

1 **Jon B. Eisenberg, California Bar No. 88278** (jon@eandhlaw.com)  
2 **William N. Hancock, California Bar No. 104501** (bill@eandhlaw.com)  
3 **Eisenberg & Hancock LLP**  
4 1970 Broadway, Suite 1200 • Oakland, CA 94612  
5 510.452.2581 – Fax 510.452.3277

6 **Steven Goldberg, Oregon Bar No. 75134** (steven@stevengoldberglaw.com)  
7 River Park Center, Suite 300 • 205 SE Spokane St. • Portland, OR 97202  
8 503.445.4622 – Fax 503.238.7501

9 **Thomas H. Nelson, Oregon Bar No. 78315** (nelson@thnelson.com)  
10 P.O. Box 1211, 24525 E. Welches Road • Welches, OR 97067  
11 503.622.3123 - Fax: 503.622.1438

12 **Zaha S. Hassan, California Bar No. 184696** (zahahassan@comcast.net)  
13 8101 N.E. Parkway Drive, Suite F-2 • Vancouver, WA 98662  
14 360.213.9737 - Fax 866.399.5575

15 **J. Ashlee Albies, Oregon Bar No. 05184** (ashlee@sstcr.com)  
16 **Stenson, Schumann, Tewksbury, Creighton and Rose, PC**  
17 815 S.W. Second Ave., Suite 500 • Portland, OR 97204  
18 503.221.1792 – Fax 503.223.1516

19 **Lisa R. Jaskol, California Bar No. 138769** (ljaskol@earthlink.net)  
20 610 S. Ardmore Ave. • Los Angeles, CA 90005  
21 213.385.2977 – Fax 213.385.9089

22 **Attorneys for Plaintiffs Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., Wendell Belew and Asim  
23 Ghafoor**

24 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
25 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

26 **IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY ) MDL Docket No. 06-1791 VRW**  
27 **TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS )**  
28 **LITIGATION ) April 23, 2008; 10:00 a.m.**  
29 **)**  
30 **This Document Relates Solely To: ) MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO**  
31 **) DEFENDANTS’ SECOND MOTION TO**  
32 ***Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., et al. v. ) DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,***  
33 ***Bush, et al. (C07-CV-0109-VRW) ) FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT***  
34 **)**  
35 **) *Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., et***  
36 **) *al., v. Bush, et al.***

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|--|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION .....   | 1           |
| FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....   | 2           |
| I.    The FISA Context .....   | 2           |
| II.   The Warrantless Surveillance Program .....   | 3           |
| III.  Plaintiffs’ Surveillance .....   | 4           |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....  | 6           |
| I.    The Al-Haramain Complaint .....  | 6           |
| II.   The State Secrets Privilege .....  | 6           |
| III.  The Pretrial Motions and the Oregon District Court’s Decision .....  | 7           |
| IV.   The Ninth Circuit’s Decision .....   | 7           |
| ARGUMENT .....   | 8           |
| I.    FISA PREEMPTS THE COMMON LAW STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE. ....   | 8           |
| A.    FISA Strikes a Balance Between Protecting National Security and Safeguarding<br>Civil Liberties .....                                  | 8           |
| B.    The State Secrets Privilege is a Rule of Federal Common Law That Congress<br>May Preempt With a Comprehensive Regulatory Program ..... | 9           |
| C.    FISA’s Comprehensive Regulatory Program Speaks Directly to Protection of<br>National Security in FISA Litigation .....                 | 11          |
| 1.    FISA Section 1806(f) Speaks Directly to Security Procedures and<br>Rules of Disclosure. ....   | 11          |
| 2.    FISA Section 1810 Speaks Directly Against Outright Dismissal .....   | 14          |
| D.    FISA Section 1806(f) is Not Limited to “Acknowledged” Surveillance .....   | 15          |

1 II. EVEN IF THE STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE IS CONSTITUTIONALLY BASED, FISA  
2 STILL PREEMPTS THE PRIVILEGE THROUGH CONGRESS’S EXERCISE  
3 OF CONCURRENT CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY ..... 18  
4  
5 A. Congress Has Constitutional Authority to Regulate Protection of State Secrets . . 18  
6  
7 B. The President Lacks Inherent Power to Disregard Congressional Preemption  
8 of the State Secrets Privilege ..... 19  
9  
10 III. THE NINTH CIRCUIT DID NOT PRECLUDE ADJUDICATION OF THE FACT OF  
11 PLAINTIFFS’ SURVEILLANCE ..... 22  
12  
13 IV. DEFENDANTS PREMATURELY ASSERT SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, WHICH IN  
14 ANY EVENT DOES NOT BAR THIS ACTION. .... 24  
15  
16 CONCLUSION ..... 28  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

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

*ACLU Foundation v. Barr*, 952 F.2d 457 (D.C. Cir. 1991) . . . . . 17

*Adams v. City of Battle Creek*, 250 F.3d 980 (6th Cir. 2001) . . . . . 25

*Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 528 U.S. 216 (2000) . . . . . 27

*Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 253 (1967) . . . . . 19

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc. v. Bush*, 451 F. Supp.2d 1215 (D. Ore. 2006) . . . . . 7, 12

*Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc. v. Bush*, 507 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2007) . . . . . 7, 9, 11, 20, 23

*Asmar v. U.S. Dept. of Treasury*, 680 F.Supp. 248 (E.D. Mich. 1987) . . . . . 25

*Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976) . . . . . 22

*Burgos v. Milton*, 709 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1983) . . . . . 25

*Butz v. Economou*, 438 U.S. 478 (1978) . . . . . 26

*Campbell v. United States*, 365 U.S. 85 (1961) . . . . . 18

*City of Mesquite v. Aladdin’s Castle, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 283 (1982) . . . . . 27

*Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681 (1997) . . . . . 22

*County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation*, 470 U.S. 226 (1985) . . . . . 11

*Dickerson v. United States*, 530 U.S. 428 (2000) . . . . . 10

*Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.*, 528 U.S. 167 (2000) . . . . . 27

*Gilbert v. DaGrossa*, 756 F.2d 1455 (9th Cir. 1985) . . . . . 25

*Halkins v. Helms*, 690 F.2d 977 (D.C. Cir. 1982) . . . . . 9

*Halpern v. U.S.*, 258 F.2d 36 (2d Cir. 1958) . . . . . 14, 15

*Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (2006) . . . . . 19, 21, 22

*Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507 (2004) . . . . . 20

1 *Home Building & Loan Ass’n v. Blaisdell*, 290 U.S. 398 (1934) ..... 22

2 *In re United States*, 872 F.2d 472 (D.C. Cir. 1989) ..... 10

3 *ITSI TV Productions, Inc. v. Agricultural Associations*, 3 F.3d 1289 (9th Cir. 1993) ..... 18

4 *Kasza v. Browner*, 133 F.3d 1159 (9th Cir. 1998) ..... 6, 9, 11

5 *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159 (1985) ..... 26

6 *Lane v. Pena*, 518 U.S. 187 (1996) ..... 24

7 *Milwaukee v. Illinois*, 451 U.S. 304 (1981) ..... 9, 10

8 *Mistretta v. United States*, 488 U.S. 361 (1989) ..... 20

9 *Monarch Assur. P.L.C. v. U.S.*, 244 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ..... 10

10 *Multi Denominational Ministry of Cannabis and Rastafari, Inc. v. Gonzales*, 474 F. Supp.2d 1133

11 (N.D. Cal. 2007) ..... 24, 25

12 *Organizacion JD Ltda. v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 18 F.3d 91 (2d Cir. 1994) ..... 25

13 *Rochon v. Gonzales*, 438 F.3d 1211 (D.C. Cir. 2006) ..... 25

14 *Salazar v. Heckler*, 787 F.2d 527 (10th Cir. 1986) ..... 25

15 *SD Warren Co. v. Maine Board of Environmental Protection*, 547 U.S. 370 (2006) ..... 16

16 *Shelton v. United States*, 404 F.2d 1292 (D.C. Cir. 1968) ..... 19

17 *Tenet v. Doe*, 544 U.S. 1 (2005) ..... 10

18 *United States v. Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company*, 191 U.S. 84 (1903) ..... 18

19 *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683 (1974) ..... 10, 22

20 *United States v. Reynolds*, 345 U.S. 1 (1953) ..... 6, 10

21 *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58 (1989) ..... 25

22 *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952) ..... 2, 18, 20, 21, 22

