

BETTS, PATTERSON & MINES P.S.
Christopher W. Tompkins (WSBA #11686)
CTompkins@bpmlaw.com
701 Pike Street, Suite 1400
Seattle, WA 98101-3927

BLANK ROME LLP
Henry F. Schuelke III (admitted pro hac vice)
HSchuelke@blankrome.com
1825 Eye St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

James T. Smith (admitted pro hac vice)
Smith-jt@blankrome.com
Brian S. Paszamant (admitted pro hac vice)
Paszamant@blankrome.com
One Logan Square, 130 N. 18th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SPOKANE**

SULEIMAN ABDULLAH SALIM,
MOHAMED AHMED BEN SOUD,
OBAID ULLAH (as personal
representative of GUL RAHMAN),

Plaintiffs,

vs.

JAMES ELMER MITCHELL and
JOHN "BRUCE" JESSEN,

Defendants.

NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT
OF MOTION TO TAKE JUDICIAL
NOTICE

Without Oral Argument

Expedited Hearing Requested

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

Betts
Patterson
Mines
One Convention Place
Suite 1400
701 Pike Street
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
(206) 292-9988

1 Plaintiffs concede the facts Defendants ask this Court to take judicial notice
2 of regarding the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on our nation (the “9/11
3 Facts”) are “generally known,” and thus, are appropriate for judicial notice. ECF
4 184 at 2. Still, Plaintiffs object on the basis these facts are “irrelevant” and
5 “unduly prejudicial.” This position is unfounded. The factfinder needs to
6 understand the context underlying Plaintiffs’ claims and Defendants’ defenses—
7 both of which originate with the September 11 attacks. Further, the significant
8 probative value of the 9/11 Facts outweigh any claimed prejudice. Plaintiffs’
9 refusal to recognize the relevance and admissibility of the 9/11 Facts is myopic
10 and futile. For instance, the occurrence of September 11 and the 9/11 Facts are
11 referenced in numerous documents that lie at the core of this matter, and will be
12 offered as evidence at trial. It would thus be impractical—if not impossible—to
13 sanitize the record of the 9/11 Facts in the manner Plaintiffs propose. For this
14 reason, judicially-noticing the relevant 9/11 Facts in connection with Defendants’
15 *Motion for Summary Judgment*, ECF No. 169, is the most practical outcome, as it
16 will not cause undue prejudice, and any potential remaining prejudice can easily
17 be cured by a limiting instruction.
18
19

20 I. THE 9/11 FACTS ARE RELEVANT.

21 Evidence is relevant if has any “tendency to make the existence of any fact
22 that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less
23 probable than it would be without the evidence.” FED. R. EVID. 401. Courts
24 routinely admit evidence that “provides context for the activities at issue.” *See*,
25

DEFENDANTS’ REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

- 1 -

Betts
Patterson
Mines
One Convention Place
Suite 1400
701 Pike Street
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
(206) 292-9988

1 e.g., *U.S. v. Slade*, 2015 WL 4208634, at *2 (D. Alaska July 10, 2015); *Boecken*
2 v. *Gallo Glass Co.*, 2008 WL 4470867, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2008) (evidence
3 admissible to “provide context and background”).
4

5 Here, the 9/11 Facts provide critical context for all the governmental
6 activities following September 11, including those that form the basis for the
7 instant claims/defenses. Specifically, Plaintiffs’ claims are premised on the dual
8 contention that: (1) Defendants were the “architects” of the CIA’s enhanced
9 interrogation program; and (2) Plaintiffs were innocent victims caught in the
10 CIA’s overzealous War on Terror. But, were it not for the September 11 attacks,
11 the President would not have issued the September 17, 2001, Memorandum of
12 Notification (“MON”) directing the CIA to establish a program to capture, detain,
13 and interrogate al-Qaeda operatives to obtain critical intelligence to fight the War
14 on Terror. ECF No. 170 ¶¶ 6, 7 (citing US Bates 001631). And were it not for
15 the MON, the CIA’s High-Value Detainee Program (“HVD Program”), designed
16 to prevent further “imminent attacks,” and for which Defendants provided
17 recommendations, would never have been created. *Id.* ¶¶ 25-27, 80, 90-91, 102,
18 104, 141, 158, 165, 209-210. Indeed, but for the authority afforded by the MON
19 and the creation of the HVD Program, “enhanced interrogation techniques”
20 (“EITs”) presumably would not have been used on Abu Zubaydah—a central
21 figure in Plaintiffs’ claims, whom they contend served as the testing ground for
22 techniques later used on them. It is simply illogical Zubaydah’s treatment could
23 be relevant to Plaintiffs’ claims, while the very reason Zubaydah was interrogated
24
25

