61/21
difficult [3] 17/15 36/4 56/18
direct [1] 50/22
direction [1] 71/18
directly [1] 53/14
disagreed [1] 22/15
disavowal [1] 48/22
discern [1] 27/7
disciplinary [1] 7/17
disclaims [1] $12 / 24$
discovery [1] 19/8
discretion [1] 47/7
discretionary [9] 16/24 25/11 26/9 26/11
46/11 46/12 47/21 47/23 47/25
discuss [2] 9/6 66/17
discusses [1] 66/10
discussing [1] 4/11
discussion [1] 63/4
disparage [1] 59/15
dispense [1] 66/16
dispositive [1] 48/13
dispute [3] 8/15 33/17 33/21
disregard [1] 68/24
distinct [1] 42/21
distinction [2] 53/2 53/5
distinguishing [1] 19/17
distraction [1] 12/4
distressing [1] 36/19
DISTRICT [6] $1 / 1$ 1/1 $1 / 12$ 22/2 49/1
51/12
divide [1] 39/18
3/16 46/17 57/6
$\qquad$


111
$\qquad$

<br>





## DLadin [1] 1/19

do [56] 3/22 7/25 7/25 8/14 8/25 9/1
16/8 16/12 17/13 18/10 19/2 23/4 25/20
27/6 29/21 30/1 30/3 32/22 37/21 38/14
38/16 39/1 40/11 41/6 43/24 43/24 44/5
50/12 50/14 50/15 50/21 51/13 51/16
52/2 52/15 52/21 54/19 57/4 59/17
61/23 61/24 63/12 64/18 65/7 65/22
66/18 69/7 69/18 69/21 70/8 70/12
72/17 72/18 72/19 72/22 72/24
documents [17] 31/3 32/13 32/14 32/14
33/4 33/9 34/9 34/22 35/3 36/8 36/11
36/16 36/22 38/20 39/4 39/21 39/22
DoD [1] 54/21
Dodson [1] 61/2
Dodson-type [1] 61/2
does [23] 6/18 6/20 16/25 20/20 21/11
25/22 31/2 37/3 38/12 42/9 46/5 46/7
46/15 47/11 48/15 49/7 50/2 50/11 52/7
57/23 58/19 60/4 61/4
doesn't [16] 9/4 23/15 28/20 29/13 30/1
32/10 34/9 37/4 37/6 38/15 38/15 40/9
58/20 58/22 63/12 64/15
dog [1] 37/7
doing [5] 16/16 21/4 36/15 47/25 54/25
DOJ [3] 32/15 33/22 34/2
don't [23] 8/13 8/22 14/22 16/6 17/3
19/3 19/4 19/17 23/6 23/16 26/18 28/18
33/18 34/5 36/22 58/10 61/25 69/14
69/17 70/17 71/2 71/25 73/3
done [19] 16/20 31/25 34/22 39/5 41/8
41/11 42/1 54/15 54/20 54/21 55/24
56/6 63/6 63/6 63/7 65/1 68/12 68/13
68/16
Dotson [6] 27/11 28/5 59/16 60/2 60/18
60/18
doubt [2] 27/14 27/17
down [5] 18/14 38/9 55/6 62/23 71/3
dozens [2] 45/22 58/6
dramatically [1] 69/24
draw [1] 60/20
drawing [1] 30/2
draws [1] 24/15
driving [1] 42/2
DROR [3] 1/16 3/7 3/21
DTA [1] 15/24
due [14] 14/13 16/9 20/9 20/20 21/21
22/23 23/5 41/21 43/1 47/14 49/24 50/1 50/10 70/25
dumped [1] 32/17
duration[5] 9/23 13/23 28/4 53/24 59/5
E
e-mail [3] 34/2 34/11 64/25
each [11] 7/25 7/25 36/24 45/6 47/17
49/2 53/16 56/15 56/18 63/22 66/22
earlier [2] 12/17 37/1
easier [1] 31/18
easily [1] $25 / 3$
economic [1] 20/12
effect [4] 8/14 20/19 59/2 60/24
effectively [5] 40/6 45/4 51/24 53/10

## 60/12

eight [1] 67/15
either [5] 11/9 14/20 18/3 28/4 35/25
elaborate [1] 71/20
eligibility [1] 60/19
eligible [1] 60/23
else [5] 14/7 17/2 30/13 40/10 64/19
emphasize [2] 68/5 68/11
emphasized [1] 27/18
en [4] 22/10 22/15 22/18 23/11
end [5] 11/14 12/23 23/6 46/3 73/8 enemy [4] 45/1 52/17 53/22 71/6 enforce [3] 8/16 42/18 72/23 enforceability [1] 41/13
enforceable [6] 12/24 41/20 42/9 46/6 48/3 48/10
engage [1] 50/24
engaged [3] 9/19 54/8 70/15
ensure [4] 9/16 10/15 54/20 69/20
entire [2] 6/22 12/20
entirely [3] 8/23 28/14 28/16
entirety [1] 28/25
entitled [2] 12/8 69/11
entitlement [6] 4/12 4/14 10/2 29/8
69/12 69/13
entry [1] 21/3
envelopes [2] 32/22 32/22
equal [1] 69/20
equally [1] 22/21
equity [2] 46/6 48/17
erroneous [2] 15/5 15/6

2/7 2/12
essence [2] 6/4 47/3
essentially [4] 6/9 18/22 18/24 72/9
establish [5] 42/23 43/14 43/20 55/20
57/1
established [6] 6/22 6/23 20/3 43/24
45/3 46/14
establishes [1] 46/10
establishing [2] 47/22 47/23
ET [1] 1/6
evaluate [1] 28/1
evaluated [2] 26/14 45/5
evaluating [2] 26/1 28/17
evaporate [1] 53/22
eve [1] 17/12
even [23] 5/19 9/20 15/13 19/25 20/3
24/9 26/4 28/5 28/19 28/20 29/7 29/7
38/17 40/10 41/5 42/4 48/8 48/18 59/23
61/3 61/12 61/20 61/24
ever [2] 7/13 38/3
every [5] 14/15 34/13 39/6 40/6 66/19
everyone [1] 64/5
everything [8] 16/21 32/1 35/5 37/1
38/20 38/20 38/21 67/3
evidence [3] 19/1 48/20 68/6
ex [2] 22/13 22/19
exact [1] 28/2
exactly [7] 11/23 25/21 25/21 50/11
51/17 53/15 72/7
examined [2] 21/17 21/18
example [3] 23/2 42/25 47/16
exchange [3] 62/13 64/3 64/17
exclude [1] 71/1
Excuse [1] 50/13
executive [64] 4/7 6/18 7/2 8/2 8/14 9/2
12/13 14/10 14/15 14/20 16/14 19/16
20/3 24/16 24/19 25/4 25/16 26/8 29/9
30/4 41/8 41/21 42/12 42/19 43/3 43/13
43/14 45/24 46/1 46/3 46/9 46/10 46/12
46/21 46/22 47/8 47/9 47/19 47/21
47/24 48/2 48/2 48/11 48/15 48/19
48/21 49/1 49/3 49/5 49/10 49/13 49/15
49/23 51/25 54/11 54/21 54/25 55/20
57/18 58/24 60/22 69/14 69/18 72/22
exercise [4] 26/9 26/11 46/12 70/16
exhibit [5] 34/6 34/12 34/13 67/6 67/7
exhibits [1] 36/24
exist [2] 49/7 66/10
existed [2] 26/1 29/6
existing [1] 46/13
exists [4] 9/6 9/7 69/18 71/10
expanded [1] 29/5
expectation [1] 16/15
expedited [1] 18/23
expensive [1] 38/18
explain [9] 8/18 24/5 26/2 31/1 41/17
50/12 50/14 50/15 65/7
explained [8] 24/3 30/10 30/25 43/5
43/7 43/10 53/14 62/13
explanation [1] $6 / 2$
explicitly [1] 69/16
express [3] 48/22 49/2 49/5
extending [1] 22/11
extension [2] 17/18 22/8
extent [1] 31/15
extinguished [2] 27/17 27/17
extraterritorial [3] 20/11 70/22 70/24
extraterritoriality [1] 51/7
extreme [1] 70/18
extremely [2] 25/6 39/8