23 *Zucherbraun v. General Dynamics Corp.*, 935 F.2d 544 (2d Cir. 1991) ..... 10

24

25

26

27

28

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

**CONSTITUTION, STATUTES AND RULES**

U.S. Const., art. I, § 8 ..... 18, 19

10 U.S.C. § 801 ..... 21

18 U.S.C. § 2520(a) ..... 14, 24

18 U.S.C. § 2707(a) ..... 14, 25

18 U.S.C. § 2712(a) ..... 16, 26

18 U.S.C. § 2712(b)(4) ..... 16

28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) ..... 7

35 U.S.C. § 181 ..... 14

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... 25, 26

42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c) ..... 25

47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(A) ..... 14

50 U.S.C. § 1801(f)(2) ..... 5

50 U.S.C. § 1801(i) ..... 3

50 U.S.C. § 1801(m) ..... 24, 25, 26

50 U.S.C. § 1806(a) ..... 26

50 U.S.C. § 1806(c) ..... 15

50 U.S.C. § 1806(d) ..... 15

50 U.S.C. § 1806(e) ..... 15

50 U.S.C. § 1806(f) ..... *passim*

50 U.S.C. § 1809 ..... 3, 24

50 U.S.C. § 1810 ..... *passim*

50 U.S.C. § 1825(a) ..... 26

1 50 U.S.C. § 1845(a) ..... 26  
 2 Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m) ..... 27  
 3 Fed. R. Evid. 501 notes of Committee on the Judiciary ..... 10  
 4

5 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

6 BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 1084 (7th ed. 1999) ..... 16  
 7 Excerpt from Press Conference of the President (Dec. 19, 2005) ..... 5  
 8 124 CONG. REC. 10,903-04 (1978) ..... 11, 14  
 9 H. CONF. REP. NO. 95-1720 (1978) ..... 9, 13, 14, 21  
 10 H. REP. NO. 95-1283(I) (1978) ..... 2, 13  
 11 Letter from Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales to Senator Patrick Leahy (Jan. 17, 2007) ... 27  
 12 National Security Agency Act of 1959 ..... 17  
 13 S. REP. NO. 95-604(I) (1977) ..... 2, 9, 13  
 14 S. REP. NO. 95-701 (1978) ..... 13  
 15 THE FEDERALIST NO. 47 (James Madison) ..... 22  
 16 U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Legal Authorities Supporting the Activities of the National Security Agency*  
 17 *Described by the President* (Jan. 19, 2006) ..... 3, 19  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

## INTRODUCTION

1  
2 This lawsuit challenges defendants' warrantless electronic surveillance of Al-Haramain Islamic  
3 Foundation, Inc. and two of its lawyers, Wendell Belew and Asim Ghafoor. The United States Court  
4 of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has remanded the case to this Court for a determination whether the  
5 Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) preempts the state secrets privilege. If FISA preempts  
6 the privilege, this Court can proceed to determine plaintiffs' standing and, thereafter, the merits of this  
7 lawsuit.

8 FISA was enacted to curb governmental abuses of modern electronic surveillance capabilities  
9 by requiring a warrant for the sort of eavesdropping to which plaintiffs were subjected. FISA created  
10 an exclusive statutory framework for the domestic use of electronic surveillance to acquire foreign  
11 intelligence information – and for litigating claims of unlawful surveillance – in order to prevent the  
12 Executive Branch from unnecessarily intruding on civil liberties in the name of national security.

13 FISA strikes a balance between two potentially competing interests – protecting national  
14 security and safeguarding civil liberties – by authorizing the courts to adjudicate claims of unlawful  
15 surveillance within the protective framework of *ex parte* and *in camera* proceedings. In contrast, the  
16 state secrets privilege – which permits exclusion of evidence from litigation or, in rare instances,  
17 outright dismissal of a lawsuit when the government successfully asserts national security concerns  
18 – abides no such balancing of interests, at the expense of civil liberties. FISA's protective framework  
19 for litigating claims of unlawful surveillance preempts the state secrets privilege by embracing the  
20 balancing of interests that the state secrets privilege eschews.

21 Preemption also results from the prescription of a private right of action for FISA violations,  
22 which is wholly inconsistent with the state secrets privilege – for, absent such preemption, the  
23 government could evade private lawsuits at will, making the private right completely illusory.  
24 Congress cannot possibly have envisioned use of the state secrets privilege to subvert FISA's statutory  
25 scheme for challenging unlawful surveillance.

26 Defendants claim the state secrets privilege is rooted in the Constitution, and thus any effort  
27 by Congress to preempt the privilege is constitutionally suspect. The Ninth Circuit has said otherwise:  
28 The privilege is one of federal common law. As such, it is subject to congressional preemption with



1 a comprehensive regulatory scheme like FISA. And even if the privilege is constitutionally based, that  
2 just means the President and Congress have concurrent constitutional authority to regulate protection  
3 of state secrets. According to the formulation set forth in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co. v. Sawyer*,  
4 343 U.S. 579 (1952) for determining the parameters of such concurrent authority under our  
5 Constitution’s separation of powers and its system of checks and balances, Congress can preempt the  
6 privilege, even if it is constitutionally based, by enacting legislation like FISA that puts presidential  
7 power at its lowest ebb.

8 Defendants claim the President has inherent power to disregard FISA entirely, but the  
9 *Youngstown* formulation forecloses that claim. The President does *not* have inherent power to ignore  
10 FISA. Congress having passed – and the 39th President having signed – laws regulating electronic  
11 surveillance and prescribing security procedures for litigating claims of unlawful surveillance, the 43rd  
12 President must follow those laws.

13 The protective statutory framework for FISA litigation enables this lawsuit to go forward, with  
14 ample safeguards to protect national security, so that this Court can proceed to decide the merits of this  
15 case.

## 16 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

### 17 **I. The FISA Context**

18 Congress enacted FISA in 1978 as a response to past instances of abusive warrantless  
19 wiretapping by the National Security Agency (NSA) and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). *See*  
20 H. REP. NO. 95-1283(I), at 21-22 (1978), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. E; S. REP. NO. 95-604(I), at  
21 7-8 (1977), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F.<sup>1/</sup> FISA provides an exclusive framework for the domestic  
22 use of electronic surveillance to acquire foreign intelligence information. *See* H. REP. NO. 95-1283(I),  
23 *supra*, at 22 (FISA prescribes “the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance, as defined, could  
24 be used for foreign intelligence purposes”), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. E; S. REP. NO. 95-604(I),  
25 *supra*, at 6 (FISA, combined with the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968,  
26 “constitutes the exclusive means by which electronic surveillance, as defined, . . . may be conducted;

---

27  
28 <sup>1/</sup> All citations to the “Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg” are to the declaration and exhibits filed  
simultaneously with this memorandum.

1 the bill recognizes no inherent power of the President in this area”), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F.

2 With narrow exceptions not applicable here, FISA requires the government to obtain a court  
3 order – that is, a warrant – in order to conduct electronic surveillance of a “United States person,”  
4 meaning a citizen, resident alien or association of such persons. 50 U.S.C. § 1801(i). FISA imposes  
5 criminal penalties for its violation, making it an offense to “engage[] in electronic surveillance under  
6 color of law except as authorized by statute.” 50 U.S.C. § 1809(a)(1). FISA also imposes civil  
7 liability for its violation. Victims of unlawful electronic surveillance “shall have a cause of action  
8 against any person who committed such violation” and “shall be entitled to recover” actual damages,  
9 punitive damages, and reasonable attorney’s fees and costs. 50 U.S.C. § 1810.

## 10 **II. The Warrantless Surveillance Program**

11 Shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, President Bush authorized a secret  
12 program for the NSA to engage in warrantless electronic surveillance of international communications  
13 into and out of the United States where the NSA believed that one of the participants was affiliated  
14 with or working in support of al-Qaeda. President Bush regularly re-authorized the warrantless  
15 surveillance program at 45-day intervals upon written certifications by the Department of Justice  
16 (DOJ) until January 2007, when the program purportedly was suspended. The warrantless surveillance  
17 program did not comply with the requirements of FISA. In a 42-page “White Paper” the DOJ issued  
18 in January 2006, defendants have publicly asserted their legal justifications for the program. *See* U.S.  
19 Dept. of Justice, *Legal Authorities Supporting the Activities of the National Security Agency Described*  
20 *by the President* (Jan. 19, 2006), available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/whitepaperonnsalegalauthoriti>  
21 [es.pdf](http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/whitepaperonnsalegalauthorities.pdf), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. A at 11-12, 34.

22 As of early March 2004, former Attorney General John Ashcroft and former Deputy Attorney  
23 General James B. Comey had determined that the warrantless surveillance program was unlawful.  
24 Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. A at 11-12, 33-34. During a meeting at the White House on March 9,  
25 2004 – two days before the DOJ’s next 45-day written re-certification was due – Comey conveyed this  
26 conclusion to Vice-President Dick Cheney and members of his and the President’s staffs, telling them  
27 the DOJ would not re-certify the program. *Id.*, Ex. A at 11-12, 31, Ex. B at 2, 4. The Director of the

28 //

1 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Robert S. Mueller III – one of the defendants in this case – also  
2 harbored what he called “serious reservations” about the program’s legality. *Id.*, Ex. C at 27. On  
3 March 10, 2004, while Ashcroft was hospitalized, two White House officials went to Ashcroft’s  
4 bedside and attempted to obtain the written re-certification from Ashcroft, but he refused. *Id.*, Ex. A  
5 at 10, 14. Nevertheless, despite the advice that the warrantless surveillance program as then  
6 constituted was unlawful, the President did not direct Comey or the FBI to discontinue or suspend any  
7 portion of the program. Instead, the program went ahead without the DOJ’s re-certification for a  
8 period of several weeks – the precise time when the plaintiffs in the present case were subjected to  
9 surveillance. *Id.*, Ex. A at 27-28, 32-33, 43, Ex. B at 4.

