

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

<b>IN RE :</b>	:	
<b>GUANTÁNAMO BAY</b>	:	<b>Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH)</b>
<b>DETAINEE LITIGATION</b>	:	
_____	:	
<b>YOUNOUS CHEKKOURI, et al.,</b>	:	
<b>Petitioners/Plaintiff,</b>	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>Civil No. 05-CV-0329 (PLF)</b>
<b>GEORGE W. BUSH, et al.,</b>	:	
<b>Respondents/Defendants.</b>	:	
_____	:	

**OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION,  
AND MOTION TO TRANSFER THIS CASE BACK TO THE MERITS JUDGE FOR  
ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner Younous Chekkouri, by and through his undersigned counsel, respectfully submits this opposition to the government’s omnibus motion for reconsideration, *see In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 1004) (“Gvt. Motion”), and the Court’s November 20, 2008 Minute Order directing the detainees to respond to the motion by November 26, 2008. Chekkouri also moves to transfer this case back to Judge Friedman (“Merits Judge”) for all further proceedings.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As to the motion to transfer, the government’s position is that Judge Hogan should address the issues related to the CMO and the motion for reconsideration in all of the coordinated detainee cases, including this case.

## PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Younous Chekkouri, a citizen of Morocco, was one of the first prisoners transferred to Guantánamo Bay in May 2002. He has been held there without charge or trial longer than most remaining prisoners. He also has one of the oldest remaining cases, filed in February 2005. Chekkouri's detention has been and continues to be indefinite and unlawful by any standard.

On June 12, 2008, the Supreme Court held that detainees at Guantánamo Bay have a constitutionally-protected right to petition for habeas relief. *See Boumediene v. Bush*, 128 S. Ct. 2229 (2008). The Court further held that “[w]hile some delay in fashioning new procedures is unavoidable, the costs of delay can no longer be borne by those who are held in custody. The detainees in these cases are entitled to a prompt habeas corpus hearing.” *Id.* at 2275. The detainee cases are now governed by the Habeas Corpus Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2241 *et seq.*, which sets forth specific guidelines for prompt resolution of these cases.

Yet the government plainly seeks by its motion for reconsideration to prolong Chekkouri's indefinite detention. The government's motion is simply the latest tactic in a long-standing strategy to deprive Chekkouri and other Guantánamo detainees of any meaningful opportunity to challenge the legality of their detention through habeas. Although Judge Hogan and the Merits Judge each ordered the parties in this case and other detainee cases to proceed on an individualized basis – and, indeed, invited the government to propose modifications to Judge Hogan's November 6, 2008 case management order in the context of this particular case – the government made no objection to that mode of proceeding. Rather, now that the courts have ruled, the government seeks to continue litigation essentially on a class-wide basis that is contrary to the courts' orders and serves only to delay consideration of the merits of this case.

The government's motion should be denied for three reasons: (1) because the government failed to meet and confer with Chekkouri's counsel as required by Local Civil Rule 7(m); (2) because the motion fails to establish any basis for reconsideration; and (3) because the motion does not address the particular facts and circumstances of this case, which would not warrant the relief sought by the government – *i.e.*, a further indefinite stay – if reconsideration were granted.<sup>2</sup>

This case should be transferred back to the Merits Judge for all further proceedings, for the reasons below.

### **BACKGROUND**

On July 2, 2008, this case was transferred to Judge Hogan for coordination and management pursuant to the Resolution of the Executive Session (D.D.C. July 1, 2008).