## F

F.Supp [1] 66/8
face [2] 20/14 20/14
faces [1] 49/25
facilitate [1] 64/4
fact [18] 10/14 15/13 20/18 21/11 $22 / 5$
25/24 26/6 26/14 28/4 32/8 37/18 37/19
44/14 44/25 46/22 59/5 62/22 70/2
facto [2] 22/13 22/19
factor [1] 68/8
factors [1] 58/13
facts [2] 30/24 66/17
factual [5] 21/1 33/16 33/21 67/1 71/22
failed [1] 52/22
failing [1] 25/17
failure [2] 26/10 70/2
fair [3] 19/4 19/4 56/24
faith [1] 63/16
false[3] 33/5 33/7 52/7
familiar [1] 21/13
family [2] $32 / 232 / 3$
far [5] 9/18 29/6 42/12 46/25 65/20
favor [2] 12/21 41/14
fbdlaw.com [1] 2/4
FCRR [3] 2/13 73/11 73/18
fear [1] 39/7
Federal [1] 49/14
feeding [3] 21/19 22/2 24/24
feet [2] 17/21 73/1
felt [1] 38/11
few [5] 35/24 35/25 36/1 63/21 67/25
Fifth [1] 22/12
fight [1] 52/17
figure [3] 36/4 51/12 54/22
file [4] 55/10 55/10 71/24 72/4
filed [7] 18/23 33/2 33/14 63/11 63/14
63/20 67/16
filing [1] 33/18
fill [1] $35 / 2$
final [3] 18/10 23/3 51/21
finally [4] 5/8 24/9 29/25 61/5
find [7] 23/6 23/7 41/14 48/20 49/6 64/1
64/4
finding [2] 26/23 70/14
findings [1] 18/12
finds [1] 30/15
fine [1] 40/25
finish [1] 56/15
finished [1] 35/13
fire [2] 17/21 73/1
firmly [1] 60/6
first [19] $2 / 2$ 20/25 24/2 27/18 28/8
31/13 41/3 42/11 43/20 44/24 45/23
48/1 48/5 48/8 55/21 56/15 61/8 65/14
68/3

| F | $18$ | hasn't [6] 11/17 17/5 41/11 54/20 54/21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fit [1] 67/3 | gives [1] 35/18 | m[4] 65/19 65/23 66/3 66/6 |
| five [3] 22/18 67/3 67/10 | giving [1] 41/1 |  |
| flaw [1] 25/3 | go [19] 15/7 18/3 19/7 19/14 19/15 20 1 | haven't [5] 3/25 5 |
| floating [1] 66/19 | 31/4 33/13 34/25 35/6 38/8 38/22 38/2 | having [1] 20/14 |
| oor [1] 1/17 | 64/1764/18 64/23 66/15 71/18 |  |
| cus [2] 46/16 |  | 34/25 |
| focused [3] 44/19 48/9 51/15 | going [21] 5/22 17/17 23/14 33/17 36 | he's [19] 4/23 34/20 35/24 36/20 |
| focuses [1] 57/24 | /18 38/22 39/18 39/18 39/20 | 37/1 |
| FOLIO [5] 2/6 3/11 39/16 62/2 68/3 | 39/25 40/11 40/17 40/23 47/14 54/11 | 42/2 44/9 52/10 60/24 61/2 62/23 64 |
| follow [6] 15/23 39/25 44/7 53/1 66/17 | 56/15 58/8 64/20 67/24 | head [1] 58/25 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ootnote [2] 12/2 71 |  |  |
| Foradori [3] 2/13 73/11 73/18 | government [62] 3/12 4/21 5/1 8/25 | 39/25 40/6 40/21 44/15 45/23 60/19 |
| force [10] 8/3 8/14 21/19 22/2 24/24 | 10/25 11/6 11/12 11/17 11/24 12/15 |  |
| 30/6 45/9 52/21 64/22 68/10 | /12 16/4 16/12 16/15 16/18 | earings [13] 5/22 6/21 17/22 40/5 45/2 |
| forced [1] 5/18 | 14 | 3 |
| forces [4] 45/1 52/7 52/18 53/23 | 20/17 20/18 23/22 24/14 25/7 25/18 | 2/25 |
| foregoing [1] 73/12 | 25/22 26/7 26/18 26/19 27/6 28/2 | heart [2] 15/1 70/18 |
|  | 30/7 30/12 31/20 33/8 33/18 33/25 | Heath [6] 34/19 36/3 |
| formalistic [1] 30/2 | 2 35/25 36/14 39/17 40/10 43/11 | 62/21 |
| Former [1] 7/17 | 52/19 54/23 54/23 57/4 57/13 57/23 | He |
| forth [1] 16/22 | 57/24 58/1 58/2 69/15 69/24 71/14 | held [15] 4/22 5/20 9/10 12/5 |
| forward [7] 3/4 5/23 19/15 19/16 20/2 | 72 | 15/19 16/1 17/21 27/23 30/4 48/145018 |
|  | Government's [18] 11/21 12/14 12/21 |  |
| FOSTER [2] 2/12 3/14 | 15/23 16/23 17/21 19/9 21/19 | helped [1] 35/9 |
| ught [1] 7/12 | 21/24 23/21 24/1 24/7 25/3 36/23 52/1 | helpful [1] 51/13 |
| found [2] 42/14 49/17 |  | Henderson [2] 22/10 22/16 |
| four [14] 4/19 6/14 7/5 | Grace [1] | HENRY [2] 2/6 3/13 |
| 34/20 34/21 40/18 | granted [3] 3/25 |  |
| 2/17 62/18 | Gravity [1] 35/14 | here [42] 3/15 4/186/3 9/17 9/24 10/21 |
| urth [6] 12/75 | greater [1] 16 | 12/2 12/6 16/3 16/15 17/2 20/5 20/12 21/6 21/25 22/21 22/25 23/3 23/15 |
| ed [1] 40/21 | $\left.\right\|_{\text {grows [1] }} ^{\operatorname{group}}$ | 23/23 $24 / 3$ |
| framework [3] 12/19 12/20 2 | GTMO [1] 31/10 | 28/2 28/22 29/24 30/24 35/22 |
| frameworks [1] 72/16 | Guantanamo [26] 4/22 7/15 7/18 7/23 | 42/17 48/23 49/6 57/7 60/22 65/7 65 |
| framing [1] 4/11 | 8/21 20/20 22/9 22/12 22/20 | 66/16 68/13 69/10 |
| free [3] 21/15 65/25 66/19 | 28/23 29/4 31/20 34/20 35/6 35/16 38/6 | him [57] 3/22 5/6 6/12 7/20 8/17 17/1 |
| free-floating [1] 661 | 19 45/22 49/12 50/2 | $31 / 631 / 931 / 1031 / 1231 / 1331 / 1$ |
|  |  |  |
| friction [1] 20/17 | guard [3] 35/14 37/18 64/22 | 32/2 32/4 32/5 32/6 32/9 32/17 32/2 |
| friends [1] 31/16 | guards [4] 7/18 31/16 32/5 32/15 | 32/24 33/3 33/9 33/9 |
| frightened [1] 36/20 |  | 35/13 35/15 36/19 37/19 37/20 |
| from 2000 [1] 59/8 | guidance [3] 50/22 59/19 71/11 | $38 / 438 / 11$ 38/14 38/17 38/20 38/22 |
| from $2009[1]$ 64/12 |  | /142/11 44/24 45/12 50/11 |
| from 2014 [1] 64/25 | H | 5 63/25 64/6 64/11 67/14 |
| full [7] 19/2 19/14 29/3 55/10 55/11 |  | himself [2] 7/116 |
| 62/10 |  | HINA [2] 1/15 3/7 |
| fully [1] 10/18 |  | hinted [1] 55/19 |
| fundamental [5] 14/14 20/10 25/12 $46 / 1952 / 25$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} \text { his [78] } \\ \text { historical [2] 25/24 29/2 } \end{array}\right.$ |
| fundamentally [2] 19/4 28/21 <br> further [5] 5/15 44/11 59/1 60/21 62/1 <br> future [1] 59/24 |  | historical [2] 25/24 29/2 <br> Hogan [5] 17/8 17/17 42/13 72/25 72/25 hold [6] 14/16 26/7 32/15 34/9 60/6 60/8 holding [5] 25/19 30/8 34/8 34/8 59/16 HOLLANDER [12] 2/1 2/1 3/8 4/14 18/19 30/21 39/14 62/16 62/20 63/3 64/11 |
| G |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | Hollander's [1] 16/22 |
|  |  | home [1] 7/20 |
|  |  | st [1] 62/8 |
|  |  | Honor [110] |
|  |  | Honor's [2] 54/4 66/7 |
|  |  | RABLE [1] 1/11 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | stilities [5] 9/20 11/14 12/23 53 |
|  |  | 54/8 |
|  |  | hours [1] 34/18 |

