- 1 [The R.M.C. 803 session was called to order at 1406,
- 2 29 January 2019.]
- **3** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: The commission is called to order.
- 4 I'll note for the record that it doesn't appear any of the
- 5 accused are here. So all parties that were here at the
- 6 previous session of the commission are here with the exception
- 7 of the accused.
- 8 Trial Counsel, do you have a witness that's here to
- 9 account for their absence?
- 10 CP [BG MARTINS]: We do, Your Honor. Captain, could you
- 11 please move to the witness box. Remain standing, raise your
- 12 right hand for the oath.
- 13 CAPTAIN, U.S. NAVY, was called as a witness for the
- 14 prosecution, was sworn, and testified as follows:
- 15 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 16 Questions by the Chief Prosecutor [BG MARTINS]:
- 17 Q. You are a United States Navy captain; is that
- **18** correct?
- **19** A. Correct, sir.
- Q. You are an assistant staff judge advocate assigned to
- 21 the Joint Task Force Guantanamo?
- **22** A. Yes, sir.
- 23 [END OF PAGE]

## 1 Questions by the Trial Counsel [MR. SWANN]:

- 2 Q. Captain, did you have occasion to advise each of the
- 3 accused in this case of their right to attend today's
- 4 proceedings?
- **5** A. I did.
- **6** Q. And did you do that between, what, 8:00 and 11:00
- 7 today?
- **8** A. Roughly so, yes, sir.
- **9** Q. All right. Let's take what's been marked as
- 10 Appellate Exhibit 618. It's a waiver signed by Khalid Shaikh
- 11 Mohammad consisting of three pages. Do you have that document
- 12 in front of you?
- **13** A. I do.
- **14** Q. Did you read this document to Mr. Mohammad?
- **15** A. I did.
- 16 Q. Is that his signature that appears on the second page
- 17 of this document?
- **18** A. It is, sir.
- 19 Q. Do you have any question whether he understood his
- 20 right to attend today's proceeding?
- 21 A. I have no question, sir. He understood.
- Q. Walid Mohammad Salih Mubarak Bin'Attash, a three-page
- 23 document, Appellate Exhibit 618A. Is that his signature on

- 1 the third page of this document?
- **2** A. It is.
- 3 Q. That's the Arabic version. Did you read him both the
- 4 English and Arabic version?
- **5** A. I read him the English version. There was a linguist
- 6 present. He did not require the translation by the linguist.
- 7 Q. Is that his signature that appears on that page?
- 8 A. It is.
- **9** Q. Do you have any misgivings about his understanding of
- 10 his right to attend?
- **11** A. I have no misgivings.
- 12 Q. Ramzi Binalshibh, Appellate Exhibit 618B, consisting
- 13 of three pages. Do you have that document in front of you?
- **14** A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Is that Mr. Binalshibh's signature on the second page
- **16** of this document?
- **17** A. It is.
- 18 Q. And did you read his rights to him in English or
- **19** Arabic?
- 20 A. I read it in English, sir.
- Q. Did he understand -- did he say that he understood he
- 22 had a right to attend?
- A. Yes, sir, he understood.

- 1 Q. Ali Abdul Aziz Ali, Appellate Exhibit 618C. Again, a
- 2 three-page document. Is that Mr. Ali's signature on the
- 3 second page?
- **4** A. It is.
- **5** Q. Do you believe he understood his right to attend
- 6 today's proceedings?
- 7 A. I believe he did, yes, sir.
- **8** Q. And did he waive that right?
- **9** A. Yes, he did.
- 10 Q. And finally, Mustafa Ahmed Adam al Hawsawi. Again, a
- 11 three-page document, Appellate Exhibit 618D. Do you have that
- 12 in front of you?
- **13** A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Is that Mr. Hawsawi's signature on the second page of
- 15 this document?
- **16** A. It is.
- 17 Q. Did you read these rights to him in English or in
- **18** Arabic?
- 19 A. I read them in English.
- Q. And did he waive his right to attend today's
- 21 proceeding?
- 22 A. Yes, sir, he did.
- TC [MR. SWANN]: No further questions, Your Honor.