On July 11, 2008, Judge Hogan entered a scheduling order requiring the government to produce factual returns in each detainee case on a rolling basis. The government failed to comply with that schedule – which they had proposed – and moved to amend the schedule for production of returns. *See In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 317). Judge Hogan granted the motion on September 19, 2008, over the detainees' objections, but cautioned that “[g]oing forward . . . the government cannot claim as a

---

<sup>2</sup> Chekkouri also objects to the government's alternate request to certify these issues for appeal and for a stay pending appeal. There is no legitimate basis for an interlocutory appeal of a case management order pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Nor do the issues raised in the government's motion present substantial ground for difference of opinion. The government's suggestion that further appellate litigation in the detainee cases would materially advance the litigation also strains credulity in light of its consistent dilatory tactics.

basis for failing to meet deadlines imposed by this Court that it simply did not appreciate the full extent of the challenges posed.” *Id.* (misc. dkt. no. 466, at 6) (internal quotation marks omitted).<sup>3</sup>

Chekkouri’s amended factual return was consequently delayed. And when the government finally did produce the return, it attempted unilaterally to designate all non-classified information in the return as “protected,” thus preventing Chekkouri himself from reviewing the information. Indeed, to date, Chekkouri himself has not been able to review a single document contained in his return or prepare a response to the return.

In the meantime, Judge Hogan’s July 11, 2008 scheduling order also required the parties to submit briefs addressing the procedural framework to govern these cases. *See, e.g., id.* (misc. dkt. nos. 206, 231) (detainee briefs). Those briefs addressed nearly all of the issues raised in the government’s omnibus motion for reconsideration, including issues concerning production of exculpatory evidence and other discovery, the admissibility of hearsay evidence, and whether the government’s evidence should be afforded any presumptions.

On November 6, 2008, Judge Hogan issued a Case Management Order (“CMO”) to govern the coordinated detainee cases. The CMO resolved many of the issues addressed in the parties’ procedural framework briefs, and indicated (at p.2 n.1) that the judges to whom the cases are assigned for final resolution “may alter the framework based on the particular facts and circumstances of their individual cases,” and “will address procedural and substantive issues not covered in this [CMO].”

---

<sup>3</sup> Yet the government soon failed to comply once again, and sought further relief from their proposed schedule on October 31, 2008. *See In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 917).

The Merits Judge in this case has not entered any orders modifying Judge Hogan's orders.

On November 18, 2008, the government filed its omnibus motion for reconsideration, seeking a blanket stay of all detainee cases coordinated before Judge Hogan regardless of the facts and circumstances of the individual cases, and seeking the opportunity to relitigate issues that were addressed before Judge Hogan in the parties' procedural framework briefs. The government's motion made no mention of this case specifically. *See* Gvt. Motion.

On November 21, 2008, Judge Hogan entered an order staying the deadlines in the CMO pending resolution of the government's motion for reconsideration. *See In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 1026).

**I. THE GOVERNMENT'S BLANKET MOTION FAILS TO PROVIDE ANY BASIS FOR RECONSIDERATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS CASE**

**A. The Motion Should Be Denied for Failure to Meet and Confer**

The government's motion should be denied because counsel for the government failed to meet and confer with undersigned counsel as required by Local Civil Rule 7(m). Simply stated, the government made no good faith attempt to determine whether undersigned counsel objected to the requested relief or to narrow the areas of disagreement in this particular case.

A day prior to filing this motion, government counsel asked counsel for Chekkouri if he would stipulate to an unseen motion. Counsel for Chekkouri stated that he could not until he at least saw the proposed motion. No response was had until the motion was filed. The movant made no attempt to confer.

Accordingly, because counsel for the government failed to comply with Local Civil Rule 7(m), the motion for reconsideration should be denied on this basis alone. Rule 7(m) serves

important institutional purposes, and the courts should not treat a violation of the rule lightly.

*See Ellipso, Inc. v. Mann*, 460 F. Supp. 2d 99, 102 (D.D.C. 2006).<sup>4</sup>

**B. The Motion Should Be Denied for Failure to State Any Basis for Reconsideration**

The government cites Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) in support of its request for reconsideration of Judge Hogan's CMO. *See* Gvt. Motion at 10 n.7. But that rule provides no basis for reconsideration here.