11/25
information [11] 17/5 17/16 19/1 57/5
57/6 57/8 57/10 57/15 57/21 58/3 72/9
informed [8] 5/15 8/11 9/7 9/11 11/7
14/11 14/21 51/25
informing [1] 5/9
infractions [1] 7/17
infringed [1] 65/16
initial [9] 13/3 19/20 20/4 43/22 44/24
55/9 55/10 56/20 57/1
injunction [2] 30/6 30/8
INS [3] 24/20 25/4 25/5
insofar [1] 60/19
instance [3] 22/24 23/4 48/21
instead [4] 26/18 29/14 56/4 56/6
instructed [2] 6/20 17/19
intended [2] 46/5 49/14
intent [1] 48/20
intentional [1] 32/18
interagency [3] 43/14 43/21 57/17
interest [7] 8/9 18/11 21/20 21/21 47/13 64/6 64/7
interesting [1] 60/18
interests [3] 43/17 46/24 57/9
interfere [1] 20/16
interment [1] 53/17
internal [3] 5/7 46/21 49/22
international [16] 9/4 10/5 10/7 10/9
10/12 10/13 10/21 11/4 11/11 15/9
47/15 51/24 52/18 53/11 53/12 54/1
internment [2] 12/5 12/8
interplay [1] 59/18
interpretation [3] 11/4 15/5 15/6
interpretations [1] 10/12
interrogation [1] 31/12
interrogator [1] 35/13
interrogators [1] 31/13
intervene [2] 46/20 47/3
intervention [2] 41/4 49/22
inventoried [1] 38/1
invoking [1] 11/13
involve [1] 26/21
involved [1] 25/24
involves [1] 57/2
involving [2] 17/23 24/24
irrelevant [1] 29/3
is [279]
is the [1] 37/8
isn't [3] 19/23 36/5 68/21
issue [22] 4/11 14/7 20/5 21/2 37/2 37/8
37/8 38/10 40/21 42/10 47/4 50/17
51/22 58/23 62/8 62/9 63/8 64/9 65/1 65/4 71/3 71/22
issued [3] 8/4 43/3 48/5
issues [12] 19/19 21/2 23/2 31/2 39/19
39/21 40/2 41/14 42/21 43/11 62/7 65/3
it [201]
it's [53] 4/10 5/2 6/5 6/9 7/5 9/1 9/25
11/18 12/19 13/5 18/7 19/4 19/4 20/14 21/25 23/25 24/2 25/12 28/2 28/11 29/13 29/15 33/7 33/21 34/8 34/8 34/9 36/4 36/12 36/14 36/19 37/13 38/12 38/22 38/25 40/18 40/18 40/21 42/11 44/7 48/5 52/11 52/20 57/3 57/24 58/6 65/18 68/8 70/3 70/3 70/21 72/12 72/14
item [3] 65/15 66/23 66/24
items [9] 62/23 65/9 65/9 65/13 65/13 67/4 67/11 67/14 67/17
its [13] 6/9 21/11 22/4 26/9 28/24 30/6
30/7 30/16 34/12 43/25 50/10 52/19 70/22
itself [12] 6/5 16/5 29/17 43/22 46/4
47/9 47/24 48/2 51/15 56/19 69/1 72/24
IV [2] 12/1 12/4

JASON [2] 2/12 3/14
joined [1] 3/12
JOSEPH [3] 2/6 3/11 39/16
joseph.folio [1] 2/9
JTF [1] 34/14
judge [24] 1/12 4/25 14/4 17/8 17/17
19/24 22/10 22/16 22/17 42/13 51/2
51/3 51/11 52/14 52/16 54/5 64/23 66/7
66/19 68/5 68/9 70/10 72/25 72/25
judges [2] 22/18 50/6
judgment [1] 18/24
judicial [5] 15/21 26/23 26/23 41/3 48/16
judiciary [2] 46/20 47/2
judiciary's [1] 13/23
July [2] 5/8 54/5
July 2013 [1] 5/8
July 2015 [1] 54/5
jumping [1] 6/9
jurisdiction [27] 4/14 8/20 8/24 13/14
14/9 16/25 23/25 24/8 27/8 41/16 41/16
41/18 41/20 42/4 49/14 54/12 58/15
58/17 58/21 60/10 60/11 60/15 69/17
71/13 71/19 72/14 72/21
jurisdictional [1] 23/21
just [51] 3/18 7/9 7/22 9/9 12/2 13/15
14/8 14/23 17/7 17/18 19/17 23/20 24/3
25/22 26/3 28/10 29/25 30/12 32/17
33/5 34/9 35/19 35/23 36/6 37/9 38/21
39/17 40/8 40/15 41/19 42/3 44/3 44/6
44/8 44/22 45/16 51/11 53/14 54/7
57/24 58/6 58/12 58/16 63/25 64/12
67/1 67/25 68/4 69/23 70/11 71/8
justice [7] 2/7 3/13 9/20 13/7 27/11 30/3
71/16
justified [1] 20/4
justifies [1] 49/22
iustify [1] 11/14
K
Kandari [1] 54/6
Kavanaugh [1] 70/10
Kavanaugh's [1] 22/17
keep [2] 34/7 64/1
keeping [1] 64/6
keeps [1] 62/14
Kennedy [1] 51/11
kept [6] 32/20 32/24 36/11 39/11 62/15
64/24
Kessler's [1] 66/7
key [4] 8/10 14/16 53/4 58/1
kind [1] 15/7
Kiyemba [14] 20/21 20/22 21/1 21/8 21/10 21/24 22/4 22/21 49/17 50/1 50/25 70/7 70/8 70/10
know [16] 5/5 7/19 14/8 14/14 17/15 18/17 21/13 21/17 21/18 33/19 39/17 40/18 44/22 69/25 70/8 73/3
known [1] 31/19
Kollar [1] 54/5
Kollar-Kotelly's [1] 54/5
Kotelly's [1] 54/5

LADIN [5] 1/16 3/7 3/21 4/13 8/18
laid [1] 67/5
LAMBERTH [1] $1 / 11$
language [3] 20/19 49/2 50/18
languishes [1] 45/17
larger [1] 67/2
laser [1] 51/15
last [6] $4 / 19$ 13/23 29/12 53/25 60/15