- 1 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Any defense counsel have a question
- 2 for this witness? Mr. Nevin?
- 3 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Well, I don't have a question for the
- **4** witness, Your Honor.
- 5 And I perhaps should have said this before, but I
- 6 renew the objection that I raised with you yesterday regarding
- 7 our inability to resolve our conflict and so we won't be -- as
- 8 we said this morning in the closed sessions, we will not be
- 9 participating in these proceedings pending resolution of those
- 10 issues.
- 11 I should also have said perhaps before the captain
- 12 testified that Ms. Radostitz, who was here earlier in the day,
- 13 is absent. Let me just take the occasion to say that she's
- 14 studying the availability of appellate or extraordinary
- 15 remedies about this situation, and I felt that I should renew
- 16 the request we made previously that the proceedings be
- 17 recessed pending resolution of those proceedings.
- So I renew that -- I give you that information and I
- **19** renew the request.
- 20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand, Mr. Nevin. The
- 21 commission obviously stands by its earlier ruling from
- 22 yesterday, but I will consider that your objection or your
- 23 request is ongoing, at least from the commission's

- 1 perspective.
- 2 LDC [MR. NEVIN]: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 3 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You're welcome. Any other defense
- 4 counsel have a question for this witness?
- 5 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Military commission will please note
- 6 my objection to anonymous testimony.
- 7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I will.
- **8** LDC [MR. CONNELL]: And second, we did this in the closed
- 9 session, but I want to renew my objection to proceeding under
- 10 Rule 805 while Captain Andreu is not present, being sick in
- **11** quarters.
- 12 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you, Mr. Connell. Your
- 13 objection with respect to anonymous testimony is overruled.
- 14 With respect to Captain Andreu, the commission stands
- 15 by its earlier ruling that it made in the closed session with
- 16 respect to my finding that, under the circumstances, a
- 17 continuance is not warranted. I would ask you to continue to
- 18 keep the commission apprised of Captain Andreu's status.
- 19 Okay. I have no questions for this witness.
- 20 Captain, you may step down.
- 21 [The witness was excused.]
- 22 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: The commission finds that
- 23 Mr. Mohammad, Mr. Bin'Attash, Mr. Binalshibh, Mr. Ali, and

- 1 Mr. Hawsawi have knowingly and voluntarily waived their right
- 2 to be present at today's session.
- We will now turn to AE 616. We'll start by --
- 4 Mr. Connell, I believe that your team was the proponent
- 5 initially of the issue in this one, so I'll afford you the
- 6 first opportunity to be heard, should you choose to.
- 7 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
- **8** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Good afternoon.
- **9** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Your Honor, just to set the stage, we
- 10 are here on AE 616, which is -- which was -- follows the order
- 11 in AE 350RRR from the military commission ordering the
- 12 testimony of a former interpreter for Mr. Binalshibh's team to
- 13 testify tomorrow by secure video conference by closed -- in a
- 14 closed session.
- 15 Pursuant -- following AE 350RRR, Mr. al Baluchi put
- 16 on record his objection to unclassified testimony being taken
- 17 in a classified session, and the military commission then
- 18 ruled -- asked the parties to brief their positions on this.
- 19 So it is our position that, actually because the government is
- 20 moving to close the session, the government bears the burden
- 21 of proof here, which I'll talk about in a minute.
- 22 As I mentioned, the interpreter is due to testify
- 23 tomorrow. And under AE 350RRR, there are two areas of inquiry