Rule 54(b) governs motions for reconsideration that do not constitute final judgments. *See Singh v. George Washington Univ.*, 383 F. Supp. 2d 99, 101 (D.D.C. 2005). A court may reconsider an order pursuant to Rule 54(b) when it "patently misunderstood a party, has made a decision outside the adversarial issue presented to the Court by the parties, has made an error not of reasoning but of apprehension, or where a controlling or significant change in the law or facts [has occurred] since the submission of the issue to the Court." *Id.* (quoting *Cobell v. Norton*, 224 F.R.D. 266, 272 (D.D.C. 2004)). In general, a court will only consider a motion for reconsideration when the moving party demonstrates: "(1) an intervening change in the law; (2) the discovery of new evidence not previously available; or (3) a clear error of law in the first order." *Keystone Tobacco Co. v. U.S. Tobacco Co.*, 217 F.R.D. 235, 237 (D.D.C. 2003).  
Motions for reconsideration should not be used to "relitigate old matters." *Niedermeier v. Office*

---

<sup>4</sup> *See Penobscot Indian Nation v. HUD*, Civ. No. 07-1282 (PLF), 2008 WL 635740, at \*1 (D.D.C. Mar. 5, 2008) (order granting motion to strike papers filed in violation of Rule 7(m)); *Canady v. Erbe Elektromedizin GmbH*, 271 F. Supp. 2d 64, 75 n.19 (D.D.C. 2002) (denying plain-tiffs' motion to lift stay and awarding fees and costs to defendants); *see also United States v. Sci. Applications Int'l Corp.*, 555 F. Supp. 2d 40, 47 (D.D.C. 2008) (denying motion to strike because party "failed to comply with Rule 7(m) and meet its heavy burden in filing its motion to strike").

of *Max. S. Baucus*, 153 F. Supp. 2d 23, 29 (D.D.C. 2001) (addressing Rule 59(e)); *see also Singh*, 383 F. Supp. 2d at 101.

The standard for reconsideration is not met here. Indeed, nothing about the government's motion is particularly new. There are no new legal issues presented – all were previously addressed at length in the parties' procedural framework briefs – and the government does not identify any factual or legal issues that Judge Hogan misunderstood or overlooked in his case management orders. Rather, what the government plainly seeks to do is relitigate on a class-wide basis four central issues that have already been addressed in the parties' procedural framework briefs and resolved by Judge Hogan in the CMO: (1) the breadth of the required search for exculpatory evidence; (2) the provision for automatic discovery of detainee statements relating to the amended factual returns; (3) the requirement that the government provide counsel and the detainees themselves with classified information or "adequate substitutes" for classified information; and (4) the procedures governing the use of hearsay, presumptions in favor of the government's evidence, and the standard for an evidentiary hearing. *See Gvt. Motion at 2-3.*<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> To the extent the government seeks "clarification" of these and other issues, that request is likewise nothing more than an attempt to relitigate those issues on class-wide basis. For instance, on November 20, 2008, the government filed a notice pertaining to its purported compliance with Part I.D.1 of the CMO. *See In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 1022) ("Exculpatory Evidence Statement"). The notice stated that the government had complied with the requirement to produce exculpatory evidence to the extent that the CMO was intended to require a search for exculpatory evidence that is no broader than the search previously conducted by the government – an interpretation that conflicts not only with the plain language of the CMO but also with the express orders of Judge Sullivan, Judge Kessler and Judge Walton (who has since stayed the order) requiring a broader search for exculpatory evidence. *See Gvt. Motion at 5* (acknowledging these contrary orders); *Tr. of Status Hearing at 17, Habishi v. Bush*, No. 05-765 (EGS) (D.D.C. Oct. 30 2008) (discussing obligation of government attorneys to search for exculpatory evidence not in their immediate possession). In any case, the government has further acknowledged its failure

In its opposition to Chekkouri's motion to strike, the government concedes that the issues raised in its motion for reconsideration are the same as the issues addressed in the parties' procedural framework briefs before Judge Hogan: "The issues to be resolved by the Motion for Reconsideration are precisely the types of issues contemplated in the [July 1, 2008] transfer order. Only nine days after the transfer of cases to Judge Hogan, he ordered the parties to brief precisely these issues. The Motion for Reconsideration addresses nothing not addressed in the CMO." *In re Guantánamo Bay Detainee Litig.*, Misc. No. 08-442 (TFH) (D.D.C.) (misc. dkt. no. 1041, at 2). And that is precisely why the standard for reconsideration is not satisfied.