### 10 **III. Plaintiffs’ Surveillance**

11 In February 2004, defendant Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) temporarily froze the  
12 assets of plaintiff Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc., pending a proceeding to determine whether  
13 to declare Al-Haramain a “Specially Designated Global Terrorist” organization. Decl. of Barbara C.  
14 Hammerle ¶ 4.<sup>2/</sup> On August 20, 2004, in the course of that proceeding, OFAC produced a group of  
15 unclassified materials to Al-Haramain counsel Lynne Bernabei, who gave copies to five other Al-  
16 Haramain lawyers, including plaintiffs Wendell Belew and Asim Ghafoor, and to Al-Haramain  
17 directors Soliman al-Buthi and Pirouz Sedaghaty. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶¶ 3-8; Decl. of Lynne  
18 Bernabei ¶¶ 4-6; Decl. of Wendell Belew ¶ 4; Decl. of Asim Ghafoor ¶ 4.

19 Also included in this production – evidently by accident – was a document (hereafter “the  
20 Document”) bearing an extremely high top secret classification. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶ 4;  
21 Suppl. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶¶ 4-5. In late August 2004, the FBI was notified of the  
22 Document’s inadvertent disclosure. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶ 3; Suppl. Decl. of Frances R.  
23 Hourihan ¶ 3. In mid-October 2004, FBI agents retrieved copies of the Document from all counsel.  
24 Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶ 7; Suppl. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶ 7; Decl. of Lynne Bernabei  
25 ¶ 9; Decl. of Wendell Belew ¶¶ 5-6, Decl. of Asim Ghafoor ¶¶ 5-7. The FBI did not, however, contact

---

27 <sup>2/</sup> The declarations of Barbara C. Hammerle, Frances R. Hourihan, Lynne Bernabei, Wendell  
28 Belew, and Asim Ghafoor cited in this memorandum are on file with this Court, having been filed  
in connection with prior proceedings.

1 Al-Buthi or Sedaghaty, who were living overseas at the time. Decl. of Frances R. Hourihan ¶ 8. The  
2 Document demonstrates that, in March and April of 2004 – during the period when the Attorney  
3 General and other high governmental officials had determined that the warrantless surveillance  
4 program was unlawful yet it went forward without certification – Al-Haramain and its attorneys were  
5 subjected to warrantless electronic surveillance in violation of FISA.

6 Testimony by Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell and NSA Director Keith  
7 Alexander before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has confirmed that plaintiffs’  
8 surveillance was within the scope of FISA’s requirement of a warrant. One of FISA’s definitions of  
9 the types of “electronic surveillance” that invoke the warrant requirement is “the acquisition . . . of the  
10 contents of any wire communication to or from a person in the United States . . . *if such acquisition*  
11 *occurs in the United States . . . .*” 50 U.S.C. § 1801(f)(2) (emphasis added). McConnell and  
12 Alexander explained that, because of technological innovations since FISA’s inception,  
13 communications between persons located inside and outside the United States are now transmitted  
14 over wire, and the interception of such communications occurs *in the United States*. Decl. of Jon B.  
15 Eisenberg, Ex. D at 7-9, 22-23. Thus, according to McConnell, “when seeking to monitor foreign  
16 persons suspected of involvement in terrorist activity who are physically located in foreign countries,  
17 the intelligence community is required under today’s FISA [50 U.S.C. § 1801(f)(2)] to obtain a court  
18 order to conduct surveillance.” *Id.*, Ex. D at 9. The communications at issue in this case occurred  
19 between persons located inside and outside the United States. Those communications thus were  
20 “electronic surveillance” within the scope of FISA.

21 The applicability of section 1801(f)(2) to this case was previously obscured by President  
22 Bush’s assertion on December 19, 2005 – now known to be untrue – that “these calls are not  
23 intercepted within the country.” *See* Excerpt from Press Conference of the President (Dec. 19, 2005),  
24 *available at* <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051219-2.html>, Decl. of Jon B.  
25 Eisenberg, Ex. J.

26 //

27 //

28 //

1 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

2 **I. The *Al-Haramain* Complaint**

3 On February 28, 2006, plaintiffs Al-Haramain, Belew and Ghafoor filed a complaint in the  
4 United States District Court for the District of Oregon alleging a private cause of action under FISA.  
5 The complaint also alleges violations of the constitutional separation of powers, the First, Fourth and  
6 Sixth Amendments, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

7 The complaint alleges that defendants “have engaged in electronic surveillance of plaintiffs  
8 without court orders.” Compl. ¶ 2. Specifically, the complaint alleges that in March and April 2004,  
9 the NSA targeted and engaged in electronic surveillance of attorney-client communications between  
10 a director or officer of Al-Haramain and its attorneys Belew and Ghafoor without obtaining a warrant  
11 or otherwise complying with FISA, and that in May 2004 the NSA gave logs of those surveilled  
12 communications to OFAC. *Id.*, ¶¶ 19-20. Along with the complaint, plaintiffs filed a copy of the  
13 Document under seal with the Oregon district court in order to establish the fact of their surveillance  
14 and thus their standing as “aggrieved” persons to assert a private cause of action under FISA.

15 **II. The State Secrets Privilege**

16 Defendants responded to this lawsuit by invoking the state secrets privilege, which – where  
17 applicable – allows the government to refuse discovery of classified information that poses a risk to  
18 national security if publicly disclosed. *United States v. Reynolds*, 345 U.S. 1, 6, 10 (1953). In *Kasza*  
19 *v. Browner*, 133 F.3d 1159, 1165 (9th Cir. 1998), the Ninth Circuit explained the state secrets privilege  
20 as follows: The state secrets privilege is “a common law evidentiary privilege.” *Id.* It “allows the  
21 government to deny discovery of military secrets” which, in the interest of national security, should  
22 not be divulged. *Id.* “Once the privilege is properly invoked and the court is satisfied as to the danger  
23 of divulging state secrets, the privilege is absolute.” *Id.* at 1165-66. The government can invoke the  
24 privilege with regard to “particular evidence,” so that the privileged evidence “is completely removed  
25 from the case,” which then “goes forward based on evidence not covered by the privilege.” *Id.*  
26 Further, if the “very subject matter of the action” is a state secret, the court must “dismiss the  
27 plaintiff’s action.” *Id.*

28 //

### 1 **III. The Pretrial Motions and the Oregon District Court's Decision**

2 Defendants filed a motion for dismissal of this action, or alternatively for summary judgment,  
3 based on the state secrets privilege. They also filed a motion to bar plaintiffs from having access to  
4 the Document. Plaintiffs responded that (1) FISA section 1806(f) preempts the state secrets privilege  
5 and vests the district court with authority to permit use of the Document under secure conditions to  
6 determine plaintiffs' standing, and (2) even if the state secrets privilege applies here, it does not require  
7 dismissal of this lawsuit.

8 In an opinion filed September 7, 2006, the Oregon district court declined to dismiss the action  
9 or grant summary judgment based on the state secrets privilege, concluding that the warrantless  
10 surveillance program is no longer a secret to the general public and, because of the Document's  
11 inadvertent disclosure, "it is not a secret to plaintiffs whether their communications have been  
12 intercepted." *Al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Inc. v. Bush*, 451 F. Supp.2d 1215, 1222-23 (D. Ore.  
13 2006). Instead, the judge said he would "permit plaintiffs to file *in camera* any affidavits attesting to  
14 the contents of the document from their memories to support their standing in this case and to make  
15 a *prima facie* case." *Id.* at 1229.

16 The Oregon district court did not decide the issue whether FISA preempts the state secrets  
17 privilege, saying "I decline to reach this very difficult question at this time, which involves whether  
18 Congress preempted what the government asserts is a constitutionally-based privilege." *Id.* at 1231.  
19 The court noted, however, that defendants' arguments against preemption "would nullify FISA's  
20 private remedy and would be contrary to the plain language of Section 1806(f)." *Id.*

### 21 **IV. The Ninth Circuit's Decision**

22 The Ninth Circuit granted defendants' request to permit an interlocutory appeal pursuant to 28  
23 U.S.C. section 1292(b). Thereafter, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation transferred the action  
24 to this Court. On November 16, 2007, the Ninth Circuit reversed the Oregon district court's decision  
25 and ordered the case remanded to this Court for further proceedings. *Al-Haramain Islamic*  
26 *Foundation, Inc. v. Bush*, 507 F.3d 1190 (9th Cir. 2007). The Ninth Circuit held that the Oregon  
27 district court properly determined the warrantless surveillance program is no longer a state secret, but  
28 that the district court erred in permitting the plaintiffs to establish their standing by filing affidavits

1 describing the Document from memory, because the Document is a state secret and the district court's  
2 ruling was an improper "back door around" the state secrets privilege. *Id.* at 1193.

