FILED UNDER SEAL¹

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY, CHARLIE SAVAGE, SCOTT SHANE, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION, Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

Nos. 13-422(L), 13-445 (Con)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, Defendants-Appellees.

PUBLIC, REDACTED VERSION OF RESPONSE TO COURT'S JUNE 10, 2014, ORDER

Defendants-appellees the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Department

of Defense, and the Central Intelligence Agency (collectively, the government)

respectfully submit this response to the Court's order of June 10, 2014.

1. The Court's proposed opinion with respect to the government's rehearing

petition, which the Court provided to the government ex parte on June 6, 2014, for

in camera classification review, does not contain classified information.

¹ The original of this document is being filed under seal because it quotes from the Court's proposed revised version of the Court's April 21, 2014, public opinion, which is under court seal, and the Court's proposed opinion on the rehearing petition, which has not yet been released publicly by the Court. A public version of this document is being filed at this time with those portions blacked out.

2. The Court's proposed revised version of the Court's April 21, 2014, public opinion (currently under court seal), which the Court provided to the government *ex parte* on June 6, 2014, for *in camera* classification review of the revisions, does not contain classified information, but one factual error that the government had requested be corrected in two different sentences (*see* Classified Pet. for Rehearing 3-4 & n.2) was corrected only in one. The government requests that it be corrected in the second sentence as well, on page 45 of the Court's proposed April 21, 2014, public opinion

3. The version of the OLC-DOD Memorandum that the government provided as Attachment B to its rehearing petition does not contain classified information. It appears that is the version that the Court intends to release along with its proposed revised version of its April 21, 2014, public opinion. The Court's proposed opinion on rehearing, however, should be modified because the description of the redactions it granted on rehearing appears, in some instances, to not address all the redactions that are requested in the rehearing petition and reflected in Attachment B.

	The Court's June 10 Order
contains similar language that states that the Court "gr	anted the petition for
rehearing to the extent that it requested further deletion	ns from the OLC-DOD
Memorandum."	

					·····	
	a p 1					
·						
				·		•
			<u></u>			

If the version of the OLC-DOD Memorandum that the Court intends to release is the version provided by the government as Attachment B, there is no remaining issue on classification or privilege. If the Court does not intend to further redact all of the requested information as set forth in the government's Attachment B, the government respectfully renews its request for a 30-day administrative stay of release of the OLC-DOD Memorandum to permit the government to determine whether to seek relief from the *en banc* Court or the Supreme Court, and to seek such relief if appropriate.

4. The government understands that the Court is deferring decision on the

rehearing petition with respect to the issues related to the Vaughn index.

Respectfully submitted,

PREET BHARARA UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

STUART DELERY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

/s/ Sarah S. Normand SARAH S. NORMAND (212) 637-2709 Assistant United States Attorney U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York 86 Chambers Street New York, NY 10007

JUNE 2014

/s/ Matthew Collette

MATTHEW COLLETTE (202) 514-4214

/s/ Sharon Swingle

SHARON SWINGLE
(202) 353-2689
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Room 7250
Washington, D.C. 20530