N
Nation's [1] 1/22
national [5] 17/15 43/17 46/24 54/17 57/9
nca.org [1] 1/24
necessarily [2] 23/23 60/3
necessary [2] 14/18 22/3
need [7] 8/22 14/22 16/6 25/13 33/17
69/17 71/18
needs [5] 44/14 47/18 57/4 57/5 57/13
negligent [1] 32/19
neither [4] 59/7 59/24 64/22 65/7
Nettles [9] 29/15 29/16 29/16 29/20 61/6
61/14 61/15 61/19 71/15
never [4] 7/11 13/20 21/8 38/1
new [8] 1/17 9/4 19/25 32/11 33/18
35/17 72/16 72/16
next [4] 6/15 49/8 53/7 55/14
NH [1] 2/4
night [1] 38/11
nine [2] 62/24 64/18
Ninth [5] 29/15 61/6 61/7 61/15 71/15 NM [1] 2/3
no [53] 1/4 5/14 5/15 5/19 6/2 6/4 6/5
6/13 6/14 6/14 6/21 7/12 7/16 7/17 7/21
15/25 16/11 16/24 20/12 22/22 23/16
26/5 28/25 30/19 31/9 31/22 31/22
34/14 35/24 36/20 37/4 38/25 39/5
41/23 41/25 42/4 44/17 48/11 48/20
49/3 49/4 49/6 49/21 50/2 50/9 52/24
53/4 58/21 59/12 59/21 60/2 61/25 64/6
non [3] 10/21 52/18 58/18
non-core [1] 58/18
non-international [2] 10/21 52/18
none [4] 28/9 28/12 47/19 72/11
nonlegal [1] 32/14
not [128]
notable [1] 49/10
Notably [1] 61/19
note [2] 23/1 67/15
noted [3] 45/21 47/19 61/7
notes [8] 34/25 35/1 35/2 35/4 35/11
36/1 36/1 64/12
nothing [6] 41/24 44/5 49/13 49/16
61/24 69/25
notice [5] 4/20 4/21 5/9 5/19 6/7
notion [1] 48/19
novel [1] 13/24
November [2] 1/5 35/23
November 5th [1] 35/23
now [39] 4/22 6/10 6/16 6/16 8/13 9/24
10/4 10/25 13/18 17/5 19/12 20/18
23/11 28/23 30/24 31/21 32/7 33/4
33/13 33/19 34/20 35/3 35/15 35/19
36/4 36/21 37/16 37/21 37/23 38/14
39/7 39/12 42/2 43/3 47/16 56/1 57/2
59/15 73/2
number [11] 3/4 6/11 6/12 7/4 7/6 10/4
13/15 34/14 43/11 48/24 50/5
numbered [1] 63/3
numerous [1] 45/14
NW [3] $1 / 22$ 2/8 $2 / 15$
NY [1] 1/17
-
O'Connor [2] 9/20 13/7
oath [1] 39/3
OBAMA [7] 1/6 5/5 6/20 8/19 8/25 24/23
66/8
Obama's [1] 45/10
Obama,et [1] 3/3
objection [1] 23/22
obligation [2] 12/24 12/25
obligations [3] 11/9 12/18 30/7
obstacle [1] $26 / 6$
obtained [1] 68/4
obviously [6] 19/13 21/9 64/6 64/14
68/15 70/8
occur [2] 43/21 59/17
occurred [2] 45/10 67/16
occurs [1] 67/13
October [6] 31/20 35/7 35/21 36/12 43/4 43/8
October 13th [1] 35/7
October 14th [1] 35/21
October 2013 [1] 43/4
October 9th [1] 43/8
off [2] 18/12 41/3
Official [1] 2/14
officials [1] 7/19
often [1] 65/22
Oh [1] 72/2
okay [10] 3/15 4/3 20/24 24/25 24/25
30/18 39/23 42/3 56/12 72/2
old [1] 26/13
older [1] 13/17
Olson [1] 44/2
once [3] 17/9 41/8 58/2
one [45] 4/5 6/12 7/14 9/17 13/12 17/18 18/1 21/24 29/24 31/10 31/12 31/22 31/22 32/21 33/12 33/15 33/23 34/19
34/20 35/13 36/11 39/10 40/7 45/23
46/8 46/19 48/20 48/25 49/7 57/24
57/25 59/23 60/20 60/21 62/12 62/13
62/14 64/16 64/17 66/22 68/11 69/17
71/14 72/6 73/2
ones [2] 13/16 34/14
ongoing [15] 4/7 4/8 6/8 6/24 8/11 9/16
11/22 11/25 12/10 12/25 13/3 20/4 45/5

## 45/15 46/17

only [19] $7 / 22$ 12/14 12/15 18/18 28/17
31/19 41/19 45/11 47/11 51/18 52/5
55/4 59/11 61/7 66/17 66/20 68/5 68/9
68/23
opinion [3] 18/4 60/1 65/19
opportunity [2] 15/3 57/14
opposed [3] 19/3 19/6 53/22
opposing [1] 64/13
order [59] 6/18 7/2 8/2 8/14 8/25 9/2
9/16 10/17 12/13 14/9 14/10 14/21
16/14 20/6 21/3 23/23 24/10 30/6 30/10
30/16 39/25 40/3 40/3 40/4 41/8 41/21
42/10 42/19 43/3 43/13 45/24 46/1 46/4
46/4 46/9 46/10 46/14 46/15 47/9 47/19
47/21 47/24 48/2 48/2 48/11 48/15
48/21 49/3 49/6 49/11 49/13 49/16
51/22 54/11 54/21 58/23 69/14 70/4
72/22
ordered [2] 26/14 30/13
orders [2] 47/4 49/1
originally [1] 57/3
other [38] 5/22 5/25 7/22 9/23 12/3 14/4
16/13 17/3 18/1 18/9 20/17 31/3 32/7
32/14 36/2 36/24 37/8 37/8 38/4 39/22 40/7 42/19 45/12 45/22 46/19 50/21
53/11 57/21 58/6 63/22 64/2 65/3 66/19 67/20 69/23 70/9 70/24 71/11
others [2] 5/6 23/8
otherwise [5] 13/19 52/22 53/21 72/5
73/5
ought [1] 37/19
OULD [2] $1 / 33 / 8$
our [15] 21/10 30/10 33/2 35/19 41/25
43/9 48/7 48/18 61/7 63/11 63/18 64/25
65/3 68/1 68/2
out [21] 9/23 35/17 36/4 40/3 46/1 47/18
51/13 52/19 54/21 54/23 55/5 56/6 64/3

64/4 65/18 67/5 68/24 69/5 69/24 70/4 71/17
outside [1] 21/5
outstanding [2] $3 / 2565 / 3$
over [25] 4/19 5/4 5/5 8/20 9/10 9/10
11/9 24/18 24/18 24/18 27/20 27/20
29/5 32/3 32/3 32/5 35/3 42/13 44/23
45/14 54/12 62/3 62/24 69/19 69/19
overlying [1] 66/20
overrule [1] 70/7
overruled [1] 68/8
overruling [1] 50/22
oversee [1] 59/1
oversight [1] 15/21
own [4] 13/2 28/16 30/7 52/4
P
P.M [1] 73/8

PA [1] 2/2
page [6] 64/5 65/19 66/2 66/6 66/8 66/9
pages [1] 34/25
panel [2] 22/10 70/17
panels [1] 70/9
panicked [1] 32/23
panoply [1] 42/19
paper [2] 36/13 36/14
papers [4] 6/9 37/2 43/9 68/2
parole [3] 60/19 60/21 61/12
part [10] 3/22 16/23 28/4 48/10 48/11
49/10 50/8 52/21 56/18 68/8
participate [1] 57/19
particular [8] 7/2 13/24 22/24 27/1 30/13
66/23 66/24 71/16
particularly [1] 30/4
parties [2] 3/4 63/22
parts [3] 45/25 56/20 58/13
party [1] 46/7
passage [1] 53/22
passaging [1] 28/5
passed [1] 15/21
past [4] 29/6 31/5 38/6 63/22
patently [1] 36/25
path [1] 30/9
PATTON [8] 2/7 3/13 35/5 39/20 54/13
62/3 62/6 67/21
pejorative [1] 71/7
pending [3] 5/2 18/15 19/11
people [12] 9/14 12/4 12/8 14/16 15/13
17/3 17/4 27/1 34/16 53/17 71/24 72/6
percent [1] 29/22
percolating [1] 57/21
perfect [1] 47/16
perhaps [4] 25/2 31/20 57/3 57/16
period [3] 17/12 17/19 57/1
periodic [10] 4/12 9/15 10/6 39/19 46/11
47/22 47/23 52/1 53/8 53/19
periodically [1] 12/11
permissive [1] 12/16
permissively [1] 27/4
person [6] 56/16 57/7 57/8 57/25 68/6
68/9
personal [1] 57/11
personnel [2] 34/15 57/18
persons [1] 10/11
perspective [2] 62/10 65/4
petition [2] 5/1 42/15
petitioner [38] 25/6 25/9 25/13 26/6 26/8 27/23 40/4 42/17 44/23 45/14 45/17 46/7 49/4 49/18 49/19 49/25 49/25 50/8 51/19 52/7 53/16 54/15 55/4 55/18 58/5 58/17 59/11 60/11 60/23 62/10 63/5
63/20 64/3 64/21 65/9 65/18 67/1 67/23
petitioner's [21] $3 / 15$ 16/12 16/14 18/8
18/11 22/1 26/14 39/19 40/1 44/8 47/10