3 The Ninth Circuit did not decide whether FISA preempts the state secrets privilege. Noting  
4 that this issue has now become "central to Al-Haramain's ability to proceed with this lawsuit," *id.* at  
5 1205-06, the Ninth Circuit said: "Rather than consider the issue for the first time on appeal, we remand  
6 to the district court to consider whether FISA preempts the state secrets privilege and for any  
7 proceedings collateral to that determination." *Id.* at 1206.<sup>3/</sup>

## 8 ARGUMENT

### 9 I. FISA PREEMPTS THE COMMON LAW STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE.

#### 10 A. FISA Strikes a Balance Between Protecting National Security and Safeguarding 11 Civil Liberties.

12 We begin with the issue that the Ninth Circuit remanded for this Court's decision: whether  
13 FISA preempts the state secrets privilege. The answer is that FISA preempts the privilege via two  
14 statutory provisions: FISA section 1810, which prescribes the private cause of action, and FISA section  
15 1806(f), which prescribes security procedures for FISA litigation.

16 FISA's legislative history demonstrates Congress's intent to strike a balance between two  
17 potentially competing interests – protecting national security and safeguarding civil liberties. Enacted  
18 in the wake of governmental abuses of modern surveillance techniques, FISA is intended to restore  
19 that balance by (1) prescribing an exclusive framework for the domestic use of electronic surveillance  
20 to acquire foreign intelligence information, and (2) specifying the judiciary's role in approving  
21 proposed surveillance and determining the legality of past surveillance. After extensive deliberation  
22 and debate, Congress concluded that protection of civil liberties requires comprehensive judicial  
23 oversight of electronic surveillance conducted in the name of national security, as a check against  
24 documented overreaching by the Executive Branch. A 1978 House Conference Report explained that  
25 section 1806(f) "adequately protects the rights of the aggrieved person" and at the same time "ensures

---

26 <sup>3/</sup> The remanded issue is a pure question of law. Defendants, however, have lodged *in camera*  
27 and *ex parte* a secret "Classified Supplemental Memorandum" in support of their second dismissal  
28 motion. Absent some legitimate justification (which is difficult to imagine) for filing a secret  
argument on a pure question of law, plaintiffs object to this secret filing.

1 adequate protection of national security interests.” H. CONF. REP. NO. 95-1720, at 32 (1978), Decl.  
2 of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. G. Similarly, a Senate Judiciary Committee report called section 1806(f) “a  
3 reasonable balance between an entirely in camera proceeding . . . and mandatory disclosure, which  
4 might occasionally result in the wholesale revelation of sensitive foreign intelligence information.”  
5 S. REP. NO. 95-604(I), *supra*, at 58, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F.

6 In this respect, FISA departs from the state secrets privilege, where the rule of outright  
7 dismissal precludes any balancing of competing interests. *See Halkins v. Helms*, 690 F.2d 977, 997  
8 n.71 (D.C. Cir. 1982) (“the state secrets privilege, being absolute, requires no such balancing”).  
9 Section 1806(f), in contrast, embraces such balancing – and thereby preempts the state secrets privilege  
10 – by prescribing a procedure whereby the courts can safeguard civil liberties by adjudicating claims  
11 of unlawful surveillance yet protect national security by considering sensitive information *ex parte* and  
12 *in camera*.

13 **B. The State Secrets Privilege is a Rule of Federal Common Law That Congress May**  
14 **Preempt With a Comprehensive Regulatory Program.**

15 The threshold question is whether the state secrets privilege arises from the Constitution or  
16 from federal common law. This question is important because the Supreme Court has prescribed a  
17 special standard for determining preemption of federal common law, which differs from the standard  
18 that would apply if the state secrets privilege were constitutionally based. The standard for  
19 “determining if federal statutory law governs a question previously the subject of federal common law”  
20 does not require “evidence of a clear and manifest purpose” to preempt – as does the standard for  
21 determining whether federal law preempts state law. *Milwaukee v. Illinois*, 451 U.S. 304, 316-17  
22 (1981). Rather, a federal statutory scheme can preempt federal common law, even without explicit  
23 evidence of a clear and manifest purpose to do so, if Congress has “*occupied the field* through the  
24 establishment of a *comprehensive regulatory program*.” *Id.* at 317 (emphasis added).

25 The Ninth Circuit has now implicitly resolved the question whether the state secrets privilege  
26 is one of federal common law or is constitutionally based: Once again, as in *Kasza*, the Ninth Circuit  
27 has plainly described the privilege as “a common law evidentiary privilege.” *Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d  
28 at 1196; *accord*, *Kasza*, 133 F.3d at 1167 (“the state secrets privilege is an evidentiary privilege rooted



1 in federal common law”); *Monarch Assur. P.L.C. v. U.S.*, 244 F.3d 1356, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 2001)  
2 (“common-law state secrets privilege”); *Zuckerbraun v. General Dynamics Corp.*, 935 F.2d 544, 546  
3 (2d Cir. 1991) (“common law evidentiary rule”); *In re United States*, 872 F.2d 472, 474 (D.C. Cir.  
4 1989) (same). That description is consistent with *Reynolds*, which said the privilege is “well  
5 established in the *law of evidence*,” 345 U.S. at 6-7 (emphasis added), not in constitutional law. *See*  
6 *also* Fed R. Evid. 501 notes of Committee on the Judiciary, H. Rep. No. 93-650 (describing “secrets  
7 of state” privilege as one of nine “nonconstitutional privileges” the Supreme Court submitted to  
8 Congress).

9 In this respect, the state secrets privilege differs from executive privilege, which the Supreme  
10 Court has suggested is “inextricably rooted in the separation of powers under the Constitution.”  
11 *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 708 (1974). The Supreme Court has never said that the state  
12 secrets privilege is similarly rooted in the constitutional separation of powers. Defendants rely on  
13 *Nixon* for the proposition that “the state secrets privilege derives from the President’s authority under  
14 Article II of the Constitution to protect national security,” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 13,  
15 but *Nixon* held nothing of the sort. *Nixon* did not adjudicate any issues regarding the state secrets  
16 privilege.

17 As a federal common law privilege, the state secrets privilege may be displaced by statute.  
18 *Dickerson v. United States*, 530 U.S. 428, 437 (2000) (“Congress retains the ultimate authority to  
19 modify or set aside any judicially created rules of evidence and procedure that are not required by the  
20 Constitution”); *see also Tenet v. Doe*, 544 U.S. 1, 11 (2005) (Stevens, concurring) (“Congress can  
21 modify the federal common-law rule”). And the privilege, as one of federal common law, may be  
22 preempted by a “comprehensive regulatory program” like FISA. *Milwaukee v. Illinois*, 451 U.S. at  
23 317. In *Milwaukee v. Illinois*, a statutory scheme regulating interstate water pollution preempted  
24 federal common law on nuisance abatement, even without any mention of the federal common law in  
25 legislative history, because “[t]he establishment of such a self-consciously comprehensive program  
26 by Congress . . . strongly suggests that there is no room for courts to attempt to improve on that  
27 program with federal common law.” *Id.* at 319. Similarly here, FISA preempts the state secrets  
28 privilege by occupying the entire field of foreign intelligence surveillance with a comprehensive

1 regulatory program that includes a warrant requirement and secure procedures for adjudicating civil  
2 actions for FISA violations. As Senator Gaylord A. Nelson (one of FISA’s co-sponsors) explained  
3 during floor debate, FISA “[a]long with the existing statute dealing with criminal wiretaps . . . *blankets*  
4 *the field.*” 124 CONG. REC. 10,903-04 (1978) (emphasis added.) As the Ninth Circuit put it, FISA  
5 “provides a *detailed regime* to determine whether surveillance ‘was lawfully authorized and  
6 conducted.’” *Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1205 (emphasis added).

7 Thus, it is inconsequential that, as defendants argue, FISA’s “legislative history does not even  
8 mention the state secrets privilege.” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 19. It may be true that  
9 FISA’s legislative history does not explicitly mention the state secrets privilege by name, but Congress  
10 plainly intended to create a comprehensive regulatory program that includes a statutory scheme for  
11 challenging unlawful surveillance. And if the privilege is one of federal common law, then it is  
12 preempted by this comprehensive regulatory program.

13 **C. FISA’s Comprehensive Regulatory Program Speaks Directly to Protection of**  
14 **National Security in FISA Litigation.**

15 The specific preemption inquiry is whether FISA’s comprehensive regulatory program  
16 ““[speaks] *directly* to [the] question” otherwise answered by federal common law.”” *Kasza*, 133 F.3d  
17 at 1167 (emphasis in original) (quoting *County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation*, 470 U.S. 226, 236-  
18 37 (1985)). The question, simply put, is whether FISA speaks directly to protection of national  
19 security in FISA litigation. Two sub-issues are presented: (1) Does FISA speak directly to security  
20 procedures and rules of disclosure that are otherwise prescribed by the state secrets privilege? (2)  
21 Does FISA speak directly to the rule of outright dismissal that is otherwise prescribed by the state  
22 secrets privilege? The answer in both instances is *yes*.

