## **EXHIBIT E**

```
1
                      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                     EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
2
   SULEIMAN ABDULLAH SALIM,
   MOHAMED AHMED BEN SOUD, and
3
                                       Case No. 2:15-CV-00286-JLO
   OBAID ULLAH, as personal
   representative of Gul Rahman,
                                       July 8, 2016
                                        Spokane, Washington
5
                        Plaintiffs,
                                        Telephonic Scheduling
   VS.
                                        Conference
6
   JAMES ELMER MITCHELL and JOHN
   "BRUCE" JESSEN,
                                        Pages 1 - 27
7
                        Defendants.
8
9
               BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUSTIN L. QUACKENBUSH
               SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
10
   APPEARANCES:
11
   For the Plaintiffs:
                                  Mr. Dror Ladin
                                  Ms. Hina Shamsi
12
                                  Mr. Steven M. Watt
13
                                  Attorneys at Law
                                  125 Broad Street, 17th Floor
                                  New York, New York 10004
14
15
                                  Ms. Emily Chiang
                                  Attorney at Law
                                  901 5th Avenue, Suite 630
16
                                  Seattle, Washington 98164
17
                                  Mr. Christopher W. Tompkins
   For the Defendants:
18
                                  Attorney at Law
                                  701 Pike Street, Suite 1400
                                  Seattle, Washington 98101-3927
19
                                  Mr. James T. Smith
2.0
                                  Mr. Brian S. Paszamant
21
                                  Attorneys at Law
                                  One Logan Square
                                  130 North 18th Street
22
                                  Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
2.3
                                  Mr. Henry F. Schuelke, III
24
                                  Attorney at Law
                                  600 New Hampshire Avenue NW
2.5
                                  Washington, DC 20037
```

```
2
   APPEARANCES (continued):
 1
   For Interested Party:
   United States of America
 3
                                        Mr. Andrew I. Warden
                                        Assistant U.S. Attorney
                                        20 Massachusetts Avenue NW
 4
                                        Washington, DC 20530
 5
    /////
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
    /////
11
12
13
14
15
    /////
16
17
18
                                        Ronelle F. Corbey, RPR, CRR, CCR
United States District Courthouse
    Official Court Reporter:
19
                                        P.O. Box 700
20
                                        Spokane, Washington 99210
                                        (509) 458-5283
21
22
23
24
Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
```

## TELEPHONIC SCHEDULING CONFERENCE - JULY 8, 2016

So I don't know if we're going to get into any discussions 1 as to classified information. I don't even know if they still 2 have the classifications that I understood. We started with 3 "Restricted," went to "Confidential," went to "Secret," and, 4 then, "Top Secret." Do they still have those, Mr. Warden? 5 6 MR. WARDEN: Yes, your Honor. There are currently three levels of classification. 7 THE COURT: Well, which one did they delete? 8 9 MR. WARDEN: From the contracts? THE COURT: No. You say that there's three levels. 10 MR. WARDEN: Three levels. There's "Confidential," 11 "Secret," and "Top Secret." 12 THE COURT: Oh, they did away with "Restricted." 13 MR. WARDEN: That's not currently a classification. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. MR. WARDEN: Correct. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Do you want to speak to any of these dates, Mr. Warden? 18 19 MR. WARDEN: The dates you've set, your Honor, are acceptable to the Government. 20 21 THE COURT: Okay. Well, if you run into matters that 22 need my attention, just -- I try to stay on top of these cases and move them along. You can call either Ms. Mauk or 23 Mr. Johnson, Jeremy Johnson; and we'll accommodate you. 24 25 MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, this is Chris Tompkins.

## TELEPHONIC SCHEDULING CONFERENCE - JULY 8, 2016

concerns about what information we're going to be able to receive and what we might be able to do with it if we receive it. How that might play into information being put before the Court, I can't say at this point. I could envision motions to require the United States to respond to Touhy requests or to set a timeline for them to respond and that might bring such information before the Court, but I'm not certain at the moment how that might play out.

THE COURT: Well, it may well be that there's classified information that the Government says it's classified and I would, then, enter an order saying, therefore, it will be furnished only to the Court; and, then, I would hear from the Government as to why it should not be furnished to the parties.

I just don't want to delay this with all this classification. You know, if it's confidential, that's different than being secret or top secret I think.

But I'm just not going to delay this case at the instance of the Government that's got a -- both, as I say, I sense a monetary and other interest in the outcome of this case.

MR. TOMPKINS: Your Honor, this is Chris Tompkins.

May I ask a question related to what the Court just said?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. TOMPKINS: One of the issues that we have, your Honor -- and it's not an issue with Mr. Warden, but it is an issue with the agencies on whose behalf -- or may be an issue

## TELEPHONIC SCHEDULING CONFERENCE - JULY 8, 2016

with the agencies on whose behalf he's appearing. We have -- we have served *Touhy* requests, and -- and I understand that the process involves review to identify potentially responsive documents and, then, review for actual responsiveness and classification. We don't know at the moment how long the Government is going to claim that that requires on any individual request.

Does the Court take the position that it would be able to order the Government to respond within a defined period of time if -- if there is an issue? Or that the Court is -- is in a position to address disputes as to whether a response is appropriate or -- or not?

THE COURT: Well, the case is assigned to me. I'll decide the issues, Mr. Tompkins, as they arise. And, if there's an issue, get it timely noted in a motion or other filing; and I'll give the Government a reasonable period of time. I'm not going to let the Government delay this case, and I'm not going to let the defendants delay this case because they say, well, there's classified information that need — issues that need to be resolved. So —

MR. TOMPKINS: I appreciate -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

THE COURT: That's all right. I'll -- I'll make myself available.

MR. TOMPKINS: All right. And, as a related issue,