March 292 2012

15-DOJ ALUV. DOJ-SEALED-CLASSIFIED



1	MS. LA MORTE: This is Tara La Morte, Assistant United
2	States Attorney for the government. With me is Sarah Normand,
3	also from the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District
4	of New York. We have Amy Barcelo from the Southern District of
5	New York, Jeannette Vargas from the Southern District of New
6	York, and Brian Germ from the CIA.
7	JUDGE WESLEY: We have Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe who is
8	the clerk of the Second Circuit with us also, and the members
. 9	of the panel, and Mike Macisso who is a DoJ security
.10	information officer.
11	MR. MACISSO: The classified information security
12	officer. We have a new title.
13 .	JUDGE CARNEY: Can I ask what are the positions of
14	Mr. G and is Ms. P here as well? No.
15	MR. G I am an attorney with the Office of
16	General Counsel at the Central Intelligence Agency.
17	JUDGE CARNEY: Great.
18	JUDGE WESLEY: Ms. La Morte, I don't see a reason for
19	you to stand. Not everyone is here. Jennifer Parada is not
20	here, correct?
21	MS. LA MORTE: Correct.
22	JUDGE WESLEY: Everyone else is?
23	MR. MACISSO: Zabel is not.
24	JUDGE WESLEY: And Andrew Schilling is not here.
25	MS. LA MORTE: Correct.
	N

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

It's in the nature of the method.

22

23

24

25

JUDGE CARNEY: The nature of the activity is different

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17_

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

P. 4

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

as well. And I note the use of the word "activity" being different from intelligence source or method. The intelligence is gathering or acquiring information.

And

therefore, I find it difficult to equate them.

It seems to me that the agency is relying on the modifier "intelligence" to mean whatever we do within our charter is an intelligence method. But the statute seems to distinguish between activities and methods.

So could you address that, please, because this bears obviously on the applicability of Exemption 1 versus Exemption 3.

MS. LA MORTE: Okay. As I said, methods are the means by which the CIA carries out its functions. So, interrogation, for example, is a method.

And activities are the operalization, if I said that word correctly, probably not, of the CIA's methods. So, examples of activities —

So activities are the operalization of methods. I am going to avoid that word from now on.

Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM

24

25

15-DOJ

No. 9713 P. 5

32

XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED JUDGE CEDARBAUM: "Operability," how's that, MS. LA MORTE: 2 3 4 5 6 The reason it is a method or a means, a way in which 7 the CIA carries out its functions, is because these activities. 8 9 10 11 12 JUDGE CARNEY: 13 14 15 16 MS. LA MORTE: There are traditional intelligence 17_ 18 methods, and your Honor is correct, the traditional activities 19 concern the CIA's collection of information. So that is 20 correct. So we coordinate with foreign liaison services to try 21 and get information from them. We interview sources. We try 22 and recruit sources. We do electronic eavesdropping. And the 23 point of all that is for the CIA to gather information and pass

it along to U.S. policy makers who could then decide what, if.

anything, to do with the information.

Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 6 SEALED CLASSIFIED XC93ACL2 2 3 JUDGE CARNEY: 4 MS. LA MORTE: 5 6 7 8 But, I guess where the trip up is, is there are 9 certain ways or methods in which the CIA accomplishes that. is one of those intelligence things that is 10 11 both a method and an activity. JUDGE WESLEY: 12 naving - excuse me. Nothing like a janitor. 13 14 15 16 MS, LA MORTE: That's absolutely correct. So, for 17 example, in the OLC memos, 18 19 that program was a program where the CIA was authorized to 20. capture international terrorists abroad, detain them in foreign 21 countries, and interrogate them using not only standard 22 methods, but enhanced interrogation techniques. 23 But that detention, that CIA detention and 24 25 interrogation program, was a program that

Case: 10-4290

Document: 140

Page: 5

04/17/2012

27

33

XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED And that's important because here, the references to contained in the OLC memos reveals for the first time the existence and the scope That has never before been acknowledged, and would be acknowledged for the first time simply by revealing in the OLC memos. JUDGE CARNEY: Judge Hellerstein rejected the characterization of that as a method, and said instead this is

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Document: 140 Page: 6 04/17/2012

Case: 10-4290

15-DOJ

Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM

P. 7

No. 9713

Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM

15-DOJ

No. 9713 P.