23 **1. FISA Section 1806(f) Speaks Directly to Security Procedures and Rules of**  
24 **Disclosure.**

25 On the first sub-issue, FISA section 1806(f) speaks directly to security procedures and rules  
26 of disclosure by prescribing rules for judicial determination and protection of national security  
27 concerns where, as here, a private cause of action is alleged under FISA section 1810. This regime  
28 speaks directly to use and disclosure that would otherwise be governed by the state secrets privilege.  
It speaks directly to secure use of the Document in the present case to demonstrate plaintiffs’ standing.

1 And its application “notwithstanding any other law,” 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f), means the state secrets  
2 privilege is preempted.

3 Plaintiffs invoked section 1806(f)’s security regime by opposing defendants’ motion to bar  
4 plaintiffs from having access to the Document. Section 1806(f) authorizes this Court to review the  
5 Document *in camera* and *ex parte* to determine plaintiffs’ standing. Further, section 1806(f)  
6 authorizes this Court, in its discretion, to give plaintiffs access to the Document under appropriate  
7 security procedures and protective orders – e.g., redaction of sensitive information from the Document  
8 – for purposes of counsel’s discussion of the Document in subsequent argument before this Court on  
9 the issue of standing. *See* 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f) (court may disclose to aggrieved parties underlying  
10 documentation “under appropriate security procedures and protective orders . . . where such disclosure  
11 is necessary to make an accurate determination of the legality of the surveillance”).

12 This case is unusual in that the aggrieved parties are plaintiffs in a civil action rather than  
13 defendants in a criminal action, and the Attorney General never filed the prescribed affidavit. But  
14 nothing in section 1806(f) restricts its application to either circumstance. By its plain language, section  
15 1806(f) applies whenever a “request is made by an aggrieved person . . . to . . . obtain materials relating  
16 to electronic surveillance . . .” That language is more than broad enough to encompass the plaintiffs  
17 here, to the extent they sought access to the Document. That is why the Oregon district court  
18 concluded that defendants’ arguments against preemption “would be contrary to the plain language  
19 of Section 1806(f).” *Al-Haramain*, 451 F. Supp.2d at 1231.<sup>4/</sup>

20 Moreover, Congress envisioned the statute’s application in civil actions and/or where, as here,

---

21  
22 <sup>4/</sup> Defendants contend section 1806(f) applies only to electronic surveillance undertaken  
23 pursuant to FISA because of the presence of the phrase “under this chapter” in section 1806(f). *See*  
24 *Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc.* at 17 n.16 (also citing similar language elsewhere in section  
25 1806). But that phrase modifies only section 1806(f)’s provision regarding motions and requests “to  
26 discover, obtain, or suppress evidence or information *obtained or derived from* electronic  
27 surveillance.” 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f) (emphasis added). Plaintiffs rely not on that provision, but on  
28 section 1806(f)’s entirely separate provision regarding motions and requests “to discover or obtain  
applications or orders or other materials *relating to* electronic surveillance,” 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f)  
(emphasis added), which includes no “under this chapter” restriction. Indeed, if section 1806(f)  
applied only to surveillance that was lawfully undertaken pursuant to FISA, then the statute’s  
provisions for determining whether surveillance was “lawfully authorized and conducted,” 50 U.S.C.  
§ 1806(f), would be meaningless, because the statute would apply only to lawful surveillance.

1 the Attorney General does not file an affidavit asserting harm to national security. The 1978 House  
2 Conference Report expressed agreement among the members of Congress “that an *in camera* and *ex*  
3 *parte* proceeding is appropriate for determining the lawfulness of electronic surveillance in both  
4 criminal *and civil cases*.” H. CONF. REP. NO. 95-1720, *supra*, at 32 (emphasis added), Decl. of Jon  
5 B. Eisenberg, Ex. G. And a 1978 Senate Intelligence Committee report stated that where “no such  
6 assertion is made [in an Attorney General’s affidavit] the Committee envisions that mandatory  
7 disclosure of the application and order, and discretionary disclosure of other surveillance materials,  
8 would be available to the [aggrieved party].” S. REP. NO. 95-701, at 63 (1978), Decl. of Jon B.  
9 Eisenberg, Ex. H; *accord*, S. REP. NO. 95-604(I), *supra*, at 57, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F. FISA  
10 gives the President a choice between unrestricted disclosure and an Attorney General’s affidavit – not  
11 a choice between unrestricted disclosure and invocation of the state secrets privilege as an end run  
12 around an Attorney General’s affidavit.

13 FISA’s legislative history evinces congressional intent to displace the state secrets privilege  
14 with the regime prescribed by section 1806(f). The 1978 House Conference Report declared that “an  
15 *in camera* and *ex parte* proceeding is appropriate for determining the lawfulness of electronic  
16 surveillance[.]” H. REP. NO. 95-1720, *supra*, at 32, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. G. The Senate  
17 Judiciary Committee said with regard to section 1806(f) that when the legality of surveillance is at  
18 issue, “it is this procedure ‘notwithstanding any other law’ that must be used to resolve the question.”  
19 S. REP. NO. 96-604(I), *supra*, at 57, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F; *accord*, S. REP. NO. 95-701,  
20 *supra*, at 63, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. H; H. REP. NO. 95-1283(I), *supra*, at 91, Decl. of Jon B.  
21 Eisenberg, Ex. E.

22 More broadly, FISA’s legislative history demonstrates that FISA was meant to curb unfettered  
23 electronic surveillance by the Executive Branch via “an exclusive charter for the conduct of electronic  
24 surveillance in the United States” and “effective substantive and procedural controls” which “regulate  
25 the exercise” of presidential authority to conduct foreign intelligence electronic surveillance. S. REP.  
26 No. 96-604(I), *supra*, at 15-16, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. F; *accord*, H. REP. NO. 95-1283(I),  
27 *supra*, at 24 (“Congress has the power to regulate the conduct of such surveillance by legislating a  
28 reasonable procedure, which then becomes the exclusive means by which surveillance may be

1 conducted”), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. E. Senator Nelson explained that FISA is intended to  
2 “represent the sole authority for national security electronic surveillance in the United States” and  
3 “insures executive accountability,” which “is a striking departure from the pattern of the past in which  
4 ‘deniability’ was often built into the system to insure that responsibility for intelligence abuses could  
5 not be traced . . . .” 124 CONG. REC. 10,903-04 (1978). Thus, FISA departs from the state secrets  
6 privilege by replacing its absolute rule of outright dismissal – in effect, deniability by silence – with  
7 statutory provisions for protecting national security while holding the Executive Branch accountable  
8 for intelligence abuses.

9 In short, the security regime prescribed by section 1806(f) applies in this case *notwithstanding*  
10 *the state secrets privilege*. Congress having determined (and the 39th President having agreed) that  
11 section 1806(f) adequately ensures protection of national security, *see* H. CONF. REP. No. 95-1720,  
12 *supra*, at 32, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. G, the rules of disclosure prescribed by the state secrets  
13 privilege become superfluous in FISA litigation.

## 14 2. FISA Section 1810 Speaks Directly Against Outright Dismissal.

15 On the second sub-issue – whether FISA speaks directly to the rule of outright dismissal within  
16 the state secrets privilege – FISA section 1810, by prescribing a private right of action for FISA  
17 violations despite the otherwise secret nature of FISA proceedings, plainly displaces the rule of  
18 outright dismissal, which is wholly inconsistent with the very notion of a private FISA action. If  
19 section 1810 did *not* displace the rule of outright dismissal, then Congress’s prescription of a private  
20 FISA action would be meaningless, for the President would be able to evade any private FISA action  
21 merely by invoking the state secrets privilege.<sup>5/</sup>

22 The situation here is analogous to *Halpern v. U.S.*, 258 F.2d 36 (2d Cir. 1958), a lawsuit arising  
23 under the Invention Secrecy Act, 35 U.S.C. § 181, which allowed the patent office to withhold a patent  
24 grant for inventions implicating national security, but also allowed inventors to sue for compensation  
25 if a patent was denied. When the plaintiff was denied a patent and sued for compensation, the

---

26  
27 <sup>5/</sup> The same is true of other private causes of action prescribed for unlawful electronic  
28 surveillance. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 2520(a); 18 U.S.C. § 2707(a); 47 U.S.C. § 605(e)(3)(A). Each  
of those private rights would be meaningless if they could be subverted merely by invocation of the  
state secrets privilege.

1 government invoked the state secrets privilege. The Second Circuit rejected the assertion of the  
2 privilege because “the trial of cases involving patent applications placed under a secrecy order will  
3 always involve matters within the scope of this privilege,” and “[u]nless Congress has created rights  
4 which are completely illusory, existing only at the mercy of government officials, the Act must be  
5 viewed as waiving the privilege . . . dependent upon the availability and adequacy of other methods  
6 of protecting the overriding interest of national security during the course of a trial.” *Halpern*, 258  
7 F.2d at 43.