|  | $\text { l] } 27 / 7$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| petitioner's... [10] 48/6 48/12 50/20 <br> 50/20 53/7 58/22 59/15 61/5 62/12 65/2 | principles [2] 52/1 53/12 | 72/25 |
|  |  | Q |
| petitioners [3] 21/15 65/7 66/18 phone [1] 64/4 | prison's [1] 59/10 |  |
|  | prisoner [2] 11/17 | qualifications [1] 50/10 |
| photographs [1] 37/14 | prisoner's [1] 60 | qualify [2] 52/22 52/23 |
| physically [1] 31/16 | 3] | quantum [2] 59/5 59/6 |
| picking [1] 12/15 piece [2] 36/13 36/14 |  | quart [3] 34/7 34/13 62 |
| piece [2] 36/13 <br> pinpoint [1] 66/9 |  |  |
|  | privilege [4] 36/20 38/24 39/6 49/12 | 27/2 29/8 38/7 42/5 42/7 43/18 48/1 |
|  | privileged [3] 36/4 36/13 36/16 |  |
|  | eges [1] 53 | ons [10] 13/11 |
|  |  |  |
| plaintiffs [1] $48 / 21$ plastic [1] $34 / 13$ play [1] $69 / 20$ | probabilistic | queue [1] 57/22 |
| Plaza [1] $2 / 2$ pleading [3] $31 / 8$ | probably [2] 34/5 | quick [2] 59/15 quickly [2] 20/8 |
|  | 38/25 42/20 61/15 63/17 63/22 | $\text { quite }[2] 32 / 1247 / 6$ |
| pleading [3] $31 / 833 / 24$pleadings [2] $34 / 2435 / 9$please [2] $3 / 562 / 5$ | [ [3] 12 | quote [4] 11/2 11/8 15/4 |
|  | [3] | quoting |
| plurality [1] 13/7 <br> podium [2] 54/12 | procedures [4] 22/3 51/23 60/25 61/24 proceed [1] 3/16 | R |
| point [22] 4/19 8/23 9/10 15/14 17/7 22/16 25/12 27/10 29/12 32/21 41/5 50/21 51/23 53/14 58/1 58/6 59/7 60/15 61/8 63/16 69/3 71/20 | proceeding [5] 19/14 19/15 19/20 | Rabanni [1] 51/2 |
|  |  | Rabbani [5] 23/2 50/7 50/7 |
|  | - |  |
|  | 73/13 | raised [5] 27/14 31/2 45/24 59 |
| 61/8 63/16 69/3 71/20 <br> pointed[3] 52/19 69/24 71/17 <br> points [6] 9/17 22/6 45/23 67/25 69/23 <br> 71/2 |  | range [1] 17/16 |
|  | 13 15/24 16/4 16/9 16/24 | Rasul [2] 22/11 29/5 |
|  | 硅 | 6/14 56/22 |
|  | 26/15 29/9 30/17 41/21 42/8 43/1 43 | 48/753 |
| policy [1] 66/20 pose [2] 44/20 46/23 | 43/4 43/12 43/15 43/20 43/22 46/11 | Re [1] 3/3 |
|  | 50/1 | 2] |
| pose [2] 44/20 46/23 | 50/10 55/15 55/15 55/20 55/21 56/3 | read [8] 18/3 27/19 28/8 32/3 32/22 |
|  | 56/19 57/1 57/2 57/12 58/24 59/10 | 51/16 70/9 72/16 |
|  | 62/12 63/19 64/10 67/12 69/11 70/2 | reading [6] 21/24 28/14 52/2 |
| position [5] 15/15 16/12 29/22 41/24 63/18 | processes [2] 43/10 47/4 |  |
|  |  | [1] $20 / 1$ |
|  |  | reaffirmed [1] |
|  | programming [3] 31/13 35/12 3 | real [1] 25/24 |
|  | prohibitions [1] 11/8 13/3 16/5 20/16 | realize [2] $3 / 2426 / 17$ really [3] $6 / 1626 / 1732 / 10$ |
|  | prompt [5] 6/17 10/2 13/3 16/5 20/16 promptly [2] 63/23 73/7 | really [3] 6/16 26/17 32/10 reason [5] 22/22 24/13 33/1 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { power [4] } & 29 / 24 & 30 / 3 & 30 / 1 \\ \text { powers [1] } & 8 / 4\end{array}$ | prong [1] 48/7 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { reason } \\ 58 / 22 \end{array}$ |
| POWs [3] 9/15 12/23 52/9 practice [1] 64/8 | proper [1] 27/18 <br> property [5] 31/3 37/8 38/1 50/3 62/2 | reasonableness [1] 66/19 reasoned [1] 22/13 |
| PRB [37] 4/12 4/20 5/4 5/16 7/3 7/19 7/24 14/18 20/16 39/25 40/5 40/6 42/7 | prosecution [1] 45/13 | reasons [11] 15/8 19/24 23/4 24/2 3 |
|  | protected [1] 8/9 | 32/9 37/23 39/10 44/14 44/1 |
| 42/8 43/2 43/22 43/24 43/25 44/6 44/15 44/19 45/5 45/22 46/16 49/23 51/23 | protections [2] 22/8 26/2 | recall [1] 66/13 |
|  | proven [1] 65/16 | receive [4] 40/6 40/7 45/22 60/2 |
| 55/3 55/9 55/14 56/15 56/19 57/1 57/12 | provide [6] 16/4 16/6 47/11 59/18 70 $72 / 8$ | received [2] 45/6 45/14 receiving [1] 44/9 |
|  | provided [9] 4/20 | recent [2] 22/7 54/4 |
|  | 53/20 63/9 63/15 64/21 | recently [2] 13/21 50/6 |
| precedent [1] 42/23 <br> precise [1] 14/3 | provides [2] 4/21 | rected [1] 683 |
| prepare [1] 57/15 prepared [1] 5/13 | providing [2] 4/8 20/14 | recognition [3] 9/3 13/6 13/19 |
|  | provision [1] 46/8 | recognize [1] 70/21 |
| prerequisites [2] 65/21 66/1 presence [1] 50/3 | provisions psychologically [1] 31/15 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r\|r} \text { recognizec } \\ 60 / 871 / 9 \end{array}\right.$ |
|  |  | recognizes [2] 8/9 8/10 |
|  | public [1] 18/18 | reconsidered [1] 12/9 |
| 58/19 presents [2] 6/25 21/1 | publish [1] 42/12 | record [2] 3/5 73/12 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { presents [2] } 6 / 2521 / 1 \\ & \text { presided [1] } \\ & 42 / 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| President[17] 5/5 6/20 8/25 16/13 41/7 41/11 45/10 54/15 54/20 68/12 68/15 | purpose [6] 4/9 11/2 13/9 15/8 52/25 59/2 | recovered [3] 31/15 31/15 31/16 reduce [1] 59/25 |
| 68/17 68/18 68/18 68/24 69/4 70/3 <br> President's [3] 8/4 9/3 70/4 <br> press [1] 43/9 | purposes [6] 9/17 10/24 11/6 31/12 | referenced [1] 54/2 |
|  | 53/21 66/1 <br> pursuant[2] 8/4 15/4 | erred [2] 45/9 45/12 erring [1] 34/7 |
| pressed [1] 5/4 prevail [1] 20/1 | [3] 44/12 45/15 49/20 | reflected [2] 12/12 13/1 |
|  | 9 | refusing [1] 26/9 |
| prevail [1] 20/1 previous [1] 68/1 | 1] $57 / 25$ | rd [4] 39/24 43/2 65/1 65/6 |
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## 59/23
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remember [1] 34/25
Remind [1] 24/22
reminded [1] 17/7
removal [1] 61/1
removed [1] 60/22
rendered [1] 12/19
renders [1] 12/20
repeatedly [3] 4/23 16/21 27/6
repercussions [1] 39/13
replaced [1] 34/18
reply [1] 33/2
report [4] 33/13 33/25 36/23 65/1
Reporter [2] 2/13 2/14
represent [1] 3/8
representation [1] 66/4
representative [1] 57/11
represented [1] 31/4
represents [1] 9/2
request [7] 35/8 35/25 38/10 39/24
62/16 64/10 67/11
requested [3] 35/6 35/11 35/11
requests [1] $35 / 8$
require [1] 9/14
required [5] 10/6 43/10 43/13 43/14 52/1
requirement [6] 8/7 8/11 10/15 12/12 16/5 24/4
requirements [4] 16/2 47/5 47/14 65/21
requires [5] 12/25 21/9 53/8 56/19 69/12
requiring [1] 42/11
resolve [2] 63/24 64/8
respect [11] 8/2 15/9 20/9 22/22 68/10
68/14 69/24 70/6 70/19 71/12 71/18
respectfully [2] 16/17 22/20
respond [1] 38/5
respondent's [2] 62/10 65/17
respondents [2] 62/6 65/18
responding [2] 37/25 38/4
response [7] 5/20 35/24 57/15 57/15
61/8 63/9 63/21
responsibility [1] 65/10
rest [5] 18/20 34/22 62/9 62/14 65/5
restricting [1] 29/14
result [2] 39/8 52/17
resulted [1] 55/12
results [1] 55/11
retains [1] 45/15
returns [1] 17/11
review [38] 4/8 4/12 7/4 8/8 9/15 10/6 10/15 12/25 13/4 15/7 15/17 38/24 39/20 43/15 43/21 44/1 44/7 44/10 45/3 45/9 45/20 46/11 46/21 46/22 47/22 47/23 48/16 49/23 52/1 53/8 53/19 53/20 57/14 64/23 68/10 68/12 72/3 72/4
reviewed [3] 12/11 64/9 68/6
reviews [11] 13/3 44/6 45/14 55/9 55/10
55/10 55/11 55/12 57/19 68/4 71/24
right [60] 4/10 4/16 8/22 9/5 9/5 9/7
16/24 17/18 18/21 19/22 21/15 23/9
23/12 25/10 25/15 25/21 25/21 30/21
37/6 41/10 41/20 42/1 42/2 42/5 42/9 42/15 42/16 42/18 42/22 43/3 44/11 45/15 45/19 46/5 47/10 47/12 48/3 48/10 48/15 48/19 48/22 49/3 49/6 49/12 49/20 50/16 58/10 58/14 62/20 65/14 65/16 65/24 65/25 66/3 66/4 66/15 66/21 69/15 72/12 73/4
rights [13] 9/5 14/25 23/5 25/18 27/4
27/9 27/10 28/1 28/10 28/18 41/23 48/11 51/22
Robertson [4] 5/1 19/24 68/5 68/9
RODNEY [3] 2/7 3/13 62/5
rodney.patton [1] 2/10
role [5] 13/23 47/1 69/8 69/9 69/20
room [3] 2/14 53/4 72/19
ROYCE [1] 1/11
RPR [3] 2/13 73/11 73/18
rule [6] 14/20 19/13 63/11 72/21 72/21 73/7
ruled [2] 17/9 19/24
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ruling [1] 19/12
Russian [1] 38/16
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safeguards [1] 11/22
Safley [1] 66/11
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SALAHI [40] 1/3 3/3 3/9 4/6 4/20 4/22
5/4 5/6 5/11 6/11 6/15 7/24 8/16 8/23
10/2 $12 / 6$ 15/15 15/19 16/24 19/1 $19 / 6$
21/6 22/23 23/5 24/2 25/7 30/8 31/2 31/5 34/4 34/23 35/7 36/9 37/11 39/5 39/22 62/22 68/4 68/7 73/4
Salahi's [9] 4/11 4/15 5/21 7/8 15/7 17/2 19/19 23/24 27/16
same [15] 11/20 11/23 19/24 22/6 27/8
28/2 28/5 32/12 32/21 52/11 54/14
57/20 63/23 64/5 67/12
satisfy [1] 40/15
saw [2] 36/12 38/11
say [19] $6 / 18$ 13/15 15/6 18/25 22/6
22/10 25/13 28/17 28/18 29/18 38/8
40/9 40/10 41/17 47/24 54/17 54/25 58/16 64/1
saying [11] $10 / 6$ 11/20 23/6 28/2 35/24
37/5 42/9 48/18 49/6 70/1 70/2
says [23] 6/19 10/14 12/7 13/2 27/7
30/12 33/6 34/4 34/11 34/19 35/25 36/3
37/11 37/16 45/24 46/4 46/10 46/14
47/21 48/11 66/24 69/15 73/3