DEFENDANTS’ REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

- 2 -

Betts
Patterson
Mines
One Convention Place
Suite 1400
701 Pike Street
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
(206) 292-9988

1 is not. In short, the factfinder needs to be apprised *why* Defendants became
2 involved in the HVD Program, as well as why there even was an HVD Program
3 in the first place.
4

5 Further, the 9/11 Facts afford context for the CIA's interest in detaining
6 and interrogating Plaintiffs. Specifically, Plaintiffs assert they were "innocent"
7 and ultimately released without being prosecuted as terrorists. ECF No. 178 at
8 13, ECF No. 179, ¶ 106. If so, counter-evidence regarding the CIA's belief as to
9 Plaintiffs' involvement in various terrorist organizations, ECF No. 170, ¶¶ 266-
10 268 (Salim's believed terrorist connections); ¶¶ 274-276 (Ben Soud's believed
11 terrorist/al-Qaeda connections); ¶ 283 (Rahman's believed terrorist/al-Qaeda
12 connections), would likewise be relevant. So too would the reason *why* the CIA
13 was focused on detaining and interrogating those individuals believed to be
14 affiliated with al-Qaeda also be relevant. This requires disclosure of the 9/11
15 Facts—the most appropriate vehicle being judicial notice of these uncontested
16 and "generally known" facts.¹
17

18 ¹ Plaintiffs claim that since the 9/11 Facts do not feature prominently in
19 Defendants' *Motion for Summary Judgment*, they must be irrelevant. ECF No.
20 184 at 4-5. On the contrary, the 9/11 Facts form the underpinning for the
21 arguments advanced in Defendants' motion—including, among other things, the
22 issuance of the MON, creation of the HVD Program, and Defendants' hiring by
23 the CIA to participate in detainee interrogations. ECF No. 169 at 12; ECF No.
24 170 at 1-8.
25

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

- 3 -

Betts
Patterson
Mines
One Convention Place
Suite 1400
701 Pike Street
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
(206) 292-9988

II. RULE 403 DOES NOT WARRANT PRECLUSION.

Relevant evidence may be excluded only where its probative value is *substantially outweighed* by one or more of the articulated dangers or considerations. *U.S. v. Hankey*, 203 F.3d 1160, 1172 (9th Cir. 2000). Stripped of its rhetoric, Plaintiffs’ sole consideration is their suggestion the September 11 attacks could stir the jurors’ emotions, and thus be prejudicial. ECF No. 184 at 9-10.² But the mere fact evidence may provoke an emotional response does not alone render it *unduly* prejudicial. *See, e.g., Hankey*, 203 F.3d at 1772.³ And here, any prejudice does not substantially outweigh the probative value of the 9/11 Facts.

The 9/11 Facts are the impetus for that which occurred afterward, and which form the basis for Plaintiffs’ claims. Their introduction is sought for legitimate, highly probative reasons; they are not “dragged in by the heels for the

² There is no credible support for Plaintiffs’ suggestion that the trial’s proximity to the anniversary of 9/11 makes the prejudice of this evidence “particularly pronounced.” ECF No. 184 at 10. Plaintiffs also provide no support for their bold assertion that the “prevailing environment of prejudice against people who, like Plaintiffs, are identified as Muslim or from majority-Muslim countries” could not receive a fair trial in this jurisdiction.

³ Ironically, Plaintiffs intend to present evidence aimed at eliciting an emotional response, *i.e.*, facts intended to show the “horror” and “pain” they allege they endured. *See, e.g.,* ECF 179, ¶¶ 22, 30-43, 62, 66, 67, 74, 76, 78, 86-99, 108-119.

1 sale of [their] prejudicial effect.” *U.S. v. Plascencia-Orozco*, 852 F.3d 910, 926
 2 (9th Cir. 2017).