8 Similarly here, a private FISA action generally involves matters that normally would be within  
9 the scope of the state secrets privilege. *Id.* Unless section 1810 creates “rights which are completely  
10 illusory, existing only at the mercy of government officials,” *id.*, FISA must be viewed as preempting  
11 the state secrets privilege, vesting courts with the power to ensure national security with *in camera* and  
12 *ex parte* review plus “appropriate security procedures and protective orders.” 50 U.S.C. §1806(f).

13 **D. FISA Section 1806(f) is Not Limited to “Acknowledged” Surveillance.**

14 Defendants contend section 1806(f) cannot preempt the state secrets privilege because the  
15 statute applies only “where the Government has *acknowledged* the existence of electronic  
16 surveillance.” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 2 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 13, 17.  
17 Generally speaking, section 1806(f) is invoked in four circumstances: (1) when the government gives  
18 notice under section 1806(c)-(d) that it intends to use surveillance-based information against a  
19 defendant, (2) when a defendant moves under section 1806(e) to suppress surveillance-based  
20 information, (3) when an aggrieved person makes a “motion or request” to “to discover or obtain  
21 applications or orders or other materials relating to electronic surveillance,” and (4) when an aggrieved  
22 person makes a “motion or request” to “discover, obtain, or suppress evidence or information obtained  
23 or derived from electronic surveillance under this chapter.” 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f). According to  
24 defendants, “each of the circumstances in which Section 1806(f) applies is premised on the fact that  
25 electronic surveillance has already been acknowledged by the Government.” Defs’ Second Mo. To  
26 Dismiss etc. at 17.

27 Defendants are wrong. Admittedly, the first two circumstances necessarily involve  
28 acknowledged surveillance, because the government seeks to use surveillance-based information in

1 a proceeding the government has initiated. But the third circumstance – which is the circumstance of  
2 the present case – is *not* necessarily restricted to government-initiated proceedings but can include civil  
3 actions initiated *against* the government under FISA section 1810. (The same is true of the fourth  
4 circumstance.) Nothing in section 1806(f) expressly or impliedly injects a requirement in the third  
5 circumstance that the governmental must “acknowledge” the challenged surveillance for section  
6 1806(f) to be invoked. Such language simply is not there. And if defendants truly mean to suggest  
7 that section 1806(f) is restricted to government-initiated proceedings, they are wrong in light of 18  
8 U.S.C. § 2712(b)(4), which makes the security procedures set forth in section 1806(f) applicable to  
9 lawsuits that are prosecuted *against* the government under 18 U.S.C. § 2712(a).

10 A close reading of section 1806(f) drives the point home. Within the context of this case, the  
11 statute states in pertinent part: “Whenever any . . . request is made by an aggrieved person . . . to obtain  
12 . . . materials relating to electronic surveillance . . . the United States district court . . . shall . . . review  
13 in camera and ex parte the . . . materials . . . as may be necessary to determine whether the surveillance  
14 of the aggrieved person was lawfully authorized and conducted . . .” 50 U.S.C. § 1806(f). The  
15 present case invokes this language because plaintiffs, by opposing defendants’ motion to bar plaintiffs  
16 from having access to the Document, have made a request to obtain material relating to electronic  
17 surveillance – the Document, which plaintiffs have already seen – for use in demonstrating their  
18 standing to prosecute a civil action under FISA section 1810. Upon plaintiffs’ request, section 1806(f)  
19 expressly authorizes this Court to review the Document *in camera* and *ex parte* in the course of  
20 determining whether plaintiffs were surveilled unlawfully. One searches in vain for anything in the  
21 statute that says this language applies only if the government “acknowledges” the surveillance or in  
22 government-initiated proceedings.<sup>6/</sup>

---

24 <sup>6/</sup> Absent anything in the language of section 1806(f) that supports the interpretation defendants  
25 urge, they seek refuge in the canon of statutory construction *noscitur a sociis*. See Defs.’ Second  
26 Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 18 n.17. This canon – in English, “it is known by its associates” – counsels  
27 that “the meaning of an unclear word or phrase should be determined by the words immediately  
28 surrounding it.” BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 1084 (7th ed. 1999). The canon, however, is invoked  
only where statutory language is *unclear*. *Id.* Nothing in the language of section 1806(f) is unclear.  
See generally *S.D. Warren Co. v. Maine Board of Environmental Protection*, 547 U.S. 370, 380  
(2006) (rejecting assertion of *noscitur a sociis* because “uncritical use of interpretative rules is

1 Defendants argue that a request to obtain material relating to electronic surveillance is  
2 necessarily “predicated on *disclosed* surveillance,” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 17 (emphasis  
3 added), because of the statute’s requirement that the request be “made by an aggrieved party.” 50  
4 U.S.C. § 1806(f). Whether defendants are right about this is beside the point here, because plaintiffs’  
5 surveillance *was* disclosed to them, albeit inadvertently. Surveilled plaintiffs in a civil action under  
6 section 1810 certainly know they are aggrieved if the surveillance is disclosed to them, regardless of  
7 how the disclosure occurs. That is the situation here. Defendants wrongly equate *disclosure* with  
8 *acknowledgment*. The two are not the same thing. Disclosure can be accidental, without being  
9 acknowledged. The present case demonstrates this: Even though defendants refuse to acknowledge  
10 the fact of plaintiffs’ surveillance, it was nevertheless disclosed to them when OFAC accidentally gave  
11 the Document to Al-Haramain counsel Lynne Bernabei.

12 Thus, plaintiffs do not advance, and this Court need not reach, the “radical theory” of which  
13 defendants warn – that section 1806(f) might allow “litigants in any case to discover *whether* they are  
14 even subject to any surveillance.” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 18 (emphasis in original); see  
15 also *id.* at 19 (“this very lawsuit is effectively an effort to compel the Government to provide notice  
16 of whether or not alleged surveillance has occurred”). Nor, as defendants claim, *id.* at 18-19, does this  
17 case invoke *ACLU Foundation v. Barr*, 952 F.2d 457 (D.C. Cir. 1991), which observed that the  
18 government “has no duty to reveal ongoing foreign intelligence surveillance,” *id.* at 468 n.13, and  
19 cannot be “forced to admit or deny such allegations,” *id.* at 468. Plaintiffs do not seek any revelation  
20 or admission by defendants as to *whether* plaintiffs were subjected to surveillance. The Document  
21 demonstrates that they *were*. This Court need only read the Document to know that. Plaintiffs seek  
22 no disclosure at all. Thus, the anti-disclosure provision of the National Security Agency Act of 1959,  
23 on which defendants also rely, *see* Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 21-22, is irrelevant here.

24 In short, plaintiffs seek to use what has already been disclosed to them – the Document itself  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 especially risky in making sense of a complicated statute . . . where technical definitions are worked  
out with great effort in the legislative process”).



1 – to establish their standing to obtain an adjudication whether their surveillance was unlawful.<sup>27</sup>

2 **II. EVEN IF THE STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE IS CONSTITUTIONALLY BASED,**  
 3 **FISA STILL PREEMPTS THE PRIVILEGE THROUGH CONGRESS’S EXERCISE**  
 4 **OF CONCURRENT CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.**

5 **A. Congress Has Constitutional Authority to Regulate Protection of State Secrets.**

6 If this Court determines – despite the Ninth Circuit’s pronouncement – that the state secrets  
 7 privilege *is* constitutionally based, then different legal standards are invoked for determining the  
 8 question of preemption, because that means the President and Congress have *concurrent* constitutional  
 9 authority over protection of state secrets. The presence of such concurrent constitutional authority  
 10 invokes the standards set forth in *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.*, 343 U.S. 579 – commonly called  
 11 the *Steel Seizure Case* – for determining the parameters of such authority according to our  
 12 Constitution’s separation of powers and its system of checks and balance.

13 The threshold question is whether Congress has constitutional authority to regulate protection  
 14 of state secrets. The answer is *yes*. Congress’s authority to do so has multiple roots in the following  
 15 powers prescribed by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution:

- 16 • to “provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States.” *Id.*, cl. 1.
- 17 • to “constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.” *Id.*, cl. 9.
- 18 • to “make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into  
 19 execution the foregoing powers.” *Id.*, cl. 18.

