1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
2	X
3	JASON LEOPOLD
4	Plaintiff Civil Action Nos.: 13-1324 and 14-048
5	13-1324 and 14-048 V.
6	CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, DEPT. OF JUSTICE, et al.,
7	Defendants X
9	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, et al.,
10	Plaintiffs,
11	v. Civil Action No. 13-1870
12	CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, et al.,
13	Defendants
14	X
15 16	Washington, D.C. Tuesday, October 7, 2014 9:35 A.M.
17	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE
18	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES E. BOASBERG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19	APPEARANCES:
20	For Plaintiff Leopold: Jeffrey Louis Light, Esq.
21	LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY LIGHT 1712 Eye Street, NW, Suite 915
22	Washington, DC 20006 (202) 277-6213
23	For Plaintiff ACLU: Hina Shamsi, Esq. AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION
24	125 Broad Street, 18th floor New York, NY 10004
25	(212) 284-7321

_			2
1	APPEARANCES: (Cont	'd.)	
2			
3	For the Defendants:	Elizabeth J. Shapiro, Esq. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
4			
5		Federal Programs Branch, Civil Division P.O. Box 883 Washington, DC 20044	
6		(202) 514-4686	
7			
8			
9			
1,0			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16	Court Reporter:	Lisa Walker Griffith, RPR U.S. District Courthouse	
17		Room 6507 Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3247	
18			
19			
20			
22			
23			
24			
25			
-			

PROCEEDINGS

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Your Honor, calling Civil Action Number 13-1324, Jason Leopold versus the Department of Justice, et al.; Case Number 13-1870, the American Civil Liberties Union, et al., v. The Central Intelligence Agency, et al.; Case Number 14-48, Jason Leopold versus the Central Intelligence Agency; and 14-1056, Jason Leopold, et al. v. the Central Intelligence Agency.

Counsel, will you please approach the podium and identify yourselves for the record.

MR. LIGHT: Good morning, Your Honor, Jeffrey Light on behalf of the plaintiff, Jason Leopold.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. SHAMSI: Good morning, Your Honor. Hina Shamsi and Arthur Spitzer on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning to you folks.

MS. MEI: Good morning, Your Honor. Vesper Mei and Elizabeth Shapiro from the Department of Justice on behalf of all of the defendants.

THE COURT: Okay. Good morning to you ladies.

All right. So, I know there's been a motion to extend the time. And, Ms. Mei, why don't you elaborate on that.

MS. MEI: Your Honor, as you are aware, we

originally requested a one month extension until September 29th, which we did move for. The committee then requested an additional extension and didn't provide a date by which we should move until. So, therefore, we did move until October 29th to give ourselves an extra month.

We can't predict exactly when the discussions of declassification will be completed. Obviously, that's not completely in our control, but we have learned, and we don't anticipate further extensions beyond October 29th. So we are actually at this time prepared to set a briefing schedule, assuming that everything will be released by the 29th.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

Ms. Shamsi, your position on that?

MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, we had agreed to a one week extension, and I felt we couldn't agree to more without additional information about the status of negotiations, when processing would be completed, and we weren't able to get that information.

We also have a concern, as I had expressed to you during the last status conference, Your Honor, about whether or not the agencies did, in fact, possess the full updated SSCI report which is the subject of one of our FOIA requests and the second amended complaint. And we had asked the Department of Justice to let us know whether, in fact, agencies did possess those reports. We asked in June of this

summer and were told that, although it wasn't definitive, it wasn't definitive whether, in fact, the agencies possessed any updated version.

2.3

We asked again in July, August and then in September. And in July, August and September, were told that, in fact, no agencies possessed a full report and that was based on agency's representations to the Department of Justice. That representation was in addition, Your Honor, made to you on September 4th.

We, as I had mentioned to you when we last met, Your Honor, I just didn't think that that was plausible given Senator Feinstein's letter to the executive branch in April, intending the executive branch to — intending for the dissemination of the full report and for lessons to be learned from that report.

We also didn't think it was plausible because the full report is 6,000 pages long, and as a matter of common sense, Your Honor, it just seems that CIA and other agencies who are weighing in on the redaction of the summary would want to have the full report.

