

1 PETER D. KEISLER
 Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division
 2 CARL J. NICHOLS
 Deputy Assistant Attorney General
 3 DOUGLAS N. LETTER
 Terrorism Litigation Counsel
 4 JOSEPH H. HUNT
 Director, Federal Programs Branch
 5 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
 Special Litigation Counsel
 6 tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov
 ANDREW H. TANNENBAUM
 7 Trial Attorney
andrew.tannenbaum@usdoj.gov
 8 U.S. Department of Justice
 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
 9 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
 Washington, D.C. 20001
 10 Phone: (202) 514-4782/(202) 514-4263
 Fax: (202) 616-8460/(202) 616-8202/(202) 318-2461

11 Attorneys for Intervenor Defendant United States of America

12
 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15
 16 TASH HEPTING, GREGORY HICKS)
 CAROLYN JEWEL and ERIK KNUTZEN)
 17 on Behalf of Themselves and All Others)
 Similarly Situated,)
 18)
 Plaintiffs,)
 19)
 v.)
 20)
 21 AT&T CORP., AT&T INC. and)
 DOES 1-20, inclusive,)
 22)
 23 Defendants.)
 24)
 25)
 26)
 27)
 28)

Case No. C-06-0672-VRW
 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 Judge: The Hon. Vaughn R. Walker
 Hearing Date: June 21, 2006
 Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor

1 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE**

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, on June 21, 2006,¹ before the Honorable Vaughn R.
3 Walker, intervenor United States of America will move, pursuant to Rule 24(a) of the Federal
4 Rules of Civil Procedure, for an order allowing the United States to intervene in this action for
5 the purpose of seeking dismissal. The grounds in support of this motion are set out in the United
6 States' memorandum below.

7 **MEMORANDUM OF SUPPORTING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 Plaintiffs, subscribers of various communications services of AT&T Corporation, bring
10 this purported class action alleging that AT&T Corporation and AT&T Incorporated (together,
11 "AT&T") participated in a Government program to intercept and analyze Americans' telephone
12 and Internet communications in violation of certain federal electronic surveillance and
13 telecommunications statutes as well as the First and Fourth Amendments of the United States
14 Constitution. Through the present motion, the United States seeks to intervene in this action,
15 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a), for the purpose of seeking dismissal of this
16 action. For the reasons set forth below, the United States clearly meets all the requirements for
17 intervention under Rule 24(a): (1) its application for intervention is timely; (2) the United States
18 has a significantly protectable interest relating to the subject matter of this action, *i.e.*, the
19 preservation of state secrets, as set forth in its separate assertion of the military and states secrets
20 privilege, and the protection of information covered by statutory privileges; (3) the United States
21 needs to intervene because this action challenges alleged Government surveillance activities; and
22 (4) no other party in this lawsuit could adequately represent the United States' interest.
23 Accordingly, the United States' motion to intervene should be granted.

24 _____
25 ¹ The United States has filed an Administrative Motion to Set Hearing Date for the
26 United States' Motions requesting that the Court set the hearing date for this motion and the
27 United States' Motion To Dismiss Or, In The Alternative, For Summary Judgment, for June 21,
2006 – the present hearing date for Plaintiffs' Motion For Preliminary Injunction.

1 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

2 A. **The Terrorist Surveillance Program**

3 The President has explained that, following the devastating events of September 11,
4 2001, he authorized the National Security Agency (“NSA”) to intercept international
5 communications into and out of the United States of persons linked to al Qaeda or related
6 terrorist organizations. *See* Press Conference of President Bush (Dec. 19, 2005), *available at*
7 <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051219-2.html> (“President’s Press
8 Conference”). The Attorney General has further explained that in order to intercept a
9 communication, there must be “a reasonable basis to conclude that one party to the
10 communication is a member of al Qaeda, affiliated with al Qaeda, or a member of an
11 organization affiliated with al Qaeda.” Press Briefing by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales
12 and General Michael Hayden, Principal Deputy Director for National Intelligence (Dec. 19,
13 2005), *available at* <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051219-1.html>. The
14 purpose of these intercepts is to provide the United States with an early warning system to detect
15 and prevent another catastrophic terrorist attack on the United States. *See* President’s Press
16 Conference. The President has stated that the NSA activities “ha[ve] been effective in disrupting
17 the enemy, while safeguarding our civil liberties.” *Id.*