---

20 <sup>27</sup> Defendants insist that plaintiffs’ counsel “conceded” in oral argument before the Oregon  
 21 district court that “plaintiffs do not ‘already know’ whether they were subject to alleged warrantless  
 22 surveillance under the TSP in 2004.” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 23 n.20. But counsel  
 23 was merely addressing the question whether plaintiffs’ surveillance was *warrantless*, at an early  
 24 stage in this litigation when a discovery motion was pending. Within the context of that pending  
 25 discovery motion, counsel pointed out that “the simple” way of determining the warrantless nature  
 26 of the surveillance would be through discovery. Tr., 8/29/06, at 60. Counsel did not mean to suggest  
 27 that discovery was *essential* to establish the warrantless nature of the surveillance. As this litigation  
 28 has subsequently unfolded, we have demonstrated in public and sealed filings how the Document  
 and other materials show the warrantless nature of the surveillance, and that, as a matter of law,  
 because the nature of the surveillance is peculiarly within defendants’ exclusive knowledge, the  
 burden shifts to defendants to prove the surveillance was *not* warrantless. *See, e.g., Campbell v.*  
*United States*, 365 U.S. 85, 96 (1961); *United States v. Denver & Rio Grande Railroad Company*,  
 191 U.S. 84, 92 (1903); *ITSI TV Productions, Inc. v. Agricultural Associations*, 3 F.3d 1289, 1292  
 (9th Cir. 1993).

1 Further, to the extent defendants might claim that the state secrets privilege is rooted in the  
2 President's Article II authority as commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy, such authority is subject  
3 to Congress's Article I power to "make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval  
4 forces." *Id.*, cl. 14; *see Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 126 S. Ct. 2749, 2773 (2006).

5 Congressional power to regulate protection of state secrets is also rooted in Article III, Section  
6 2 of the Constitution, which subjects the jurisdiction of the federal courts to "such regulations as the  
7 Congress shall make." *Id.*, cl. 2. The Constitution also invests Congress with broad authority "to deal  
8 with foreign affairs," *Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 253, 256 (1967), and "to legislate to protect civil and  
9 individual liberties," *Shelton v. United States*, 404 F.2d 1292, 1298 n.17 (D.C. Cir. 1968).

10 Congress's constitutional authority to regulate protection of state secrets is multi-faceted. If  
11 there is any constitutional underpinning for the state secrets privilege, it is checked and balanced by  
12 concurrent congressional constitutional authority.

13 **B. The President Lacks Inherent Power to Disregard Congressional Preemption of**  
14 **the State Secrets Privilege.**

15 Defendants claim that if the state secrets privilege is constitutionally based, any effort by  
16 Congress to preempt the privilege would "raise serious constitutional concerns." Defs.' Second Mo.  
17 To Dismiss etc. at 14. Without expressly saying so, defendants are asserting a theory of "inherent"  
18 presidential power set forth in the White Paper issued by the DOJ in January 2006, which claims the  
19 President has constitutional authority to disregard FISA in the name of national security. *See Decl.*  
20 of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. I at 6-10. Defendants are wrong. Even if the privilege is constitutionally  
21 based, that just means the President and Congress have concurrent constitutional authority over  
22 protection of state secrets. And where Congress has exercised its concurrent authority – here, by  
23 displacing the state secrets privilege in FISA litigation – the President does *not* have inherent power  
24 to disregard Congress.

25 Justice Robert Jackson's concurring opinion in the *Steel Seizure Case* prescribed a formulation  
26 for determining the extent of presidential power where Congress and the President share concurrent  
27 constitutional authority. Justice Jackson observed that the Constitution "enjoins upon its branches  
28 separateness but interdependence, autonomy but reciprocity. Presidential powers are not fixed but

1 fluctuate, depending upon their disjunction or conjunction with those of Congress.” 343 U.S. at 635.

2 Thus, the extent of presidential power frequently depends on the presence or absence of congressional  
3 action:

- 4 • “When the President acts pursuant to an express or implied  
5 authorization of Congress, his authority is at its maximum, for it  
6 includes all that he possesses in his own right plus all that Congress can  
7 delegate.” *Id.*
- 8 • “When the President acts in absence of either a congressional grant or  
9 denial of authority, he can only rely upon his own independent powers,  
10 but there is a zone of twilight in which he and Congress may have  
11 concurrent authority, or in which its distribution is uncertain.” *Id.* at  
12 637.
- 13 • “When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed  
14 or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he  
15 can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any  
16 constitutional powers of Congress over the matter.” *Id.*

17 This formulation is not tossed aside in times of war. “Whatever power the United States  
18 Constitution envisions for the Executive in exchanges with other nations or with enemy organizations  
19 in times of conflict, it most assuredly envisions a role for all three branches when individual liberties  
20 are at stake.” *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 536 (2004). “[T]he greatest security against tyranny  
21 . . . lies not in a hermetic division among the Branches, but in a carefully crafted system of checked  
22 and balanced power within each Branch.” *Mistretta v. United States*, 488 U.S. 361, 381 (1989).  
23 Hanging in the balance is “the equilibrium established by our constitutional system” between three  
24 separate but interdependent branches of government. *Youngstown*, 343 U.S. at 638 (Jackson, J.,  
25 concurring).

26 Here, presidential power is at its “lowest ebb” because section 1806(f) expressly prescribes a  
27 protocol for the courts to follow when addressing executive assertions of national security concerns  
28 in FISA litigation, in order to strike a balance between potentially competing interests in protecting  
national security and safeguarding civil liberties. As the Ninth Circuit in this case observed, “[t]he  
statute, unlike the common law state secrets privilege, provides a detailed regime to determine whether  
surveillance ‘was lawfully authorized and conducted.’” *Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1205.

“The controlling fact here is that Congress, within its constitutionally delegated power, has  
prescribed for the President procedures . . . for his use in meeting the present type of emergency.”

1 *Youngstown*, 343 U.S. at 660 (Burton, J., concurring); *see also id.* at 662 (Clark, J., concurring)  
2 (“where Congress has laid down specific procedures to deal with the type of crisis confronting the  
3 President, he must follow those procedures in meeting the crisis”). Legislative history indicates that,  
4 when enacting FISA, Congress intended to curtail presidential power by prescribing these statutory  
5 procedures for determining assertions of national security concerns in FISA litigation. The 1978  
6 House Conference Report said: “The intent of the conferees is to apply the [lowest ebb] standard set  
7 forth in” the *Steel Seizure Case*. H. CONF. REP. NO. 95-1720, *supra*, at 35, Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg,  
8 Ex. G.

9       The present situation is not the first time that this President has made an expansive claim of  
10 executive power as a basis for ignoring congressional legislation. The President did so in *Hamdan v.*  
11 *Rumsfeld*, *supra*, which held that military commissions established to try Guantanamo Bay detainees  
12 violated the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 10 U.S.C. § 801, which prescribed a structure  
13 and procedures for trying the detainees. In rejecting an attempt to evade the UCMJ based on a claim  
14 of unfettered presidential power, the Supreme Court observed: “Whether or not the President has  
15 independent power, absent congressional authorization to convene military commissions, he may not  
16 disregard limitations that Congress has, in proper exercise of its own war powers, placed on his  
17 powers” through the UCMJ. *Hamdan*, 126 S.Ct. at 2774 n.23. Likewise here, the President may not  
18 disregard limitations that Congress placed on executive power when it prescribed a protocol for the  
19 courts to follow when addressing executive assertions of national security concerns in FISA litigation.

20       Justice Kennedy’s concurring opinion in *Hamdan* further explained why inherent Presidential  
21 power did not trump the UCMJ: Through the UCMJ, “Congress, in the proper exercise of its powers  
22 as an independent branch of government . . . has . . . set limits on the President’s authority.” *Id.* at  
23 2799 (Kennedy, J., concurring). *Hamdan* “is not a case, then, where the Executive can assert some  
24 unilateral authority to fill a void left by congressional action.” *Id.* Under Justice Jackson’s  
25 formulation in the *Steel Seizure Case*, Congress had, by expressing its will in the UCMJ, put inherent  
26 presidential power over the manner of trying the Guantanamo Bay detainees at “its lowest ebb.” *Id.*  
27 at 2800. Similarly here, Congress has, by expressing its will in FISA, put at “its lowest ebb” the  
28 President’s power to evade responsibility for intelligence abuses by invoking the state secrets privilege.

1 “Where a statute provides the conditions for the exercise of governmental power, its  
2 requirements are the result of a deliberative and reflective process engaging both of the political  
3 branches. Respect for laws derived from the customary operation of the Executive and Legislative  
4 Branches gives some assurance of stability in time of crisis. The Constitution is best preserved by  
5 reliance on standards tested over time and insulated from the pressures of the moment.” *Id.* at 2799.  
6 FISA, too, is the result of a deliberate and reflective process engaging both of the political branches.  
7 Its provisions cannot be trumped by a presidential power grab wholly at odds with the constitutional  
8 separation of powers. “The Framers ‘built into the tripartate Federal Government . . . a self-executing  
9 safeguard against the encroachment or aggrandizement of one branch at the expense of another.’”  
10 *Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 699 (1997) (quoting *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 122 (1976)); *see*  
11 THE FEDERALIST NO. 47 (James Madison) (“The accumulation of all powers . . . in the same hands .  
12 . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”). Under our system of government, the  
13 President is not free to ignore laws properly enacted by Congress. *See United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S.  
14 at 715 (the President is not “above the law”).