1 for the testimony of this interpreter. The first is how he 2 sought employment with the Military Commissions Defense 3 Organization, and the second is whether anything or anyone 4 prevented him from disclosing to MCDO his previous employment 5 with the CIA. 6 Now, the bar to close a hearing is very, very high 7 under both the First and the Sixth Amendments, and under the 8 Regulation for Trial by Military Commission Section 19-1, and 9 by Military Commission Rule 806(a) that says military 10 commissions shall be publicly held. The language of the case 11 law bears this out. As we discuss in our brief, the cases 12 talk about closing hearings sparingly, with an emphasis always 13 on holding a public trial. And any party seeking to close the 14 hearing -- the government in this case -- bears that burden. 15 If we look at the Press Enterprise criteria regarding 16 the right of public access, none of those criteria here, we 17 believe, have been fulfilled. We take them in turn. first is an overriding interest that is likely to be 18 19 prejudiced. Now, protecting classified information is the 20 interest that has been, of course, advanced by the government 21 and agreed by us. We do have an obligation, an interest in 22 protecting classified information. And we have already taken

significant steps to protect that information through the use

23

- 1 of pseudonyms and other limitations on the questions that can
- 2 be asked of this interpreter and the subject matter that we
- 3 can cover in -- in a potential open session.
- 4 We have taken the position to the military commission
- 5 that we would support further restrictions on broadcasting the
- 6 interpreter's likeness to the court, and any other
- 7 restrictions on voice or images that would be necessary to
- 8 protect this individual's identity. In other words, the
- 9 prejudice has been mitigated, or can be mitigated, and I would
- 10 posit, eliminated to the extent possible by our adherence to
- 11 the guidance given to us by the government regarding this
- 12 classified information.
- In a case like this, it is always going to be a
- 14 question of how do we balance the rights of the defendants and
- 15 the public to the default of a public trial with the
- 16 protection of national security? And this is why we make
- 17 every effort to bifurcate proceedings when we can, so that the
- 18 likelihood of that prejudice, that damage, is minimized.
- But in considering this issue, we equally can't
- 20 minimize or prejudice the importance of a public trial here,
- 21 where there is a real question existing in the underlying
- 22 facts of whether the interpreter's presence on a defense team
- 23 constitutes an illegal government intrusion into a capital

1 defense case. 2 The second criteria -- criterion under 3 Press Enterprise is that the closure must be no broader than 4 necessary to protect the interest. The employment of the 5 interpreter with the Military Commissions Defense Organization 6 is not classified. The former employment of the interpreter 7 with the CIA is not classified. The fact that the interpreter 8 had a nondisclosure agreement with the CIA is not classified. 9 And, in fact, we discussed the details of the interpreter's 10 history with the MCDO and his false statements to defense 11 personnel in open session in November where we were arguing to 12 call him for testimony. We did so without endangering 13 classified information, as is apparent from the public 14 transcript that's available on mc.mil. So the mere presence 15 of classified information around an issue cannot in itself --16 thank you -- justify closure; otherwise, this entire 17 proceeding would be closed. 18 The -- it is the burden of the government to prove 19 that on this issue, as opposed to the many other issues 20 involving torture and the CIA that we have -- on which we've 21 had open hearings, that this issue merits entirely closed 22 testimony, and they can't fulfill this burden. Again, the 23 personally identifying information of the interpreter and the

- 1 details of his activities or experiences during his employment
- 2 while with the CIA are classified. And we've dealt with both.
- 3 We currently have a pseudonym that we've used
- 4 successfully in open court regarding the interpreter for
- 5 several years now. We're rounding on four years now since the
- 6 initial incident in February of 2015. So it's up to the
- 7 government to let us know if they would like to modify that
- 8 pseudonym, and we will comply with any modifications that need
- 9 to happen.
- The military commission has also ruled, of course,
- 11 that we will not be discussing the details of the previous
- 12 employment with the CIA. So most if not all of the testimony
- 13 is going to be on unclassified matters as per 350RRR. We will
- 14 be discussing whether anything or anyone prevented him from
- 15 disclosing his CIA employment to the defense.
- 16 Our inquiry into his limitations on that disclosure
- 17 have to do whether -- with whether anyone from his old
- 18 employment spoke to him ahead of time; whether anyone from
- 19 government agencies exerted pressure on him; whether he acted
- 20 sua sponte in withholding this very important information; and
- 21 if so, why did he choose to pursue that route?
- 22 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Ms. Pradhan, when you argued back in
- 23 November, I believe in response to the commission's question,