**C. Even if Reconsideration Were Granted, the Requested Relief Should Be Denied in the Context of This Particular Case**

The only arguably "new" relief requested by the government includes relief from the deadlines for compliance with the CMO, which the government contends would be unduly burdensome and threaten national security. The government specifically asks the courts to set a schedule for production of unclassified returns, which would require production of an unclassified return in this case by December 12, 2008. *See* Gvt. Motion at 31. The government also seeks a new schedule for "generalized briefing" regarding a presumption in favor of the government's evidence and the admissibility of hearsay evidence – matters already briefed at length before Judge Hogan. *Id.* In addition, the government seeks a staggered schedule for other

---

to provide all exculpatory evidence in its possession. *See* Gvt. Motion at 17 n.14 (admitting failure to produce all detainee denials of government's claims); Exculpatory Evidence Statement at 3 n.1 (admitting failure to produce all detainee denials of government's claims; all agency reports containing exculpatory evidence; and all exculpatory evidence identified after filing of returns). Accordingly, it is Chekkouri's position that the government has failed to comply with Part I.D.1 of the CMO, and that this failure does not trigger the time period under Part I.G for him to file a traverse.

proceedings in these cases, which, if accepted, might delay merits hearings in the detainee cases until the end of 2009 or perhaps early 2010.<sup>6</sup> Even if reconsideration were granted, which it should not be, these requests should be denied.

The government had the opportunity to propose modifications to the CMO in the context of this case. Instead, they have attempted to seek a blanket stay of the deadlines set forth in the CMO. In doing so, the government has failed to address whether its proposed modifications are necessary or relevant in the context of this particular case. For instance, the government argues at length that the CMO's provisions concerning the production of exculpatory evidence and other discovery are improper because they do not require a showing of relevance or materiality. *See, e.g.*, Gvt. Motion at 6, 14, 22-23. But the government does not address whether all or a portion of Chekkouri's specific requests for exculpatory evidence and other discovery already satisfy its proposed requirements of relevance or materiality. The government also questions whether it should be required to produce classified information to counsel for detainees who lack security clearances at the same classification level as the information at issue.

To the extent the government seeks modifications to the CMO on the ground of undue burden, the Court should require the government to propose those modifications in context of the

---

<sup>6</sup> The government also proposes for this first time in this case to require each detainee to file a "preliminary traverse" shortly after production of the unclassified return but before any discovery proceeds. Gvt. Motion at 31-32. Chekkouri objects to such a procedure, which is plainly intended to afford the government a preview of his trial strategies and counter-evidence, and to limit the government's discovery obligations. Such a procedure has already been rejected by Judge Sullivan and Judge Leon in other cases, and should be rejected here. *See, e.g.*, Tr. of Status Hearing at 17, *Habishi v. Bush*, No. 05-765 (EGS) (D.D.C. Oct. 30 2008) (Judge Sullivan: "I think that would be inappropriate. I don't think that would be beneficial for the petitioner in this case."); *Sliti v. Bush*, No. 05-429 (RJL) (D.D.C. Oct. 24, 2008 Status Conference); *Ghazy v. Bush*, No. 05-2223 (RJL) (D.D.C. Oct. 23, 2008 Status Conference).

specific facts and circumstances of this case to determine whether such modifications are necessary or appropriate.