18 B. **Allegations in Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint**

19 Following the President’s statements, Plaintiffs filed the instant suit alleging that AT&T
20 is participating in a Government program to intercept and analyze vast quantities of Americans’
21 telephone and Internet communications “without the authorization of a court and in violation of
22 federal electronic surveillance and telecommunications statutes, as well as the First and Fourth
23 Amendments to the United States Constitution.” Amended Complaint for Damages, Declaratory
24 and Injunctive Relief (“Amended Complaint”) ¶ 2. Plaintiffs assert that the NSA began this
25 alleged classified surveillance program (which they call “the Program”) shortly after September
26 11, 2001, “to intercept the telephone and Internet communications of people inside the United
27

1 States without judicial authorization. . . .” *Id.* ¶ 32. Plaintiffs state that neither the President nor
2 the Attorney General personally approves the particular targets of the alleged surveillance;
3 instead, they assert, NSA operational personnel identify particular persons, telephone numbers or
4 Internet addresses as potential surveillance targets, with supervisory approval. *Id.* ¶¶ 36-37.

5 Plaintiffs further claim, based on their “information and belief,” that NSA personnel have
6 also “intercepted large volumes of domestic and international telephone and Internet traffic in
7 search of patterns of interest.” *Id.* ¶ 38. Plaintiffs allege that through this “data-mining
8 program,” the NSA intercepts “millions of communications made or received by people inside
9 the United States, and uses powerful computers to scan their contents for particular names,
10 numbers, words or phrases.” *Id.* ¶ 39. They claim that the NSA analyzes this communications
11 traffic data “to identify persons whose communications patterns the government believes may
12 link them, even if indirectly, to investigatory targets.” *Id.* ¶ 40. Plaintiffs allege that the NSA
13 has accomplished this surveillance program by “arranging with some of the nation’s largest
14 telecommunications companies, including AT&T, to gain direct access to the telephone and
15 Internet communications transmitted via those companies’ domestic telecommunications
16 facilities,” as well as to gain access to those companies’ communications records. *Id.* ¶ 41.

17 Plaintiffs claim that defendant AT&T has provided and continues to provide the
18 Government with direct access to all or a substantial number of the communications transmitted
19 through its domestic telecommunications facilities and has installed interception devices to allow
20 for such access. *Id.* ¶¶ 42-46. They further allege that AT&T used these interception devices,
21 and continue to use them, to acquire wire or electronic communications to which plaintiffs and
22 purported class members were a party, as well as to acquire other information pertaining to those
23 communications. *Id.* ¶ 47. And Plaintiffs allege that AT&T has provided the Government with
24 direct access to their databases of stored telephone and Internet records, including those of
25 Plaintiffs and the class members. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 48-52.

26 Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves as well as a nationwide class of
27

1 subscribers – past and present since September 2001 – of AT&T’s residential telephone or
2 Internet services.² *Id.* ¶ 65. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief and damages pursuant to
3 50 U.S.C. § 1810; 18 U.S.C. § 2520; 47 U.S.C. § 605; and 18 U.S.C. § 2707. *Id.* ¶ 66 & Counts
4 II-VI. They also seek declaratory and injunctive relief under the First and Fourth Amendments
5 of the U.S. Constitution. *Id.* ¶ 66 & Count I.

6 **ARGUMENT**

7 **THE UNITED STATES IS ENTITLED TO INTERVENE AS A MATTER OF RIGHT**

8 Rule 24(a) provides:

9 Upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in
10 an action: (1) when a statute of the United States confers an
11 unconditional right to intervene; or (2) when the applicant claims
12 an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the
13 subject of the action and the applicant is so situated that the
14 disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or
15 impede the applicant’s ability to protect that interest, unless the
16 applicant’s interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). A potential intervenor must meet four requirements to satisfy Rule 24(a):
18 “(1) the application for intervention must be timely; (2) the applicant must have a ‘significantly
19 protectable’ interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action; (3) the
20 applicant must be so situated that the disposition of the action may, as a practical matter, impair
21 or impede the applicant’s ability to protect that interest; and (4) the applicant’s interest must not
22 be adequately represented by the existing parties in the lawsuit.” *Southwest Ctr. for Biological
23 Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 817 (9th Cir. 2001) (citing *Northwest Forest Resource Council
24 v. Glickman*, 82 F.3d 825, 836 (9th Cir. 1996)). The Ninth Circuit generally construes Rule
25 24(a) liberally in favor of potential intervenors. *Southwest Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 268
26 F.3d at 818; *see also United States v. Alisal Water Corp.*, 370 F.3d 915, 919 (9th Cir. 2004) (“the

27 ² Plaintiffs also seek a subclass of California residents that are subscribers – past and
28 present since September 2001 – of AT&T’s residential telephone or Internet services. *Id.*
¶ 67. In addition to the relief sought by Plaintiffs and the nationwide class, the California
subclass seeks relief for alleged unfair, unlawful, and deceptive business practices. *See id.* Count
VII.