- 1 you indicated that the relief sought was either a deposition
- 2 or testimony.
- **3** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Yes, sir.
- 4 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: And I understand your argument about
- 5 the balance. But say I had granted the other remedy, a
- 6 deposition. How would it have factored into that balance and
- 7 how would the public have had potential access to that?
- 8 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Well, the facts surrounding that, it
- 9 would obviously be a different physical setup and we would be
- 10 conducting that -- we would be conducting -- we would have
- 11 argued that the -- that the deposition, even though it would
- 12 be necessarily not conducted in front of the public, that
- 13 parts of that deposition be made public after the fact, either
- 14 through a declaration or through evidence submitted to the
- 15 military commission publicly in a filing.
- 16 So we would not have taken the position that the
- 17 contents of that deposition be classified or be -- or be kept
- 18 classified. We would have fought to make the parts of -- at
- 19 least parts of those deposition -- of that deposition public.
- 20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Can't I simply order -- if we were to
- 21 do this in a closed session, order that a redacted transcript
- 22 of the proceeding be made available to the public?
- 23 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Yes, Your Honor, but that -- a

- 1 redacted transcript after the fact does not allow the public
- 2 to access in real time. And this is -- there is discussion of
- 3 this in the case law about the ability of the public to
- 4 access ----
- 5 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But neither would have a deposition
- **6** been accessed in real time.
- 7 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: No, Your Honor. But given that we do
- 8 have the potential of live testimony is -- live testimony in a
- 9 public setting has qualities that a deposition conducted in a
- 10 closed forum does not have.
- 11 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: But that wasn't really the nature of
- 12 the motion that got us here in the first place. I mean, the
- 13 nature of the motion was essentially discovery, which is a
- 14 request for the -- hence the request for a deposition to get
- 15 information. So presumably, depending on what comes of this
- 16 testimony, the defense could make an appropriate motion, if
- 17 they choose or find it necessary. So it seems somewhat
- 18 disingenuous to now change that to where we need this
- 19 instantaneous access made available to the public.
- 20 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: No, Your Honor, and that's for two
- 21 reasons. The first is that when we initially asked for a
- 22 deposition or for testimony, we did that with the
- 23 understanding -- or with at least the request to the

- 1 commission that that testimony also cover the details of the
- 2 interpreter's previous employment with the CIA, which we
- 3 understood -- and we understood those details to be
- 4 classified. And that was the reason that there was discussion
- 5 of whether we should have a deposition or whether we should
- 6 have testimony. And the purpose, or potential purpose of
- 7 holding, you know, either one of those in a classified --
- 8 holding testimony in a classified setting or having a
- 9 deposition that would have classified parts to it.
- 10 The default, however, of public testimony and the
- 11 default of the right to a public trial is a public trial. The
- 12 default is never closure of proceedings and then releasing
- 13 information to the public after the fact. The default on the
- 14 Sixth Amendment and the First Amendment right to a public
- 15 trial is always to keep the proceedings open and to very, very
- 16 narrowly tailor the closure of proceedings.
- 17 And that's what we're asking the military commission
- 18 to do here, that the closure of the proceedings -- and we
- 19 recognize that there may be information that we ask -- or
- 20 questions that we ask the interpreter that may come up against
- 21 classified information or that the interpreter may feel
- 22 involves classified information, and we have expressed to the
- 23 military commission our agreement that, of course, there

- 1 should be bifurcated proceedings. But the idea that the
- 2 entirety of the proceedings should be closed solely because
- 3 there is -- there are -- there's -- there are lines of
- 4 questioning that in -- in and of themselves are unclassified
- 5 but that may, you know, second or third degree out implicate
- 6 classified information is not sufficient to justify closure
- 7 under the Press Enterprise standard.
- 8 So again, you know, we've done these kinds of
- 9 questionings before where we know that there is a strict line
- 10 of classification. And the government has given us that
- 11 guidance and we appreciate that in this case. But we know
- 12 what is -- what is classified and unclassified about the
- 13 interpreter's employment. We have those boundaries, and we
- 14 protect that line, and we save its crossing for closed
- 15 session.
- 16 But the line of questioning that I've just outlined
- 17 to you strikes at the heart of what the public has a clear
- 18 interest in knowing, which is whether their government is at
- 19 all involved in actively undermining the capital defense in a
- **20** 9/11 trial.
- 21 The third criteria under Press Enterprise is that the
- 22 trial court has to consider reasonable alternatives. Now,
- 23 there are several. We can hold open testimony with the