In the meantime, the government should be required to proceed in compliance with the deadlines set forth in the CMO to ensure that this case proceeds expeditiously. Because this is a habeas case, the government bears a higher burden to justify delay than it would in an ordinary civil action. *See Boumediene v. Bush*, 128 S. Ct. 2229, 2275 (2008) (“While some delay in fashioning new procedures is unavoidable, the costs of delay can no longer be borne by those who are held in custody.”); *see also Yong v. INS*, 208 F.3d 1116, 1119 (9th Cir. 2000) (noting standard of review of district court decision to stay habeas proceeding “is somewhat less deferential than the flexible abuse of discretion standard applicable in other contexts”). The statutory provisions for prompt returns, immediate hearings, and summary disposition of habeas cases expressly require that petitions be heard and decided promptly. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241, 2243; *see also Braden v. 30th Jud. Cir. Ct. of Ky.*, 410 U.S. 484, 490 (1973) (noting interests of prisoner and society in “preserv[ing] the writ of habeas corpus as a swift and imperative remedy in all cases of illegal restraint or confinement”) (internal quotation marks omitted); *Yong*, 208 F.3d at 1120 (“[H]abeas proceedings implicate special considerations that place unique limits on a district court’s authority to stay a case in the interests of judicial economy.”) (citing cases).

Chekkouri has been in prison for nearly seven years without charge or trial and this case should not be stayed any longer.

**II. THIS CASE SHOULD BE TRANSFERRED TO THE MERITS JUDGE FOR ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS**


This case was initially transferred to Judge Hogan for coordination and management, including extensive briefing on the procedural framework for adjudicating detainee habeas cases.

The CMO established a framework to govern these cases, and indicated that the judges of this court may alter that framework based on the particular facts and circumstances of their individual cases. That is exactly what the Merits Judge in this case has already begun to do. Proceeding on an individual case-by-case basis is also the only practical way that the detainee cases will be resolved expeditiously as required by *Boumediene* and the Habeas Corpus Statute. Accordingly, Chekkouri requests that this case be transferred back to the Merits Judge for all further proceedings. If there are issues that need to be addressed after the government narrows its case, the Merits Judge is best suited to address those issues and ensure that this case is resolved expeditiously.

Date: Portland, Oregon  
November 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Counsel for Petitioner:



*Pro Hac Vice*  
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt  
1211 SW 5<sup>th</sup> AVENUE, #1500-2000  
Portland, OR 97204  
Telephone – 503.796.2939  
Facsimile – 503.796.2900

George Brent Mickum IV, Bar No. 396142  
KELLER AND HECKMAN, LLP  
1001 “G” Street, NW., Suite 500 W  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 434-4100/(202) 434-4646 (fax)  
[Mickum@KHLAW.Com](mailto:Mickum@KHLAW.Com)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Petitioners

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on November 26, 2008, I caused the foregoing OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION, AND CROSS-MOTION TO TRANSFER THIS CASE BACK TO THE MERITS JUDGE FOR ALL FURTHER PROCEEDINGS to be served on the following attorneys via electronic filing:

SCOTT M. MARCONDA  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division  
Federal Programs Branch  
Room 5130  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
202-305-8900  
Scott.Marconda@usdoj.gov

Brian David Boyle  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 4633  
Washington, DC 20530-0001  
(202) 3305-1434  
202-514-0238 (fax)  
brian.d.boyle@usdoj.gov

Terry Marcus Henry  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
CIVIL DIVISION  
P.O. Box 883  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Suite 7144  
Washington, DC 20044  
(202) 514-4107  
(202) 616-8470 (fax)  
terry.henry@usdoj.gov

Robert J. Katerberg  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
CIVIL DIVISION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530


(202) 616-8298  
(202) 616-8460 (fax)  
robert.katerberg@usdoj.gov

Robert D. Okun  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
Judiciary Center Building  
555 Fourth Street, NW  
Room 10-435  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 514-7282  
(202) 514-8784 (fax)  
robert.okun@usdoj.gov

Judry Laeb Subar  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
P.O. Box 833  
Suite 7342  
Washington, DC 20044-0833  
(202) 514-3969  
judry.subar@usdoj.gov

Andrew I. Warden  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,  
CIVIL DIVISION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 616-5084  
(202) 616-8460 (fax)  
andrew.warden@usdoj.gov

By:



Jan K. Kitchel