

Those facts also relate to the information requested by this Court in the July 29, 2008 Order. Therefore, we are seeking leave to submit a short Supplemental Declaration *in camera*.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Good Cause Exists to Protect Petitioner's Attorney-Client Communications.

Upon a showing of good cause, a court may make any order that justice requires to protect a party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Here, we ask this Court to protect the Petitioner from a potential violation of the attorney-client privilege. The attorney-client privilege protects confidential communications between a client and an attorney from disclosure. *See Clarke v. American Commerce Nat'l Bank*, 974 F.2d 127, 129 (9th Cir. 1992).

Good cause exists for this Court to grant the request. Petitioner seeks to submit *in camera* information that is confidential and protected by the attorney-client privilege. The one page Supplemental Declaration contains facts relating to the attorney-client relationship between counsel and Mr. Uthman and those facts are deserving of the protection sought. Absent such protection, counsel fears that Petitioner will be prejudiced in his pending matter before the Military Commissions.

B. The Request is Narrowly Tailored.

This request should be granted because it is narrowly tailored to cover only the specific facts that could jeopardize Petitioner's case before the Military Commissions. Indeed, counsel for Petitioner has publicly filed a lengthy declaration that does not contain confidential attorney-client information in response to the July 29, 2008 Order.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, counsel for Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court grant its request in the form of the [Proposed] Order filed herewith.

Dated: September 26, 2008
San Francisco, California

Respectfully submitted,