- 1 interpreter's appearance obscured, either partially or
- 2 completely, and we know that the government is able to provide
- 3 disguises, if necessary. The military commission can
- 4 certainly decide that certain questions should be limited to
- 5 closed session, and that would satisfy, I think, the very
- 6 narrow bit of classification that pertains to the areas of
- 7 questioning that have been allowed by the military commission
- **8** in 350RRR.
- 9 And I said this in closed session and I will submit
- 10 to you now that we have offered to submit at least our
- 11 questions on behalf of Mr. al Baluchi ex parte to -- to Your
- 12 Honor, to the military commission, so that you can make that
- 13 assessment. The topic of alternatives, though, brings me to
- 14 the confrontation clause discussion. And it is our position
- 15 that, if the military commission chooses to entirely close the
- 16 testimony of the interpreter, the defendants would have the
- 17 right to attend that closed session.
- 18 In AE 136E, Judge Pohl ruled in his findings, Section
- 19 b., that the accused do not enjoy a right to be present at
- 20 closed pretrial hearings during which classified material will
- 21 be discussed for which the accused is not the source of the
- 22 classified information. Now, in many ways, this is exactly
- 23 that scenario. But for the defendants, we would not have the

- 1 information we have today regarding the interpreter.
- Now, the case law supports the proposition that the
- 3 defendants must be allowed to attend the interpreter's
- 4 testimony. The Second Circuit has stated that the presence of
- 5 the defendant is a condition of due process to the extent that
- 6 a fair and just hearing would be thwarted by his absence. And
- 7 we know the defendants have a right to be present at any
- 8 critical stage of the proceedings. Now, it's a highly
- 9 fact-specific inquiry. The -- but it turns on the ability of
- 10 the defendant to contribute to the conduct of the proceeding.
- 11 The military commission would need factual
- 12 development of these issues every time the government seeks to
- 13 exclude the defendants from a session, and certainly in this
- 14 particular instance where we have the relatively rare at this
- 15 point instance of -- incidence of live testimony from a former
- 16 member of a defense team. And here, the interpreter, again,
- 17 is being called to discuss how he ended up in a situation that
- 18 severely compromised and violated the defendant's privilege,
- 19 at a minimum, and may have constituted government intrusion
- 20 into their capital defense.
- One of the cases under -- one of the cases that deals
- 22 with the exclusion of the defendants is
- 23 United States v. Clark. In United States v. Clark, the

- ${f 1}$  citation is 475 F.2d 240, it's the Second Circuit, 1973, at
- 2 page 244. And in that case, they state: It is readily
- 3 apparent and not surprising that the suppression hearing in
- 4 that case covered a wide range of testimony. What was
- 5 surprising and wholly improper was the exclusion of the
- 6 appellant and the public from the course of an entire pretrial
- 7 proceeding designed to determine from evidence of events in
- 8 which the defendant, the appellant, participated, whether his
- 9 constitutional right to be free from an unreasonable search
- 10 and seizure was violated.
- 11 What would be surprising and wholly improper here is
- 12 the total exclusion of the defendants from witness testimony
- 13 designed to determine whether their Sixth Amendment rights to
- 14 effective assistance of counsel, to include the sanctity of
- 15 the attorney-client privilege, has been violated.
- 16 Subject to your questions, Your Honor.
- 17 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I have no additional questions. Thank
- **18** you, Ms. Pradhan.
- 19 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: May I ----
- 20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: You may.
- 21 [Pause.]
- 22 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Your Honor, I have one final point, if
- 23 the military commission would indulge.