Scalia [2] 27/11 71/16
schedule [5] 6/14 17/9 17/10 17/22
57/16
scheduled [10] 5/12 6/7 7/3 7/4 7/7
54/22 55/2 55/5 55/14 57/17
schedules [1] 46/21
scheduling [3] 42/11 47/5 59/1
scheme [1] 12/20
scope [3] 15/17 26/22 29/10
sea [1] 60/9
second [3] 28/19 44/24 48/9
secretariat [1] 5/16
Section [5] 13/2 46/4 46/14 49/11 60/5
sections [1] 47/20
security [12] 7/1 7/21 9/16 12/5 12/8
17/16 18/19 43/17 46/24 53/21 54/17 57/9
security-cleared [1] 18/19
see [7] 18/4 21/20 28/11 34/25 37/17
57/2 57/2
seek [1] 13/13
seeking [2] 12/16 21/3
seeks [4] 12/15 14/16 21/6 25/7
seems [1] 72/23
seen [3] 14/7 18/9 32/10
senior [1] 7/19
sense [6] 37/3 37/4 37/6 52/24 69/2

## 71/8

sensitive [1] 17/15
sent [1] 5/8
sentence [2] 13/24 26/23
sentences [1] 13/25
Sentencing [1] 27/13
separate [4] 19/20 20/5 23/14 27/12
separately [3] 20/2 22/10 47/18
September [5] 34/2 35/5 36/8 63/6 63/20
September 14th [1] 63/20
September 17th [1] 63/6
September 2014 [1] 34/2
sequencing [3] 40/5 58/25 60/25
series [3] 11/8 24/15 26/20
serves [3] 4/9 13/9 15/8
set [17] $5 / 125 / 17$ 14/18 16/5 17/9 17/10
17/21 17/22 21/2 23/11 26/24 28/9
32/24 33/15 40/7 43/23 65/18
sets [1] 16/22
setting [5] 43/22 44/6 46/21 54/16 54/18
settled [1] 52/20
seven [2] 22/18 56/12
several [4] 31/5 39/11 51/1 56/21
shall [2] 12/8 66/1
SHAMSI [3] $1 / 153 / 7$ 24/3
she [1] 22/12
shoes [2] 17/2 17/4
shorten [1] 23/24
should [20] 4/24 7/21 15/23 17/3 30/16
38/21 44/16 45/7 46/1 47/7 49/9 50/24
51/16 52/23 53/15 53/17 69/4 70/18 71/3 73/1
shouldn't [3] 12/3 34/18 69/5
show [5] 4/24 18/25 34/6 36/11 65/14
showed [2] 26/13 33/6
showing [1] 68/21
shows [2] 7/15 25/3
side [1] 61/7
significant [2] 7/1 41/13
similar [5] 17/14 21/14 25/6 45/4 48/17
simple [1] 71/21
simply [10] 31/23 37/25 48/8 51/20
52/24 53/9 54/4 60/13 61/4 61/25
since [2] 31/5 57/18
single [1] 14/15
sir [1] 39/15
sit [1] 38/9
$\square$
$\square$
still [18] 7/4 14/23 14/24 14/24 24/11 26/16 27/1 29/10 30/8 31/2 33/8 33/25 35/4 35/5 36/25 57/20 63/21 72/9
storage [3] 62/15 64/24 67/4
straight [1] 66/16
straighten [1] 69/5
Street [1] 1/17
striking [1] 21/19
strongly [1] 23/5
stuck [1] 36/13
subject [3] 4/6 12/8 48/16
subjected [1] 7/14
submitted [2] 7/15 73/7
subsequent [1] 21/10
subsequently [2] 20/22 63/3
substantive [1] 46/6
substitute [1] 15/22
such [6] 13/16 24/4 48/11 50/9 52/17 61/12
sudden [1] 31/19
suffer [1] 19/7
suggest [1] 28/15
suggested [1] 61/11
Suite [2] $1 / 232 / 2$
summarize [1] 15/11
summed [1] 59/4
supplemental [1] 44/1
supports [1] 29/16
Supreme [30] 9/9 9/10 13/19 15/2 15/12
15/16 17/8 17/19 21/9 22/11 24/17
24/19 25/25 26/5 26/10 26/13 27/12
28/16 42/23 46/24 47/6 54/2 59/7 59/16
59/20 59/21 69/9 70/20 70/23 72/17
sure [10] 3/19 18/2 19/17 24/23 29/1
55/1 56/17 56/23 56/24 64/4
surely [2] 13/18 70/16
surprise [2] 70/17 70/17
suspect [1] 35/2
suspends [3] 49/16 69/25 70/1
suspension [21] 8/7 14/12 15/1 16/2
16/9 26/2 26/4 28/22 47/12 49/9 49/10
49/19 49/21 49/21 51/8 51/16 51/19
69/25 70/5 70/20 70/23
system [1] 26/25
T
table [1] 3/12
take [15] $13 / 5$ 14/3 14/23 18/5 32/16
32/25 32/25 33/17 34/18 37/12 56/15
68/18 70/18 73/3 73/4
taken [1] 35/16
taking [1] 57/3
Taliban [1] 52/6
talk [9] 7/1 14/23 18/17 18/18 20/23
31/1 33/24 38/9 53/19
talked [2] 15/9 23/4
talking [9] 17/24 20/21 30/24 34/10 36/1
56/21 61/21 61/22 63/22
tangential [1] 60/7
task [5] 30/23 45/9 66/20 68/10 68/11
team [2] 38/24 44/2
tease [1] 46/1
tell [10] $5 / 11$ 5/11 7/9 32/9 42/4 42/5
42/7 53/15 55/15 58/8
telling [2] 22/9 29/13
tells [1] 58/20
term [3] 12/3 12/3 71/4
terminate [1] 59/24
terms [3] 31/17 52/4 60/2
terrified [2] 31/24 32/8
territory [1] 50/3
terrorized [1] 31/23
TERRY [2] 2/6 3/13
terry.henry [1] 2/9
test [4] 20/11 22/22 22/24 22/25
tested [1] 13/20
testify [1] 7/18
testimony [1] 33/17
than [11] $6 / 16$ 6/22 9/25 10/1 15/18 26/3 34/18 51/7 51/17 53/2 57/3
thank [16] 3/10 3/17 4/2 4/17 23/17
23/18 30/20 30/22 39/14 39/15 62/2 62/4 67/21 67/22 67/24 73/6
that [508]
that's [54] 3/24 6/16 8/23 10/1 12/18 14/6 14/15 18/10 19/2 20/5 21/5 25/4 25/23 26/17 28/15 29/3 29/4 30/3 30/9 30/14 32/10 33/12 33/12 33/15 33/19 36/21 37/2 40/8 40/19 40/20 40/25 41/23 42/2 42/5 43/17 45/25 50/11 50/23 51/17 53/17 55/4 55/15 58/3 58/10 64/3 64/13 65/10 65/10 68/11 69/8 69/10 71/25 71/25 72/8
their [29] 7/4 8/21 10/25 21/3 28/6 29/16
33/13 33/25 34/17 38/2 38/25 40/22
41/14 46/8 47/16 49/15 51/6 51/21 52/4
52/6 53/16 63/20 65/7 66/12 66/15
70/15 70/18 71/21 72/25
them [54] 5/9 7/3 7/8 18/17 18/18 26/8
28/12 32/17 32/20 32/25 32/25 33/6 $33 / 1033 / 1134 / 1534 / 1635 / 1035 / 19$
35/20 35/21 36/3 36/5 36/6 36/10 36/10
37/1 37/17 37/24 38/3 38/19 38/22
38/23 38/25 39/1 39/2 39/4 39/5 39/12
42/21 45/7 54/19 55/6 57/19 59/7 62/16 63/3 63/5 63/6 63/17 64/3 64/10 68/1 71/1 72/24
then [26] 4/13 9/21 18/6 19/1 19/2 19/15 24/20 24/21 26/13 26/24 27/12 31/19 32/16 32/20 33/4 33/8 43/25 45/9 50/14 54/12 57/1 57/10 57/16 60/24 63/9 64/3 theory [1] 59/14
there [70] 3/25 5/22 5/24 6/1 7/2 7/21 7/22 7/23 9/15 10/4 10/14 11/24 12/14 12/17 13/3 13/8 17/3 18/13 20/2 20/12 20/18 20/19 22/9 22/22 24/9 25/9 25/22 26/5 26/7 27/14 30/5 30/15 30/19 33/16 $33 / 2334 / 1535 / 2536 / 1036 / 1136 / 16$ 36/17 36/17 38/2 41/20 41/21 45/2 45/25 48/3 48/9 49/21 51/17 54/8 55/6 55/8 55/9 56/8 58/11 61/14 61/18 62/23 63/8 63/21 64/11 65/3 66/4 67/3 69/17 71/18 71/24 72/1
