

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  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TASH HEPTING, et al,	No	C-06-672 VRW
Plaintiffs,		ORDER
v		
AT&T CORPORATION, et al,		
Defendants.		

\_\_\_\_\_/

In addition to all other matters pertinent to the hearing noticed for June 23, 2006, the parties should be prepared to address the following questions:

1. Regardless how the court decides the government's motion to dismiss on state secret grounds, should the court grant an interlocutory appeal of that decision pursuant to 28 USC § 1292(b)?
2. If the court denies the government's motion to dismiss on state secret grounds and grants an interlocutory appeal, should the court stay proceedings?

- 1 3. How can the court minimize the conflict between plaintiffs'  
2 right to litigate this case and the government's duty to  
3 protect state secrets? See Ellsberg v Mitchell, 709 F2d 51,  
4 57 (DC Cir 1983) ("[T]he [state secret] privilege may not be  
5 used to shield any material not strictly necessary to prevent  
6 injury to national security; and, whenever possible, sensitive  
7 information must be disentangled from nonsensitive information  
8 to allow for the release of the latter.").
- 9
- 10 4. If the court does not dismiss this case, which of plaintiffs'  
11 claims is least likely to require discovery of classified  
12 evidence?
- 13
- 14 5. If a warrant is not required for the government via AT&T to  
15 intercept plaintiffs' communications, how can the Fourth  
16 Amendment's reasonableness requirement be adjudicated without  
17 implicating state secrets?
- 18
- 19 6. How can confirming or denying the existence of the alleged  
20 surveillance program at issue here, or AT&T's alleged  
21 participation in that program, constitute disclosure of a  
22 state secret when the program has been so widely reported in  
23 the public sphere?
- 24 //
- 25 //
- 26 //
- 27 //
- 28 //

- 1 7. If the litigation discloses that AT&T received a certification  
2 from the government, the existence of this certification would  
3 evince AT&T's involvement in some kind of surveillance  
4 program.
- 5
- 6 a. Could the difference between a possibility that AT&T is  
7 involved (based on public reports) versus a near  
8 certainty that AT&T is involved (if it received a  
9 certification) itself be a state secret?
- 10
- 11 b. In particular, consider a terrorist who would use the  
12 communications channels that are allegedly being  
13 monitored so long as he is not certain that they are  
14 being monitored. If this litigation reveals that AT&T  
15 has received a certification and is involved in some kind  
16 of surveillance program, might the risk to national  
17 security of disclosure of the certification be *de minimis*  
18 and not outweigh plaintiffs' due process rights?
- 19
- 20 8. Which of plaintiffs' claims could survive if AT&T received a  
21 certification from the government?
- 22
- 23 9. If the court denies the government's motion to dismiss on  
24 state secret grounds, what are the parties' positions on the  
25 possible appointment pursuant to FRE 706 of an expert to  
26 advise the court on state secret assertions with respect to  
27 particular pieces of evidence?
- 28

1 10. If the court decides to appoint an FRE 706 expert, what are  
2 the criteria that the court should use in making that  
3 appointment?  
4

5 11. If such an expert is appointed, what responsibilities should  
6 that expert have?  
7

8  
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10   
11

12 VAUGHN R WALKER

13 United States District Chief Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28