- **1** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Sure.
- 2 ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: And that is just with regards to your
- 3 question regarding depositions versus testimony. The one
- 4 previous deposition that we have had here at the military
- 5 commission, even though it was closed to the public, was open
- 6 to the defendants. And so we would ask again that if the
- 7 military commission chooses to close the entirety of the
- 8 testimony from the interpreter, that the defendants be allowed
- 9 to attend.
- 10 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand. Thank you.
- **11** ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: Thank you.
- **12** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Ms. Bormann.
- 13 DC [MR. MONTROSS]: Your Honor, in AE 616C,
- 14 Mr. Bin'Attash's attorneys filed notice of conflict.
- 15 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Montross, what was the AE again?
- 16 DC [MR. MONTROSS]: AE 616C. We filed notice of conflict
- 17 and, as a result of that notice of conflict, we are not able
- 18 to proceed to offer argument or to a position in terms of this
- 19 motion.
- 20 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. You understand, I think, the
- 21 commission's position hasn't changed and views this as a
- 22 waiver of your ----
- DC [MR. MONTROSS]: It is not a waiver. Mr. Bin'Attash

- 1 does not waive his right to representation. We are
- 2 proceeding ----
- **3** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand your position.
- **4** DC [MR. MONTROSS]: ---- ethical professional
- 5 responsibilities.
- **6** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I'm just reiterating what the
- 7 commission's position is.
- **8** DC [MR. MONTROSS]: I understand what your position is,
- **9** Judge. It is not our position as to waiver.
- **10** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you.
- **11** Mr. Harrington?
- 12 LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Nothing further, Judge.
- **13** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Ruiz?
- 14 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Nothing further, Judge. We adopt the
- 15 arguments of co-counsel -- I mean counsel.
- **16** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you.
- 17 Trial Counsel? Trial Counsel, if you can start off
- 18 by addressing the defense's position about the burden of proof
- 19 and whether you agree that the government bears the burden in
- 20 this instance.
- 21 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Thank you, sir. That was actually the
- 22 only reason I was going to get up was to address that.
- The government's position is that the testimony needs

- 1 to be in closed session. I'm not going to get into any
- 2 details as to why that is. But your ruling in 350RRR was
- 3 correct. The defense has objected to your ruling. Typically
- 4 they would file a motion; that would be a motion for
- 5 reconsideration for which they would bear the burden. They
- 6 have styled this as an objection, but we still think, based on
- 7 the relief they're asking, it's, in fact, a motion; that it's
- 8 a motion to reconsider and it's a motion for which they carry
- 9 the burden.
- 10 Subject to your further questions, that's all I was
- 11 going to say.
- 12 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Thank you. I have no questions.
- **13** Ms. Pradhan?
- ADC [MS. PRADHAN]: [Microphone button not pushed; no
- 15 audio.]
- 16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. At this point, the commission
- 17 is going to take this matter under advisement, issue a ruling
- 18 as soon as practicable. What I intend to do is recess the
- 19 commission until tomorrow morning.
- 20 Mr. Trivett, did you have a ----
- 21 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: I have an administrative note, sir.
- 22 There's a weather event coming into the area where the witness
- 23 is. We are making all arrangements to make sure that the

- 1 testimony does, in fact, go off tomorrow, regardless of what
- 2 your ruling is. But that said, there's at least the
- 3 possibility that something may come up. If it does, I'll be
- 4 sure to inform the judiciary and the defense.
- 5 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. Thank you. And if that were to
- 6 occur, I do think we have some flexibility with the remainder
- 7 of the -- what's on the docket, that we could simply postpone
- 8 the testimony to perhaps Thursday, take up an earlier issue
- **9** tomorrow instead.
- 10 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: Yes, sir. Thank you.
- **11** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Mr. Ruiz?
- 12 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Yes, Judge. Your -- your ruling in terms
- 13 of whether there will be an open session or portion of an open
- 14 session tomorrow will impact Mr. al Hawsawi's decision whether
- 15 to come to court tomorrow or not. So what I'm asking is if
- 16 the commission can urge for us to have an opportunity or a way
- 17 to communicate that to Mr. al Hawsawi, that would be very
- 18 helpful.
- 19 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: What I can propose, and maybe in light
- 20 of the weather event, is why don't we go ahead and postpone
- 21 the testimony until Thursday right now, and then that way we
- 22 can -- that gives the commission ample time to issue its
- 23 ruling; you, Mr. Ruiz, and your counterparts, to discuss the

