

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
-----X
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

06-CR-652

ZEINAB TALEB-JEDI,

Defendant

-----X

AMENDED MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
ZEINAB TALEB-JEDI'S PRE-TRIAL MOTIONS

Federal Defenders of New York, Inc.
16 Court St., 3rd Floor
Brooklyn, New York 11241
(718) 330-1200

Justine A. Harris
Florian Miedel

-Of Counsel-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	i
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
LEGAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND	5
Statutory Framework	5
Background of the PMOI	7
The D.C. Circuit Litigation Challenging PMOI's Designation	25
The Charges Against Ms. Taleb-Jedi	29
Ms. Taleb-Jedi's Statements to FBI Agents at Camp Ashraf	31
The Prior Proceedings	32
ARGUMENT	34
I. THE INDICTMENT SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE IT FAILS TO STATE AN OFFENSE WITH SUFFICIENT PARTICULARITY	34
II. TITLE 8 U.S.C. § 1189(a)(8) IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT PROHIBITS MS. TALEB-JEDI FROM CHALLENGING THE DESIGNATION OF PMOI AS A FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION	39
A. Ms. Taleb-Jedi Has a Constitutional Right to Show That Her Conduct Is Protected by the First Amendment	40
B. Ms. Taleb-Jedi Should Be Permitted to Challenge the Designation as a Matter of Due Process	51
C. Because It Deprives PMOI and Ms. Taleb-Jedi of Meaningful Judicial Review, 8 U.S.C. § 1189(a)(8) Violates the Nondelegation Doctrine	56
III. UNDER THE FIRST AND FIFTH AMENDMENTS OF THE CONSTITUTION, THE COURT SHOULD INTERPRET 18 U.S.C. § 2339B TO REQUIRE PROOF OF SPECIFIC INTENT OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, DECLARE THE STATUTE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND DISMISS THE INDICTMENT	59
A. Due Process Requires the Government to Prove That Ms. Taleb-Jedi Acted With Specific Intent	60
B. The First Amendment Provides an Independent Ground to Require That the Government Prove Specific Intent	70
C. This Court Can And Should Read a Specific Intent Requirement Into 18 U.S.C § 2339B	79

IV.	THE TERM “PERSONNEL” IN 18 U.S.C. § 2339B IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE	82
A.	As Applied to Ms. Taleb-Jedi, the § 2339B Ban on the Provision of Personnel to a Designated Organization is Unconstitutionally Vague	83
B.	The Section 2339B Ban On The Provision Of Personnel Is Unconstitutionally Vague On Its Face	92
V.	THE TERM “PERSONNEL” IN 18 U.S.C. § 2339B IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY OVERBROAD	96
VI.	THE GOVERNMENT’S PROSECUTION OF MS. TALEB-JEDI IS OUTRAGEOUS	97
VII.	MS. TALEB-JEDI’S STATEMENTS MADE TO THE FBI AT CAMP ASHRAF IN IRAQ MUST BE SUPPRESSED BECAUSE THEY WERE OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF HER FIFTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS.	101
A.	Ms. Taleb-Jedi’s Statements Were Obtained Through Custodial Interrogation.	101
B.	The Form Presented to Ms. Taleb-Jedi Prior To Her Interrogation Was Not a Valid <u>Miranda</u> Waiver.	103
C.	Any Waiver of Ms. Taleb-Jedi’s <u>Miranda</u> Rights Was Involuntary	105
VIII.	THE COURT SHOULD COMPEL THE GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE A BILL OF PARTICULARS	107
IX.	THE COURT SHOULD COMPEL THE GOVERNMENT TO PRODUCE ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY	111
A.	The Court Should Compel the Government to Disclose the Identity of its Cooperating Witnesses	111
B.	The Government Should Disclose Whether Any Electronic Surveillance Has Been Conducted In This Case	115
C.	The Government Should Disclose Any Information Relating to the Interrogations Conducted at Ashraf	120
D.	The Government Should Disclose Any Information Concerning Governmental Support of the PMOI	121
	CONCLUSION	123

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<u>Aptheker v. Secretary of State</u> , 378 U.S. 500 (1964)	62, 64
<u>Brache v. Westchester County</u> , 658 F.2d 47 (2d Cir. 1981)	90
<u>Brandenburg v. Ohio</u> , 395 U.S. 444 (1969)	73
<u>Broaderick v. Oklahoma</u> , 413 U.S. 601 (1973)	96
<u>Buckley v. Valeo</u> , 424 U.S. 1 (1976)	49, 73
<u>California v. Prysock</u> , 453 U.S. 355 (1981)	103, 104
<u>Chicago v. Morales</u> , 527 U.S. 41 (1999)	82, 93, 94
<u>Coates v. Cincinnati</u> , 402 U.S. 611 (1971)	89, 90, 91
<u>Colorado v. Connelly</u> , 479 U.S. 157 (1986)	106
<u>Committee of United States Citizens Living in Nicaragua v. Reagan</u> , 859 F.2d 929 (D.C. Cir. 1988)	46, 56
<u>De Jonge v. Oregon</u> , 299 U.S. 353 (1937)	73
<u>Doe v. Gonzalez</u> , 449 F.3d 415 (2d Cir. 2006)	118
<u>Eastern R. Presidents Conference v. Noerr Motor Freight, Inc.</u> , 365 U.S. 127 (1961)	72
<u>Edwards v. South Carolina</u> , 372 U.S. 229	72
<u>Elfbrandt v. Russell</u> , 384 U.S. 11 (1966)	passim
<u>Estep v. United States</u> , 327 U.S. 114 (1946)	52
<u>Fare v. Michael C.</u> , 442 U.S. 707 (1979)	105
<u>Farrell v. Burke</u> , 449 F.3d 470 (2d Cir. 2006)	82, 88, 90, 92, 96
<u>Farrell v. Burke</u> , 499 F.3d at 494	86, 90