And we then also came to learn through our
Washington legislative office that subsequent to the
September 4th hearing before this Court, and the
representations that were made, Senate staff directly urged
DOJ to, in fact, research two things: Whether the agencies

did have the full updated report; and two, what remaining time was needed to complete the negotiations and release the executive summary.

2.3

Just this morning, Your Honor, I understand from the Department of Justice that the Central Intelligence Agency does have the full report. I'll obviously let them speak for themselves, but there's no explanation about when it received the full report and why over the course of the summer we, and then you, were told that it didn't have it.

We think this is fairly serious, Your Honor, because in order for FOIA to function, the litigants and the courts have to have faith that everyone is acting in good faith.

So therefore, Your Honor, I would ask for a couple of things. One, renew my request for a declaration from the agencies, including the CIA, about when they received the full updated report. And when representations were made to the Department of Justice to us and to the Court about agencies not having it and why those representations were made.

We think that's important because, Your Honor, depending on the timing, obviously there's an issue of the representations that were made, but also we could have been moving forward in this case. A matter that is of tremendous public significance about a Congressional investigation of historic importance.

And then, Your Honor, at a minimum, we would ask you to exercise your discretion and ensure that regardless of when the agency received the full report, we are not required to file an additional FOIA request, an additional amended complaint so that we can proceed expeditiously on the actual substantive issues that should be before the Court.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Mei, do you want to respond?

MS. MEI: Your Honor, I just want to correct one thing, which is that none of the other defendant agencies have yet received the full updated report. The CIA has. And after the last status conference, we asked that CIA check for the full report again, and they discovered that they did have it. And there was a miscommunication apparently within the agency as to what they were looking for. In fact, we have learned that the report was conveyed on disk, which may explain some of how 6,000 pages may have — they didn't realize that they had it.

With respect to the declaration from the agencies, we don't think it's necessary. There was a miscommunication, and for the merits of the case and for the agency record issue, it doesn't matter when the report was found.

THE COURT: All right. And how about the second issue about filing an additional amended complaint or an additional FOIA request?

2.3

MS. MEI: I think we're prepared to move forward on a briefing schedule and on the agency record issue without requiring them to file a new FOIA request.

2.3

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So, what do you -- all right. So, Mr. Light, do you want to be heard on any of these issues?

MR. LIGHT: Yes, Your Honor. I would echo the ACLU's request as far as asking for a status update as to where the negotiations are. And the most recent request for extension of time, unlike the previous one, the Government did not attach the letter from Senator Feinstein, which may perhaps shed a little bit more detail on where we are.

FOIA doesn't include a provision that the Court needs to wait on Senator Feinstein in order to be ready for us to proceed forward. So we'd ask for a briefing schedule to be set right away. And that any further request for extension of time be looked upon with disfavor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, what I'm going to do, I'm not going to require a declaration. I think that, Ms.

Shamsi, that the representations you've now heard on the record as opposed to just in private conversations with you are sufficient to give the Government's account. And given that I will also hold them to their agreement that you do not need to file an additional amended complaint or an additional FOIA request.

So let's set -- let's set briefing schedules then based off of the October 29th date. So, Ms. Mei, do you have a proposed schedule?

MS. MEI: We do, Your Honor. We could file a motion -- or opening briefs on summary judgment by December 12th.

THE COURT: Okay. And -- all right. Then

Ms. Shamsi? I'm sorry, one second. So are you anticipating

filing separate ones in the three cases or one brief in the

consolidated? And again, they're different, somewhat

different requests.

MS. MEI: I think we will file separate briefs in the three cases.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

So, Ms. Shamsi.

2.3

MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, if I may, just on the question about the declaration if you -- just a couple of points very briefly, which is that, DOJ was providing representations from the agency. We don't know whether those -- whether that was a miscommunication or a misrepresentation. And, Your Honor, I don't think you have, frankly, the record from the agency. And I'm not saying anything with respect to DOJ. I am expressing concerns about representations made to us and to the Court by the agencies through the DOJ and whether there was a miscommunication or

not. And that is solely the issue when we're talking about a 6,000 page report, whether on CD or not, that has gripped the nation's newspapers and public debate. I do think it is very serious, Your Honor, and I would very much ask you to reconsider your decision not to require a declaration, so that the record is clear so that we know whether it was a miscommunication or something else so that we may respond to that, and you may decide whether any further action needs to be taken, Your Honor.