1 matter with your clients; and we can take up the unclass 2 portions of the remaining motion series tomorrow morning. 3 Mr. Trivett? 4 MTC [MR. TRIVETT]: There are many, many logistics 5 required for this witness and we would prefer, if at all 6 possible, to do it tomorrow. That's what we're working 7 towards. It involves a lot of different agencies. I don't 8 want to get into detail, but everyone is trying to do 9 everything they can to make this happen and we believe that we 10 are going to make it happen, so we would prefer that it 11 actually happen tomorrow. I just wanted to raise it to the 12 commission's attention, because everyone's -- everyone's 13 schedules would be impacted by that. I can't speak for all of 14 their schedules. I'm not just talking about the witness, I'm 15 talking about all logistical pieces to get him there safely. 16 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: I understand. So perhaps -- what are 17 the parties' thoughts about maybe delaying the start time one 18 hour, doing a 10:00 a.m. start time? Would that afford 19 defense a little additional time to maybe discuss it with your 20 clients? 21 LDC [MR. RUIZ]: Well, Judge, the determination has to be 22 made prior to departing the camp. So once they depart and

make it to the courtroom, it kind of defeats the purpose.

23

- 1 So if the government can assist us in making sure
- 2 there is a communication, then that would be helpful. I know
- 3 there have been times where we have worked that out. But I
- 4 want to make sure that happens, because I don't want to come
- 5 in tomorrow and then raise an issue before the commission in
- 6 terms of a waiver of communications or those kinds of things.
- 7 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. Mr. Connell?
- 8 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: Sir, in part, the solution to that
- 9 problem may lie in what else, if anything, you intend to do
- 10 tomorrow. Because if there's -- if it's a closed session
- 11 tomorrow, none of the defendants are going to be offered the
- 12 opportunity to come to court.
- **13** MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Correct.
- 14 LDC [MR. CONNELL]: If it's a mixed session, then it
- 15 becomes a little more complicated.
- So far, it is my understanding of the commission's
- 17 intent that tomorrow would be devoted to this issue, and then
- 18 we would take up the remaining classified and unclassified
- 19 issues on Thursday and Friday. If that's accurate, I think it
- 20 offers a solution to that problem. If the commission has
- 21 something else in mind, we may need to devise another
- 22 solution.
- 23 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: My course of action is the -- the

- 1 former. Tomorrow is devoted to testimony, whether it be open,
- 2 closed, or a combination thereof. The remaining two days
- 3 would be to take up the remaining items on the docket, so if
- 4 that helps.
- 5 Mr. Harrington?
- **6** LDC [MR. HARRINGTON]: Judge, two suggestions. One is,
- 7 perhaps the court when it makes its decision could give us a
- 8 short order indicating what the decision -- without the
- 9 reasoning of the decision later -- a written decision later.
- The second one is as to the government to facilitate
- 11 us getting messages to our clients after we get that -- that
- 12 message so they can know one way or the other. And then they
- 13 can make their decision in the morning, assuming part of it is
- **14** open.
- 15 MJ [Col PARRELLA]: Okay. So we're going to proceed with
- 16 the hope that it's tomorrow to -- and then, Trial Counsel, if
- 17 you can inform the commission as well as the other parties if
- 18 there's the slightest indication that that will not happen.
- 19 I'd also ask that you, per Mr. Harrington's request, do what
- 20 you can to facilitate communication in the meantime.
- 21 For our part, the commission will do everything I can
- 22 to get you an answer as soon as possible, even if it's just
- 23 a -- an answer followed up by a more formalistic written

1	ruling.												
2	Any other questions?												
3		A11	rig	ht.	The	comm	ission	is	in	rec	cess.		
4	[The R.M	. C .	803	sess	ion	reces	sed at	143	38,	29	January	2019.	]
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
0													
1													
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
9													
20													
21													
22													
2													