1 requirements for intervention are broadly interpreted in favor of intervention”). The United
2 States clearly meets all the standards for intervention.

3 First, there should be no question that the Government’s motion to intervene is timely
4 within the meaning of Rule 24. “In determining whether a motion for intervention is timely, we
5 consider three factors: ‘(1) the stage of the proceeding at which an applicant seeks to intervene;
6 (2) the prejudice to other parties; and (3) the reason for and length of the delay.’” *League of*
7 *United Latin American Citizens v. Wilson*, 131 F.3d 1297, 1302 (9th Cir. 1997) (quoting *County*
8 *of Orange v. Air California*, 799 F.2d 535, 537 (9th Cir. 1986)). This case is only in its initial
9 stages. Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint on February 22, 2006. *See* Docket No. 8. On
10 March 6, 2006, the parties filed a Stipulation Setting Uniform Time for Defendants and Possible
11 Intervener to Respond to Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint, in which the Court was advised of the
12 United States’ possible interest or participation in the matter. *See* Docket No. 13. On April 28,
13 2006, the United States filed its First Statement of Interest, which explained that the United
14 States had determined it would assert the military and state secrets privilege (hereinafter, “state
15 secrets privilege”) and that it would, by May 12, 2006, move to intervene in this case and seek
16 its dismissal. *See* Docket No. 82. The United States has thus moved to intervene and to dismiss
17 or, in the alternative, for summary judgment, prior to the scheduled hearing date for Plaintiffs’
18 motion for preliminary injunction (June 21, 2006), *see* Order Dated April 26, 2006 (Docket No.
19 78), and before the scheduling conference presently set for May 17, 2006. There can be no
20 dispute that this motion is timely.

21 Second, the United States clearly has an interest relating to the subject matter of this
22 action. This case involves a challenge to AT&T’s alleged role in the activities described by the
23 President relating to his authorization of NSA to intercept international communications into and
24 out of the United States of persons linked to al Qaeda or related terrorist organizations, as well as
25 challenges to alleged activities beyond those described by the President. The United States has
26 asserted the state secrets privilege and statutory privileges in this matter, and is hereby moving to
27

1 intervene for the purpose of moving to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment.³
2 Because the lawsuit challenges alleged intelligence activities of the United States and because
3 the United States has asserted the state secrets privilege and statutory privileges over information
4 at issue, the Government’s interest satisfies requirements of Rule 24(a).

5 Third, for these very reasons – that the lawsuit challenges alleged activities of the United
6 States and that the United States has asserted the state secrets privilege and statutory privileges –
7 the United States is simultaneously seeking dismissal or, in the alternative, summary judgment.
8 It is appropriate to permit the United States to intervene to seek such dismissal. *See*
9 *Zuckerbraun v. General Dynamics Corp.*, 935 F.2d 544, 546-48 (2nd Cir. 1991) (United States
10 intervened and successfully sought dismissal of the action based on the assertion of the state
11 secrets privilege); *Fitzgerald v. Penthouse Int’l, Ltd.*, 77 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4th Cir. 1985) (court
12 allowed intervention where United States has a national interest in proceedings); *see also Kasza*
13 *v. Browner*, 133 F.3d 1159, 1166 (9th Cir. 1998) (“if the very subject matter of the action’ is a
14 state secret, then the court should dismiss the plaintiff’s action based solely on the invocation of
15 the state secrets privilege”) (quoting *Reynolds*, 345 U.S. at 11 n. 26).

16 Finally, the United States’ interest is not adequately represented by the parties to the
17 litigation. In determining whether a potential intervenor’s interests will be adequately
18 represented by an existing party, courts consider: “(1) whether the interest of a present party is
19 such that it will undoubtedly make all the intervenor’s arguments; (2) whether the present party
20 is capable and willing to make such arguments; and (3) whether the would-be intervenor would
21 offer any necessary elements to the proceedings that other parties would neglect.” *Southwest*
22 *Ctr. for Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 822. The intervenor’s burden of showing that the
23 existing parties may not adequately represent its interest is “minimal,” and the potential
24

25 ³ The state secrets privilege permits the Government to protect against the unauthorized
26 disclosure in litigation of information that may harm national security interests. *See United*
27 *States v. Reynolds*, 345 U.S. 1, 7-8 (1953). Specific statutory privileges also permit the
Government to protect against disclosure of intelligence-related activities.