there's [17] 6/2 7/12 10/8 10/9 10/11 14/16 23/11 26/24 27/1 28/25 30/8 33/21 44/17 49/2 49/6 58/21 63/19 therefore [4] 8/6 22/12 28/11 45/1 these [21] 14/24 20/15 23/2 26/24 34/7 34/21 36/18 39/3 42/19 42/21 43/10 45/4 45/16 47/4 47/5 53/11 60/7 64/20 64/23 67/14 67/17
they [128]
they're [19] 25/19 34/2 34/10 36/25
37/24 38/3 40/11 41/2 41/3 41/13 42/21 47/3 52/1 64/11 64/24 65/21 67/16 67/17 67/18
they've [5] 37/24 38/14 39/4 39/5 65/16
thing [5] 13/12 26/17 28/2 29/12 68/11
things [6] 28/8 31/17 37/12 40/13 58/4
67/7
think [107]
thinking [1] 50/8
third [3] 52/4 52/8 53/3
this [125]
those [29] 11/14 15/25 17/1 19/11 19/12 26/21 27/1 27/3 27/7 27/8 27/15 27/19 28/8 28/9 28/13 28/17 44/18 45/6 47/18
47/19 54/6 54/6 55/11 55/13 60/6 61/22
situation [1] $37 / 7$
six [2] 15/20 55/10
SJA [1] 38/22
JAs [1] 38/7
59/16 59/21 61/10
61/10 61/11 61/20 61/22 71/16
smaller [5] 32/11 32/12 37/12 37/13
$67 / 2$
sole [1] 59/22
somewhat [2] 32/11 33/7
soon [2] 4/20 12/9
56/5 67/5
sought [6] 18/23 23/23 24/12 25/6 $26 / 15$
sound [5] 58/19 58/20 58/22 61/4 61/25
68/3
[2]
sovereign [1] 50/3
space [2] 37/12 37/13
speak [4] 38/8 56/25 56/25 68/18
specific [3] 35/8 35/11 40/2
specicaly [2] 44/19 66/9
[1] $60 / 3$
spell [2] 29/21 60/3
SPITZER [2] 1/21 3/8
[2] 61/16 61/18
St [6] 24/20 25/4 25/5 26/16 28/22 29/7
staff [2] 57/20 64/22
19/24 19/25
standing [1] 16/15
start [3] 46/20 58/4 65/8
started [3] 31/9 33/13 73/2
state [3] 10/22 39/3 60/1
stated [1] 61/16
statement [1] 28/16
states [10] 1/11/12 7/12 7/16 9/19
stations [1] 38/18
statistics [1] 55/7
status [8] 17/22 33/13 33/25 36/23
52/16 52/22 64/25 72/25
statute [2] 8/5 27/5
statutory [3] 28/24 29/5 48/6
stenography [1] 2/25
step [6] 3/4 43/20 43/22 48/8 48/9 60/21

| T | $\begin{aligned} & 57 / 9 \\ & \text { U/S.C [1] 28/24 } \end{aligned}$ | $72 / 1272 / 1372 / 1473 / 6$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | Uh-huh [1] 2 | Vietnam [1] 10/1 |
|  |  | view [8] 21/10 24/7 29/16 71/12 71/15 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 1 |
|  | unclassified [3] 34/1 35/23 58/ | ] 28/1 |
|  |  | 21/2 |
|  | under [40] $4 / 7$ 8/11 9/7 9/22 10/10 10/11 | violation [3] 25/17 49/22 70 |
|  | 11/14 12/14 14/10 14/10 14/12 14/12 | 1] 5/10 |
|  | 14/20 14/21 19/25 25/11 26/2 26/4 | visited [1] 31/6 |
|  | 26/12 27/4 27/16 39/3 41/20 42/18 | visualize [1] 34/10 |
|  | 42/19 46/14 47/15 48/1 48/6 49/3 53/18 | vital [2] 67/14 67/17 |
|  | 60/5 70/13 70/15 71/3 71/4 71/10 71/10 | voluntarily [1] 7/10 |
|  |  | W |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 52/1 |
|  |  | 20/22 31/1 31/1 34 |
|  |  | 34/17 35/8 35/9 38/12 38/19 39/1 |
|  | /11 6 | 54/16 58/16 63/4 63/13 64/1 64/2 |
|  | undertake [1] 43/25 | 67/9 71/8 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Union [2] 1/1 | wants [4] 7/24 40/18 62/16 64/16 |
|  | unique [1] | war [28] 8/8 8/12 9/8 9/1 |
|  | UNITED [8] 1/1 |  |
|  |  | 11/16 11/17 11/20 11/24 13/2 13/8 |
|  | universe [1] $28 /$ | 14/11 14/21 46/16 51/25 52 |
|  | unlawful [3] 4/24 8/22 73/5 | 71/4 71/5 71/9 |
|  | unlawfully [1] 44/13 | Warafi [2] 13/17 54/4 |
|  |  |  |
|  | unlike [1] 9/23 unlimited [1] 34/14 | Warden [4] 33/22 34/2 34/4 34/11 Warden's [1] $64 / 25$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | unnecessary [1] 64/8 | ranted [5] 6/24 9/17 10/16 11/25 |
|  | unprecedented [1] 41 |  |
|  | unquestionably [1] 9/19 unravel [5] 9/22 13/20 14 | Washington [4] 1/5 1/23 2/15 35 |
|  |  |  |
|  | unreasonable [1] 65/17 | 64/1 |
|  | until [4] 12/23 33/2 43/4 | watch [3] 31/17 38/16 38/17 |
|  | unwanted [2] 21/15 65/25 | water [1] 34/8 |
|  |  | 27/8 27/18 28/9 28/19 29/23 37/10 |
|  |  | 2 43/5 43/8 46/22 52/2 |
|  |  |  |
|  | uphill [1] 49/25 | ways [2] 27/18 31/10 |
|  | upon [1] 27/2 | we [140] |
|  | Urias [1] 2 us [21] $5 / 1$ | we'd [3] 3/21 19/2 38/9 |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { we're [33] } 3 / 15 & 9 / 24 & 11 / 20 & 11 / 2316 / 3\end{array}$ |
|  | 24/21 30/23 38/2 39/9 62/12 72/21 | 20/1 28/17 28/21 28/23 35 |
|  | 72/22 72/23 | 38/18 39/7 42/9 43/18 56/15 |
|  | usdoj.gov [3 | 61/21 61/22 65/2 69/10 69/15 |
|  | use [4] 12/2 31/14 58/11 58/11 | 0/8 70/12 72/8 72/15 72/15 72 |
|  | used [2] 6/6 35/18 | 72 |
|  | using [2] 11/23 71/7 | we've[14] 4/4 4/5 8/3 16/20 16/21 19/23 23/4 31/2 $32 / 956 / 662 / 1363 / 1369 / 16$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | V |  |
|  |  | weight [1] 10/13 |
|  | 2] $42 / 2$ | well [31] $8 / 710 / 2413 / 318 / 1421 / 1$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | very [48] $13 / 18$ 14/8 14/8 14/14 15/1 | 52/10 52/20 54/5 54/19 55/2 55/4 58/8 |
|  | 17/13 20/8 20/9 24/6 24/7 | 60/18 63/2 63/7 63/12 63/18 66/13 |
|  | 27/2 29/13 29/25 29/25 30/9 32/18 34 |  |
|  | 38/1 |  |
|  |  | t[] 5/8 21/8 31/14 36/9 60/1 61/16 |
| U | 65/11 67/25 68/13 69/24 | were [27] 5/14 13/17 22/3 24/9 27/14 |
| U.S[7] 2/7 2/14 21/4 43/16 46/24 54/7 |  |  |