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

a source of authority. Did he rule on its coverage under Exemption 1? It looked like there was passing reference to Exemption 1 from time to time that he could have ruled that it was exempt as properly classified under Exemption 1.

MS. LA MORTE: He certainly could have, your Honor. It is unclear from the transcripts whether he actually ruled on Exemption 1.

And in the transcript, you can see in certain instances that Judge Hellerstein does understand that harms will flow from the disclosure, actual national security harms will flow from the disclosure of the information.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: Certainly the existence of Guantanamo was not covert. It was not a secret.

MS. LA MORTE: This is not Guantanamo, your Honor. This has to do with — the detention and interrogation program that I'm talking about isn't Guantanamo. It is quote unquote black sites abroad that were in countries that heretofore have never been officially acknowledged by the United States.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: You are seeking to withhold a lot of material from Guantanamo.

MS. LA MORTE: The documents at issue in this case, the references to and the quotes from the OLC memos, don't have anything to do with Guantanamo.

Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

15-DOJ

No. 9/13 P. 9

-36

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: I understand. But there is a lot of .

other material that I saw for the first time this morning.

MS. LA MORTE: I'm not precisely sure what material —

JUDGE WESLEY: She is talking about the documents
relative to the cross appeal, not to the direct appeal.

MS, LA MORTE: Oh.

JUDGE WESLEY: Could we stay on the direct appeal for a second or two, then perhaps we can move to the issue of the documents, the Vaughn index.

Go ahead and finish your thought. Have you finished your thought in response to Judge Carney's question?

JUDGE CARNEY: I have a follow up, if I may.

So if I understand the government's position, your position is the material redacted from the second and fourth OLC memos was properly exempt under Exemption 1, and that Judge Hellerstein's ruling then was somewhat incomplete in that he rejected and demanded that you use an alternative characterization under — he rejected it under Exemption 3. He was saying this was a source of authority, not a method.

But I was perplexed by the

absence of an explicit ruling about Exemption 1.

MS. LA MORTE: I don't recall an expressed ruling in the transcript about Exemption 1. I think what Judge Hellerstein's thought process was, was that this was a source of authority, and that's it, not an activity, not a method.

Document: 140 Case: 10-4290 Page: 9 583000 Mar. 13. 2012 4:04PM 15-00J No. 9/13 37 XC93ACL2 SEALED-CLASSIFIED JUDGE WESLEY: He never seemed to connect the fact.

> That's the curious - he never seemed to connect the fact that That's why it appears in the May 10 and

May 30 OLC memos.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS, LA MORTE: That's correct. I believe --

JUDGE WESLEY: It is direct connection to it.

MS, LA MORTE: Right: Again

As we said, in the spirit of trying to make as much information public as possible, in the public we refer to this as a classified intelligence method. But we've also said in public, in the declarations, that it is still ongoing, it is not unique to the detention interrogation program, and it is unaffected by the President's executive order closing the detention centers and limiting interrogation techniques to those contained in the Army Field Manual.

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 11 38 XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED JUDGE WESLEY: Director Panetta seemed to apply 1 significant weight to the fact that 2 3 4 5 MS. LA MORTE: 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 JUDGE CEDARBAUM: 17 18 MS, LA MORTE: And once that occurs, your Honor, the 19 ramifications of that could be enormous. So a couple of 20 21 examples, or one example, 22 23 24 JUDGE WESLEY: SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

Document: 140 Page: 10

04/17/2012

583000

Case: 10-4290

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 12 39 XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED 1 2 3 MS. LA MORTE: 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17. JUDGE CARNEY: If we were to accept that there was an 18 adequate showing of harm, and that this material or the use of 19 had been properly 20 redacted and classified and therefore redacted, and therefore 21 22 that this material was protected under Exemption 1, that could just resolve this issue. We don't have to reach Exemption 3. 23 24 MS. LA MORTE: Absolutely. 25 JUDGE CARNEY: Given the discordance between the . SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

Page: 11

04/17/2012

583000

27

Case: 10-4290

Document: 140

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 12 04/17/2012 583000 27

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9/13 P. 13

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

statutory use of the word "activity" versus "method." |sn't that correct?

MS. LA MORTE: This case can be entirely resolved on grounds of Exemption 1. That's correct. We only need to show one exemption.

JUDGE WESLEY: Now I want to move on to some of the issues that Judge Cedarbaum touched on before.