2.2

2.3

THE COURT: But how would that affect the merits of the case, since -- well, we've been holding it pending declassification. So, if they had had it or not, if they'd seen it or not seen it, how would that affect the merits?

MS. SHAMSI: Well, it would affect the posture and the stance of the case, Your Honor, in this way, which is that we've been seeking these reports since last year, since 2013. We've sought to move forward and to obtain representations about the possession of the full report since June of this year. And there is a fundamental importance in FOIA that the public needs to have faith in the agencies fulfilling their statutory obligations and doing so in good faith themselves.

It would be important for us and the Court to know whether or not each of the representations made on a monthly basis over the course of the summer, that the full report was

not in the possession of the agencies, that meant that we did not move forward on briefing expeditiously the matter of whether this is an agency record or not. And, therefore, the public release of that record, that is significant. It was not just a day, it was multiple months over --

THE COURT: Well, but isn't that all -- and I understand your point, but isn't it all mooted by the declassification review?

MS. SHAMSI: No, Your Honor. Declassification review are two separate things because under FOIA, there is an independent obligation that this Court has to adjudicate the merits of any basis for withholding, whether that's agency record or exemptions themselves. The fact that we have not been able to brief to you that you have not been able to exercise your independent judgment, which is separate from the declassification issue with respect to the executive summary is, I think, significant.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.3

Ms. Mei, do you want to respond to that?

MS. MEI: Your Honor, I would just point out that there is no pending FOIA request for the full updated SSCI report at this time. We filed an answer saying that none of the agencies had received the full updated version, and there was an agreement by counsel that we would do our best to check and see when the agencies received that full report.

So, we were doing this not because of some legal obligation. We were doing this because we had agreed informally with counsel to do this. And the agreement was that, you know, I would -- we would check with the agency contacts and they would see what they had. And obviously there was a miscommunication. But again, that doesn't affect the merits of the case.

THE COURT: Okay.

Ms. Shamsi, do you want to respond?

MS. SHAMSI: One final word, Your Honor. And that's exactly the issue here, which is that we had asked for certainty about whether or not that report had been provided to the executive branch. We were told on a monthly basis that it had not been received. And again, this is a case that should not come as any surprise to any of the agencies that we were seeking the full report.

We've been seeking the full report since last year.

If it turned out that the CIA had that report in July or

August or September when representations were made that the

CIA didn't have the report, then we do think that that is a

significant issue because it relates to the good faith of the

agency in compliance with statutory obligations.

THE COURT: All right. Just a second.

(There was a pause in the proceedings.)

THE COURT: Okay. Your request is certainly not an

2.3

unreasonable one, but I think it's not required in this case given the Government's representations. And so I am going to move forward and set a briefing schedule on the documents as they are. So, they say they want to file December 12th. How long do you need?

2.3

MS. SHAMSI: We think that they should file in November, Your Honor, because this is a motion, again, there's now been in our view, we don't know how much delay there's been as a result of when the agency received the record or not. This is not an issue that is new to the agency. They've previously briefed the issue of agency record. We don't think —

THE COURT: Well, I think that this would be more than that. I mean, Ms. Mei, this is your summary judgment briefing, which will relate to your search and exemptions and everything, I trust. This isn't just a jurisdictional question; right?

MS. MEI: Your Honor, for the full SSCI report, I think it would be a jurisdictional question. For the other parts of it, there would be obviously other arguments. But yes, for the exemptions and the withholdings of the other records.

MS. SHAMSI: So, Your Honor, we would urge a

November date. And as you've correctly pointed out, there is
a search issue here. And we might seek to renew the search

1 issue with respect to the CIA as briefing goes forward. 2 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to say December 3 But the problem is if I do 30 days, that's Thanksgiving, and I think that's not terribly appropriate. 4 5 So, Ms. Shamsi, I'll give you whatever time you I know you want to move things along, so if you want 6 7 your opposition to be more quickly filed, fine. I know we've 8 got the holidays, so whatever you want, I'll accept. 9 Mr. Light, while she's checking her calendar, what's 10 your position for a date? 11 MR. LIGHT: First, Your Honor, you said December 5th 12 for the Government; correct? 13 THE COURT: Right, yes, uh-huh. 14 MR. LIGHT: We would actually ask that they have 15 until December 8. December 5th is a Friday. And our concern 16 is that if their due date is on a Friday, they're going to 17 release it in the evening when the public is not going to be paying attention to it. Let's give them until the 8th. 18 19 think they'll be happy to take until that date. 20 THE COURT: For their brief? 21 MR. LIGHT: For their summary judgment brief, I'll 22 give them an extra three days. 2.3 Okay. The 5th is fine. So what would THE COURT: 24 you like for yours?