| W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { write [1] } 35 / 10 \\ & \text { writes [5] 34/23 34/24 34/24 35/1 } 35 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| were... [15] 35/16 35/17 36/2 38/2 38/18$39 / 1845 / 245 / 345 / 447 / 2053 / 653 / 20$ | writing [1] 38/10 |
|  | written [2] 35/15 57/15 |
| 63/11 63/25 68/1 | wrong [7] 24/1 24/2 29/19 31/25 41 |
| what [90] | 41/7 62/19 |
| what's [5] 26/20 36/4 41/1 66/21 66/21 whatever [4] 13/17 38/9 56/7 69/18 | wrote[3] 5/10 5/16 22/10 |
|  | Y |
| when [30] 5/11 5/19 6/7 6/7 9/18 10/22 19/12 27/2 30/3 32/1 34/25 35/1 35/5 | year [11] 5/7 5/18 6/16 6/22 39/11 41/8 |
|  | 45/15 68/13 68/13 68/16 73/2 |
| 35/6 35/12 35/21 36/8 37/1 37/2 40/11 | yearly [1] 12/12 |
| 40/17 40/18 47/20 50/17 53/19 58/3 | years [26] 4/19 4/23 6/14 7/17 9/24 |
| 60/2 60/16 63/20 71/23 | 15/21 17/5 17/24 19/12 29/6 31/5 31/14 |
| where [18] 21/20 22/17 22/22 26/21 | 32/2 32/2 32/5 37/15 37/21 40/18 41/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28 / 23 \text { 31/6 } 36 / 239 / 442 / 843 / 258 / 8 \\ & 59 / 2360 / 1263 / 166 / 970 / 1071 / 1872 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 44/23 55/2 56/14 56/21 62/24 73/3 73/4 |
|  | years' [1] 34/23 |
| 59/23 60/12 63/1 66/9 70/10 71/18 72/8 whether [38] 4/6 4/8 6/15 6/24 6/25 8/16 | Yes [2] 37/4 55/18 |
| 11/25 13/9 15/8 19/20 20/3 21/12 21/14 | yet [1] 14/4 |
| 21/18 22/2 27/3 27/4 27/15 28/11 41/6 | York [1] 1/17 |
| 42/11 43/16 44/20 45/5 45/18 46/17 | you [128] |
| 46/23 48/2 48/5 48/9 57/8 58/25 61/17 | you'll [1] 19/13 |
| 66/4 66/23 66/23 67/16 67/18 | you're [4] 21/13 37/5 56/21 69/7 |
| which [53] 3/20 4/5 5/16 11/7 11/16 12/5 | you've [6] 21/13 23/2 23/3 26/22 26/23 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} 13 / 2 & 14 / 15 \\ 14 / 17 & 15 / 2 \\ 20 / 19 & 15 / 18 \\ 21 / 9 & 16 / 2 \\ 21 / 12 & 21 / 14 / 15 \\ 27 / 19 & 27 / 20 \end{array}$ | 72/21 |
|  | your [123] |
| 28/17 28/18 32/4 32/13 33/5 35/6 35/23 | yours [1] 20/21 |
| 37/15 38/16 43/22 43/23 47/9 47/13 48/18 49/4 49/11 52/9 52/9 52/25 53/21 | yourself [1] 13/16 |
|  | yourselves [1] $3 / 5$ |
| 54/4 55/7 57/17 59/2 59/13 59/22 61/9 |  |
| 64/25 66/7 66/8 68/1 69/2 69/4 70/16 |  |
| while [2] 12/16 59/16 |  |
| who [19] $6 / 6$ 9/14 12/4 15/25 19/6 31/13$36 / 236 / 25 ~ 39 / 4 ~ 40 / 7 ~ 50 / 2 ~ 52 / 21 ~ 53 / 1 ~$ |  |
|  | 36/2 36/25 39/4 40/7 50/2 52/21 53/1 |
| 53/20 53/23 57/21 64/20 68/6 72/3 |  |
| who's [2] 33/23 36/17 |  |
| why [26] 6/2 7/9 9/6 10/1 14/24 14/24 |  |
|  |  |
| 41/11 42/8 43/6 54/15 54/19 54/21 |  |
| 55/19 57/3 58/22 61/3 63/7 63/17 69/10 |  |
| Wilkinson [2] 27/11 28/5 |  |
| will [21] 4/1 4/13 4/15 5/11 6/15 8/18 |  |
| 16/18 16/19 20/1 23/6 30/13 34/13 |  |
| 34/15 34/15 34/16 34/17 54/14 60/23 |  |
| 60/25 68/18 72/24 |  |
| willing [2] 16/12 60/20 |  |
| Wirghi [1] 51/2 |  |
| wishful [1] 50/8 |  |
| withheld [1] 23/3 |  |
| within [5] 25/23 29/10 68/12 68/13 73/2 |  |
|  |  |
| without [11] 4/8 14/16 15/7 15/21 45/17 45/19 48/18 50/18 65/24 66/2 66/5 |  |
| witnesses [1] 57/16 |  |
| Women's [1] 48/17 |  |
| won't [4] 37/7 40/10 42/3 68/18 |  |
| word [6] 46/8 58/12 67/23 68/19 71/7 |  |
| 71/7 |  |
| work [3] 43/25 57/23 65/2 |  |
| working [3] 43/10 55/15 57/20works [1] 58/1 |  |
|  |  |
| World [1] 9/25 |  |
| worth [2] 34/23 67/11 |  |
|  |  |
| would [43] 4/25 5/14 5/18 5/20 13/15 13/20 15/6 19/6 20/13 20/15 21/21 |  |
| 22/16 23/23 24/11 29/10 31/17 32/15 |  |
| 34/4 35/2 39/2 39/2 39/12 40/14 41/7 |  |
| 41/17 41/17 43/24 43/24 46/19 52/17 |  |
| 52/24 54/24 56/24 59/6 59/24 60/3 |  |
| 60/13 65/8 66/18 66/22 67/15 70/11$70 / 16$ |  |
|  |  |
| wouldn't [6] 4/18 18/6 21/25 22/1 29/2 |  |
| 38/4 |  |
| writ [9] 26/1 26/22 28/23 28/24 29/2 29/4 29/6 29/10 60/13 |  |


[^0]:    6

[^1]:    
    $\qquad$