3 The cases cited by Plaintiffs are also inapposite. ECF No. 184 at 9. In
 4 *Zubulake v. UBS Warburg*, 382 F. Supp. 2d 536 (S.D.N.Y. 2005), the “emotions”
 5 dredged up by mention of the September 11 attacks were collateral to the Title
 6 VII discrimination claims advanced; thus, the scant probative value of such
 7 evidence was outweighed by its prejudice. In *U.S. v. Moore*, 375 F.3d 259 (3d
 8 Cir. 2004), the court did not overturn the conviction because of the prosecutor’s
 9 mere comparison of defendant to a “terrorist”; rather, it held this evidence
 10 “compounded” the effect of the prior bad acts evidence already improperly
 11 introduced. *Id.* at 264.⁴ In the end, it is inconceivable that the 9/11 Facts
 12 proffered by Defendants would “cause [the] jury to base its decision on
 13 something other than the established proposition in the case.” ECF No. 184 at 8.
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18

19 ⁴ Plaintiffs also misstate the holding in *U.S. v. Royer*, 549 F.3d 886 (2d Cir.
 20 2008), a securities fraud case. There, the court refused to overturn defendant’s
 21 conviction because evidence relating to 9/11 was presented to the jury, finding
 22 that the lower court had properly provided “timely cautionary instructions ... [to]
 23 reduce[] the potential for prejudice.” *Id.* at 901. The Court can do the same here,
 24 if warranted.
 25

DEFENDANTS’ REPLY IN
 SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
 JUDICIAL NOTICE
 NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

- 5 -

Betts
 Patterson
 Mines
 One Convention Place
 Suite 1400
 701 Pike Street
 Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
 (206) 292-9988

1 DATED this 25th day of May, 2017.
2

3 **BETTS, PATTERSON & MINES, P.S.**

4 By: s/ Christopher W. Tompkins
5 Christopher W. Tompkins, WSBA #11686
6 ctompkins@bpmlaw.com
7 Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.
8 701 Pike St, Suite 1400
9 Seattle, WA 98101

10 **BLANK ROME LLP**

11 James T. Smith, admitted *pro hac vice*
12 smith-jt@blankrome.com
13 Brian S. Paszamant, admitted *pro hac vice*
14 paszamant@blankrome.com
15 130 N 18th Street
16 Philadelphia, PA 19103

17 Henry F. Schuelke III, admitted *pro hac vice*
18 hschuelke@blankrome.com
19 600 New Hampshire Ave NW
20 Washington, DC 20037

21 **Attorneys for Defendants**
22
23
24
25

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

- 1 -

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 25th day of May, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

<p>Emily Chiang echiang@aclu-wa.org ACLU of Washington Foundation 901 Fifth Ave, Suite 630 Seattle, WA 98164</p>	<p>Paul Hoffman hoffpaul@aol.com Schonbrun Seplow Harris & Hoffman, LLP 723 Ocean Front Walk, Suite 100 Venice, CA 90291</p>
<p>Andrew I. Warden Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov Senior Trial Counsel Timothy A. Johnson Timothy.Johnson4@usdoj.gov Trial Attorney United States Department of Justice Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch 20 Massachusetts Ave NW Washington, DC 20530</p>	<p>Steven M. Watt, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> swatt@aclu.org Dror Ladin, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> dladin@aclu.org Hina Shamsi, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> hshamsi@aclu.org ACLU Foundation 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor New York, NY 10007</p>
<p>Avram D. Frey, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> afrey@gibbonslaw.com Daniel J. McGrady, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> dmcgrady@gibbonslaw.com Kate E. Janukowicz, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> kjanukowicz@gibbonslaw.com Lawrence S. Lustberg, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> llustberg@gibbonslaw.com Gibbons PC One Gateway Center Newark, NJ 07102</p>	<p>Anthony DiCaprio, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i> ad@humanrightslawyers.com Law Office of Anthony DiCaprio 64 Purchase Street Rye, NY 10580</p>

By s/ Shane Kangas
Shane Kangas
skangas@bpmlaw.com
Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.

DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO TAKE
JUDICIAL NOTICE
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

Betts
Patterson
Mines
One Convention Place
Suite 1400
701 Pike Street
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
(206) 292-9988