It seems to odd to me, he did redact one reference and without ever explaining. I don't understand, I

don't understand the material difference there.

MS. LA MORTE: To be perfectly frank, I don't either.

But he did allow us to redact it. And then in a subsequent ex

parte session in October, he maintained that that part could

still be redacted, and it was never explained why that was —

he did recognize the harm, that there would be harm.

JUDGE WESLEY: That's why he offered the compromise.

He acknowledges the problem, offers the compromise, and then

for some reason when the compromise is rejected —

JUDGE CARNEY: One more quick question, If I may.

JUDGE WESLEY: Of course.

JUDGE CARNEY:

22

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25,

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 13 04/17/2012 583000 27

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 14

MS. LA MORTE:

JUDGE CARNEY: Thank you.

JUDGE WESLEY: Let's talk about the ACLU's appeal with regard to the information that's — and let's go to the photograph. I know there has been some concern about the photograph.

You might briefly restate your position as you did in public, and then give us was there further discussion with Judge Hellerstein about the particulars of the picture itself or in some way connecting the dots in some way about the significance of the picture?

MS. LA MORTE: No. There was no further discussion

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 14 04/17/2012 583000 2

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 15

XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED

with Judge Hellerstein on the photograph beyond what you've seen in the transcripts.

JUDGE WESLEY: Judge Hellerstein took it that once it was represented that it was a picture that was taken during a process, during the period of time when Mr. Zubaydah was being interrogated, that that then related to an interrogation technique?

MS. LA MORTE: Yes. I think one of the keys is recognizing that the photograph

It just

11 has to relate to an intelligence technique, and that's broader.

JUDGE CARNEY: That's under what standard?

MS. LA MORTE: Wilner v. NSA.

JUDGE CARNEY: You are talking to judicial authority rather than statutory authority.

MS. LA MORTE: I am talking about judicial construction of the National Security Act as it applies —

JUDGE WESLEY: From our court.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: Were there any photographs in

Wilner?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8.

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS_LA MORTE: No, there were not. No, it was signals intelligence.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: Normally photographs are self-disclosing or revealing, and I finally got to see it this morning. Actually I didn't realize we had it. And I looked at

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 15 04/17/2012 583000

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-00J No. 9/13 ۲. 16

XC93ACL2

SEALED CLASSIFIED

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

2 What is it disclosing?

> MS. LA MORTE: Your Honor, a person's condition in CIA custody during the time frame that they've been subject to CIA interrogation could reveal a lot of information to our adversaries.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: It could, but let's look at the particular photograph that you are objecting to.

JUDGE CARNEY: I noted that given the many cables describing the course of the interrogation on and off over months, there were regular descriptions of his physical condition which were confirmed in part by the photograph.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM:

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

JUDGE CARNEY:

JUDGE WESLEY: Let's have -

JUDGE CARNEY: Is there - I wondered whether because the review of the photograph took place in the context of the cables, was that kind of information that the government and Judge Hellerstein might have been considering that would beconveyed by publication of the photograph?

MS. LA MORTE: That's certainly plausible, your Honor. But to be frank, I can't specifically say one way or the other based on the record that I have that that is the case.

JUDGE CARNEY: You were not there.

25

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 16 04/17/2012 583000 2

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 17

XC93AGL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

1 MS. LA MORTE: No, no, I was not there.

. 11

22 .

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: I looked through all of the annotations to see if there was anything that might connect them to the photograph, and I really saw nothing.

MS. LA MORTE: Well, your Honor, the photograph is another example, and this has been well recognized throughout the case law --

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: Which case do you rely on that refused to turn over a photograph?

MS. LA MORTE: I don't have cases that are specific to a photograph, but the cases that I am talking about which include <u>CIA v. Sims</u> are cases that say the reason, the reason that the courts defer to the CIA's director's Judgment about whether something is reasonably likely to reveal an intelligence method, is because the CIA director has a full view of the scene, and is well versed in intelligence. Whereas a judiciary and those of us also that are not well versed in intelligence may not be able to see.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: I understand, but cases are not collections of statements. They are facts. So I take it that there really is no prior case in which the CIA has refused to turn over a photograph which on its face is not so clearly revealing of much, except that the man is at Guantanamo which is a public matter.