MR. LIGHT: From the 5th, we could have our

25

opposition ready December 18th.

2.3

THE COURT: Ms. Shamsi, what -- again, I'll give you what you want, depending on -- meaning your schedule and the holidays, I'm happy to work with.

MS. SHAMSI: Yes, Your Honor, and thank you.

Because it's not just the holidays, we actually have two
other major briefs due during that time. I think we would
appreciate getting until January 9th, if the Government files
on the 5th, or January 12th, if the Government files on the
8th.

THE COURT: Okay. January 9th is fine.

And, Mr. Light, you can file early if you want, but I'll give you until the same date.

And then are you expecting to file an opposition and a cross-motion or just an opposition, Ms. Shamsi, if you know?

MS. SHAMSI: Your Honor, I expect to file an opposition and a cross-motion.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the Government's reply and opposition, so then how is January 30th for your reply and opposition?

MS. MEI: That will work.

THE COURT: All right. Then is February 14th good for the plaintiffs for their rely, Mr. Light?

MR. LIGHT: I think February 14th is a Saturday.

```
1
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, you're right. The 13th is
2
      what I meant.
 3
               MR. LIGHT: That's fine.
               THE COURT: Is that okay?
 4
 5
               MR. LIGHT:
                          Yes.
6
               THE COURT: Great.
 7
               Ms. Shamsi, does that work for you?
8
               MS. SHAMSI: It does, Your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Okay, good. So I'll memorialize these.
10
      And I'll also memorialize the order that the ACLU is not
11
      required to file an additional amended complaint or the usual
12
      FOIA request.
13
               All right. Any other issues then on these three
14
      cases, Ms. Shamsi?
15
               MS. SHAMSI: No, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Light?
17
               MR. LIGHT: I wasn't clear. The dates that we were
18
      just talking about, were those for all three cases or just
19
      the SSCI report and the Panetta report?
20
               THE COURT: I have expected they were for all three
21
      cases, is what I understood.
22
               MR. LIGHT:
                           Okay.
2.3
               THE COURT:
                          Do you agree with that, Ms. Mei?
24
               MS. MEI: Yes, Your Honor.
25
               MR. LIGHT: Okay. The third case that relates to
```

```
1
      the alleged CIA spying on the Senate computers doesn't
      involve the same kind of factual interconnection --
2
 3
                          Are you talking about the 1056 case?
               THE COURT:
               MR. LIGHT:
 4
                          Right.
 5
               THE COURT: We will do that afterwards.
6
               MR. LIGHT: Oh, okay.
 7
               THE COURT: Yeah, I'm sorry. The ones I was talking
8
      about today, this hearing is just your two 13-24, 1870 and
9
      48.
10
               MR. LIGHT:
                          Oh, those three. I thought you meant my
11
      three.
12
               THE COURT:
                          No.
13
               MR. LIGHT: All right. I understand that.
14
               THE COURT:
                          Okay. Thank you.
15
               Ms. Mei, anything else?
16
               MS. MEI: No, Your Honor.
17
               THE COURT:
                          All right.
                                       Thank you, folks.
18
      appreciate your patience and your diligence on this.
19
      look for the briefing.
20
                      Now let's call the 14-1056 case. So ACLU
               Okay.
21
      counsel are excused, thank you.
22
               MS. SHAMSI: Thank you.
2.3
                           I'll issue an order today memorializing
               THE COURT:
24
      the schedule.
```

Thank you.

25

MS. SHAMSI:

1	(Court adjourned in the above-entitled matter
2	at 10:00 a.m.)
3	- 0 -
4	
5	
6	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
7	I, Lisa Walker Griffith, certify that the foregoing
8	is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
9	above-entitled matter.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Lisa Walker Griffith, RPR Date
15	
16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	