1 intervenor “need only show that representation of its interests by existing parties ‘may be’
2 inadequate.” *Id.* at 822-23 (citing *Trbobich v. United Mine Workers*, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n. 10
3 (1972)). The court’s focus should be on the “subject of the action.” *Southwest Center for*
4 *Biological Diversity*, 268 F.3d at 823 (citation omitted).

5 None of the parties has either the obligation or the ability to assert the state secrets
6 privilege or specified statutory privileges in this litigation. The privilege belongs to the
7 Government alone and cannot be asserted by private citizens. *See Reynolds*, 345 U.S. at 7-8
8 (state secrets privilege must be asserted by head of department which has control over issue).
9 Indeed, the parties are not aware of the breadth of the information covered by the privilege, and
10 because information covered by the privilege is classified, they would, in any event, be unable to
11 present the issues to the Court effectively and properly. Moreover, the parties’ interest may well
12 be in the *disclosure* of state secrets to the extent that doing so might assist them in presenting
13 their claims or defenses fully to vindicate their own private interests. Thus, only the United
14 States is in a position to protect against the disclosure of information over which it has asserted
15 the state secrets privilege, and the United States is the only entity properly positioned to explain
16 to the Court why continued litigation of the matter threatens the national security. Accordingly,
17 the United States should be permitted to intervene for the purpose of moving to dismiss this
18 action on state secrets grounds.

19 Having satisfied the requirements of Rule 24(a), the United States should be allowed to
20 intervene as of right.⁴

21
22
23
24
25 ⁴ In the alternative, Rule 24(b) allows for permissive intervention where the motion is
26 timely, the party has an interest in the litigation, and there is no undue delay or prejudice to the
27 parties in allowing the intervention. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)*. As the discussion above
demonstrates, the Government has met these standards for permissive intervention.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 Accordingly, the United States respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion to
3 intervene pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a).

4 Respectfully submitted,

5 PETER D. KEISLER
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division

6 CARL J. NICHOLS
7 Deputy Assistant Attorney General

8 DOUGLAS N. LETTER
Terrorism Litigation Counsel

9 JOSEPH H. HUNT
10 Director, Federal Programs Branch

11 *s/Anthony J. Coppolino*
12 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
Special Litigation Counsel
tony.coppolino@usdoj.gov

13 *s/Andrew H. Tannenbaum*
14 ANDREW H. TANNENBAUM
Trial Attorney
andrew.tannenbaum@usdoj.gov
15 U.S. Department of Justice
16 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
17 Washington, D.C. 20001
18 Phone: (202) 514-4782/(202) 514-4263
Fax: (202) 616-8460/(202) 616-8202/(202) 318-2461

19 Attorneys for Intervenor Defendant United States

20 DATED: May 12, 2006

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that the foregoing **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO**
3 **INTERVENE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** will be served by means of the
4 Court's CM/ECF system, which will send notifications of such filing to the following:
5

6 Electronic Frontier Foundation
7 Cindy Cohn
8 Lee Tien
9 Kurt Opsahl
10 Kevin S. Bankston
11 Corynne McSherry
12 James S. Tyre
13 545 Shotwell Street
14 San Francisco, CA 94110

15 Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP
16 Reed R. Kathrein
17 Jeff D. Friedman
18 Shana E. Scarlett
19 100 Pine Street, Suite 2600
20 San Francisco, CA 94111

21 Traber & Voorhees
22 Bert Voorhees
23 Theresa M. Traber
24 128 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 204
25 Pasadena, CA 91103

26 Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
27 Bruce A. Ericson
28 David L. Anderson
29 Patrick S. Thompson
30 Jacob R. Sorensen
31 Brian J. Wong
32 50 Freemont Street
33 PO Box 7880
34 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880

35 Sidney Austin LLP
36 David W. Carpenter
37 Bradford Berenson
38 Edward R. McNicholas
39 David L. Lawson
40 1501 K Street, NW
41 Washington, DC 20005

42 s/ Anthony J. Coppolino