JUDGE WESLEY: Do we know where he is? We have no

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 17 04/17/2012 583000 27

. 45 -

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 18

XC93ACL2 SEALED-CLASSIFIED

1 idea where he is.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: If you look on Google.

JUDGE WESLEY: I don't look at Google. I look at the record.

MS. LA MORTE: He was overseas at an undisclosed location. He was not at Guantanamo when that photograph was taken.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: I see, all right.

JUDGE WESLEY: The point is that there may not be a case on photographs, but I take it then that it is your view if the CIA makes a representation that the photograph has a meaning far greater than what we would appreciate, there is some deference due to the CIA's evaluation of that.

MS. LA MORTE: Absolutely. This is not just a conclusory, oh, this reveals a lot. We know that the photograph was taken in October of 2002. We know that Abu Zubaydah was subject to the waterboard — this is public knowledge — in August of 2002 83 times. We know he was subject to interrogation during this time period. And it is in light of those facts about this particular photograph which makes the CIA director's judgment that it relates to intelligence methods, reveals something about his treatment at the hands of CIA's custody, that is plausible. Therefore, deference would be accorded. This is a photograph that the CIA director himself viewed in the context of his declaration in

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 18 04/17/2012 583000

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM

15-DOJ

· No. 9713

P. 19

SEALED CLASSIFIED XC93ACL2

1

this case.

2

JUDGE WESLEY: Questions on anything else?

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDGE CARNEY: The record, absent being able to look

at the photograph, is remarkably barren of any description of

it or reasons given by the government or expression of reasons

6 by the District Court judge about even the categories of

information that it might convey that would warrant protection.

So much so that I felt it was difficult to review.

Having seen the photograph and given some thought, I have some more thoughts about that, but I am concerned about what one might be able to say that would explain a judgment that it could be produced or not produced given our restrictions on classification.

Can you address that concern? Do you know what I'm saying?

MS. LA MORTE: I'm sorry.

JUDGE WESLEY: Where in the record, what affidavit specifically addresses the photograph or what part of your conversation with Judge Hellerstein addresses the photograph?

MS. LA MORTE: Well, I think the issue that your Honor is hitting on is the 65 document sample that was reviewed by CIA Director Panetta was done categorically in the sense that - there isn't a lot of document-by-document distinguishing in that declaration. What it does is it looks at the common features of all of these documents, including the

> SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 19 04/17/2012 583000 27

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 20

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

photograph, which is operational information, and then links certain harms which are set forth in his declarations, and I can give you the JA cites, from the revelation of that operational information.

So, let me pull out the declarations.

JUDGE WESLEY: Is this in the classified joint appendix?

MS. LA MORTE: I'm going to look at first the — yes, the unclassified joint appendix.

JUDGE WESLEY: The unclassified one? I don't have that one with me. It's on my computer. Just go ahead.

MS. LA MORTE: Okay. So, I'm looking at JA 584.

JUDGE WESLEY: This is unclassified.

MS. LA MORTE: Unclassified. And this in paragraph five is where the CIA director is explaining the 65 sample documents that he is looking at including the photograph.

And he says "Drafted during the time frame the interrogations were being conducted, these communications are the most contemporaneous documents the CIA possesses concerning these interrogations. In addition to these top-secret communications, there are also small number of miscellaneous documents which include" etc., etc. "and a photograph. These miscellaneous documents, like the operational communications, contain top-secret operational information concerning the interrogations, and were drafted either contemporaneously with

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM

15-DOJ

No. 9/13 P. 21

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

the interrogations or with a viewing of the videotapes."

We know as a matter of fact that this photograph was, quote unquote, drafted contemporaneously with the interrogations because it was taken in October of 2002, which is also revealed in the Vaughn that's attached to —

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: The photograph is dated actually on the bottom.

MS. LA MORTE: I didn't recall that. So there you go. It is actually itself dated.

And then JA 1096, unclassified, the September 2009
Panetta declaration. He also states that "These categories of documents contain certain details about conditions of the confinement." And then he links these operational documents, which again, the photograph is included as an operational document, with certain harms that can result from release. And those harms include revealing the government's methods. And that's contained on JA 1087 unclassified.

JUDGE CARNEY: Can I interrupt for a second. When you refer to it as an operational document, that's a term of art that's a separate basis for exemption under FOIA?

MS. LA MORTE: When we say "operational," we mean what the CIA actually did in the field, how they did it, and to what effect. If you look at the OLC memos, for example, and what's revealed there, we have these general descriptions of EIT. You take the waterboard, you put it in an angle etc., etc. When I

No. 9713 P. 22

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

say "operational," what I mean is what actually happened in the field.

And the reason that we make that distinction, it is actually a very important distinction, because operational information, which, again, the photograph is included among that, is particularly sensitive information.

If our adversaries knew what the CIA actually was able to do in the field and how they actually did it, that provides a certain level of information that's invaluable for an adversary to know. For this reason, countries', including our country's, operational information is considered extraordinarily sensitive.

And the concern is that if we are unable to protect what we are considering to be among our most sensitive information, then other countries are not going to trust us to take care of their operational information.

operational information, especially in this case operational information that occurred so close in time to the actual events, then that's going to lead to the demise of relationships with our intelligence partners, our foreign

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 22 04/17/2012 583000 27

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 23

SEALED-GLASSIFIED XC93ACL2 intelligence partners, as well as a chilling of the willingness 2 of other countries to trust us with their information. 3 JUDGE CEDARBAUM: Is this something you've experienced 4 or is this something you are concerned about? 5 MS. LA MORTE: We are concerned. And I can point the 6 Court to the classified Panetta declaration. 7 JUDGE CEDARBAUM: I understand. Does he give any 8 example, can you give me an example? 9 MS. LA MORTE: Yes. He does give examples. 10 JUDGE CEDARBAUM: 11 12 MS. LA MORTE: Sure. I am going to give the Court a 13 couple of examples. 14 15 16 17 JUDGE WESLEY: I just read it an hour ago. 18

MS. LA MORTE: I can summarize.

JUDGE WESLEY: Go ahead and read it.

MS. LA MORTE:

22

19

20

21

23

24

25

XC93ACL2 SEALED - CLASSIFIED And one other example I'll point the Court to is in the March 2010 Hilton which begins on classified appendix 242. Let me see if I can find the exact cite. I think it is on CA 248.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Document: 140 Page: 24

15-001

04/17/2012

No. 9/13

P. 25

Case: 10-4290

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM

53 SEALED - CLASSIFIED XC93ACL2 2 3 6 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15. 16 1.7 18 These are real-world examples that show that what I am 19 saying is not hypothetical, but actually has concrete 20 ramifications in the world. 21 JUDGE CARNEY: Am I right in understanding that you 22. invoke both Exemption 1 and Exemption 3 to protect the ... 23 photograph's disclosure? 24 . MS. LA MORTE: Yes, that's correct. 25 SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C.

(212) 805-0300

04/17/2012

583000

No. 9713

P. 26

15-DOJ

Mar. 13. 2012 4:05PM

Case: 10-4290 Document: 140 Page: 26 04/17/2012 583000 27

Mar. 13. · 2012 4:05PM 15-DOJ No. 9713 P. 27

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED

1 JUDGE WESLEY: Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

.7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. LA MORTE: Can I say one more thing, your Honor? I don't know if your Honor is amenable to this. The one thing I would like to clarify in the public record is, it seemed to be a question what the CIA's position is as to the legality of waterboarding in this case. And the only thing I would say on the public record is we're not conceding or denying it, and our position is it is irrelevant to resolution of the appeal. Just because there seemed to be some confusion. If you don't want me to say that, I won't.

JUDGE WESLEY: Your opponent said "conceded." I took exception to that. I didn't see a concession on your part.

JUDGE CARNEY: I didn't see a concession.

JUDGE CEDARBAUM: In any event, it is your position that even if it is illegal, your position is your position. It is irrelevant. You are saying even if it is illegal, you object to the disclosure.

MS. LA MORTE: Correct.

JUDGE WESLEY: I certainly saw no concession in the oral argument.

MS. LA MORTE: Okay.

JUDGE WESLEY: Certainly there may be folks in the public who somehow take that, but I don't know how I can do anything about that.

MS. LA MORTE: Sure.

XC93ACL2 SEALED CLASSIFIED JUDGE WESLEY: Anything further, Ms. La Morte? 2 MS. LA MORTE: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. 3 JUDGE WESLEY: It is now, I have it at 3:25. We will 4 recess and reassemble in the ceremonial courtroom on the ninth 5 floor and complete the session. 6

(Continued on next page)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24