15 This is true even in times of war or emergency: “Emergency does not create power. Emergency  
16 does not increase granted power or remove or diminish the restrictions imposed upon power granted  
17 or reserved. . . . [E]ven the war power does not remove constitutional limitations safeguarding essential  
18 liberties.” *Home Building & Loan Ass’n v. Blaisdell*, 290 U.S. 398, 425-26 (1934). As Justice Jackson  
19 explained in the *Steel Seizure Case*, “emergency powers are consistent with free government only  
20 when their control is lodged elsewhere than in the Executive who exercises them. That is the  
21 safeguard that would be nullified by our adoption of the ‘inherent powers’ formula.” 343 U.S. at 652.

22 In short, even if the state secrets privilege is constitutionally based, it is preempted by  
23 Congress’s exercise, through FISA, of concurrent constitutional authority to regulate protection of state  
24 secrets, which puts presidential power at its lowest ebb.

25 **III. THE NINTH CIRCUIT DID NOT PRECLUDE ADJUDICATION OF THE FACT OF**  
26 **PLAINTIFFS’ SURVEILLANCE.**

27 Defendants insist this Court cannot adjudicate plaintiffs’ standing because the Ninth Circuit  
28 purportedly has “found that harm to national security would result from disclosure of whether or not

1 plaintiffs were subject to alleged surveillance,” Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 2, and a  
2 determination that plaintiffs were surveilled would “thus cause the very harm to national security  
3 identified by the Court of Appeals,” *id.* at 23. Defendants mischaracterize the Ninth Circuit’s opinion.  
4 Here is what the opinion actually says: “[D]isclosure of *information* concerning the Sealed Document  
5 and the *means, sources and methods* of intelligence gathering in the context of this case would  
6 undermine the government’s intelligence capabilities and compromise national security.” *Al-*  
7 *Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1204 (emphasis added). Thus, the opinion bars disclosure of *information* about  
8 the *means, sources and methods* of plaintiffs’ surveillance – not the *mere fact* of their surveillance,  
9 which is all that will be litigated if this Court determines that FISA preempts the state secrets privilege.

10 As defendants correctly observe, the Ninth Circuit concluded that “information as to whether  
11 the government surveilled Al-Haramain,” *id.* at 1203, and “data concerning surveillance,” *id.* at 1205,  
12 are within the state secrets privilege. Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 6. But that does not  
13 necessarily preclude adjudication of the fact of plaintiffs’ surveillance. As the Ninth Circuit explained,  
14 it means only that “Al-Haramain cannot establish that it has standing, and its claims must be  
15 dismissed, *unless FISA preempts the state secrets privilege.*” *Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1205  
16 (emphasis added). Conversely, if FISA *does* preempt the privilege, plaintiffs *can* establish standing  
17 – i.e., this Court *can* adjudicate whether plaintiffs were surveilled.

18 Plaintiffs have consistently agreed that information concerning the means, sources and methods  
19 of the warrantless surveillance program should not be made public in this litigation. Plaintiffs seek  
20 only this Court’s recognition of the mere fact of their surveillance for purposes of establishing their  
21 standing to sue under FISA section 1810. Plainly, the Ninth Circuit did not think such an adjudication  
22 would harm national security, or the court would not have remanded this case for a determination  
23 whether FISA preempts the state secrets privilege and thus enables plaintiffs “to proceed with this  
24 lawsuit.” *Al-Haramain*, 507 F.3d at 1205-06.

25 The security procedures prescribed by section 1806(f) guard against the sort of harm to national  
26 security with which the Ninth Circuit was concerned. In contrast with the “all or nothing” approach  
27 of the state secrets privilege – where any threat of harm is met with the blunt instrument of outright  
28 dismissal – FISA opts for a balanced approach that ensures national security while at the same time

1 safeguarding civil liberties.

2 **IV. DEFENDANTS PREMATURELY ASSERT SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, WHICH IN**  
3 **ANY EVENT DOES NOT BAR THIS ACTION.**

4 Defendants contend this Court cannot decide the issue that the Ninth Circuit has remanded for  
5 decision – whether FISA preempts the state secrets privilege – without first deciding whether FISA  
6 waives federal sovereign immunity. Evidently the Ninth Circuit thought otherwise: Defendants  
7 asserted federal sovereign immunity in the Ninth Circuit, *see* Br. for Appellants at 36-37, but the Ninth  
8 Circuit ignored that assertion and said nothing about sovereign immunity in its opinion and remand  
9 order. Further, at the case management conference of February 7, 2008, this Court instructed the  
10 parties to “proceed with further briefing of the preemption or the 1806(f) issue in *Al-Haramain* only,”  
11 Tr., 2/7/08, at 43 – despite defense counsel’s insistence that the Court must first address the “threshold  
12 jurisdictional issue[]” of sovereign immunity which purportedly “would foreclose even reaching the  
13 1806(f) issue at all,” *id.* at 19-20. As this Court observed at the hearing: “My job is to do what the  
14 Court of Appeals tells me to do.” *Id.* at 19. The Court of Appeals has told this Court to decide  
15 whether FISA preempts the state secrets privilege.

16 If this Court nevertheless decides to address sovereign immunity at this time, the Court should  
17 conclude that sovereign immunity does not deprive plaintiffs of their right to recover damages. The  
18 rule for waiver of federal sovereign immunity is that the waiver “must be unequivocally expressed in  
19 statutory text.” *Lane v. Pena*, 518 U.S. 187, 192 (1996). Lawsuits for damages against federal  
20 employees in their official capacities “cannot be maintained unless Congress has explicitly waived the  
21 sovereign immunity of the United States.” *Multi Denominational Ministry of Cannabis and Rastafari,*  
22 *Inc. v. Gonzales*, 474 F. Supp.2d 1133, 1140 (N.D. Cal. 2007). FISA explicitly and unequivocally  
23 waives federal sovereign immunity via section 1810, which prescribes a cause of action for damages  
24 against any “person” who commits unlawful electronic surveillance in violation of section 1809, and  
25 section 1801(m), which defines a “person” as including any “entity” and thus the United States.

26 The key point here is that section 1801(m) specifies “entity” *without excluding “the United*  
27 *States”* – as do, for example, provisions of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act (ECPA). *See*  
28 18 U.S.C. § 2520(a) (authorizing cause of action against a “person or entity, other than the United

1 States”); § 2707(a) (same). Had Congress meant to exclude “the United States” from the scope of  
2 “entity” in section 1801(m), Congress could have done so in the manner of ECPA. Indeed, a majority  
3 of decisions construed a prior version of one of these ECPA provisions, which did *not* exclude “the  
4 United States,” as *including* governmental entities. *See, e.g., Adams v. City of Battle Creek*, 250 F.3d  
5 980, 985 (6th Cir. 2001); *Organizacion JD Ltda. v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 18 F.3d 91, 94 (2d Cir. 1994).  
6 Defendants do not mention those decisions, but instead rely on *Asmar v. U.S. Dept. of Treasury*, 680  
7 F.Supp. 248, 250 (E.D. Mich. 1987), which opined that the former ECPA provision did *not* include  
8 government entities. *See* Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 11-12. *Asmar*, however, stated the  
9 minority view, which the Ninth Circuit subsequently rejected. *See Adams*, 250 F.3d at 985.

10 FISA also defines “person” as including “any officer or employee of the Federal Government.”  
11 50 U.S.C. § 1801(m). An action against federal officers and employees in their official capacities “is  
12 considered a suit against the United States.” *Multi Denominational Ministry*, 474 F. Supp.2d at 1140;  
13 *accord, Gilbert v. DaGrossa*, 756 F.2d 1455, 1458 (9th Cir. 1985); *Burgos v. Milton*, 709 F.2d 1, 2  
14 (1st Cir. 1983). By prescribing civil liability for federal officers or employees – and hence the United  
15 States – FISA waives federal sovereign immunity separate and apart from the “entity” definition,  
16 despite the absence of any express specification of “the United States.” *Cf. Salazar v. Heckler*, 787  
17 F.2d 527, 529 (10th Cir. 1986) (Title VII of Civil Rights Act of 1974, which authorizes civil actions  
18 for employment discrimination by specifying “the head” of an offending federal entity as defendant,  
19 *see* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c), waives sovereign immunity despite failure to specify “the United  
20 States”); *accord, Rochon v. Gonzales*, 438 F.3d 1211, 1215-16 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Defendants posit that  
21 the word “individual” at the outset of section 1801(m) means FISA authorizes civil actions against  
22 federal employees only in their individual capacities. *See* Defs’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 10.  
23 But if “individual” in section 1801(m) modifies the subsequent phrase “any officer or employee of the  
24 Federal Government,” then “individual” also must modify the subsequent phrase “any group, entity,  
25 association, corporation, or foreign power,” and that surely cannot be so.<sup>8/</sup>

26  
27 <sup>8/</sup> In contrast, 42 U.S.C. section 1983 does not waive federal sovereign immunity in civil rights  
28 actions by authorizing an action against a “person,” because there is no reason in section 1983 to  
depart from the “common usage” of the term “person” as not including the sovereign. *See Will v.*



1 Defendants also argue that section 1810 does not waive sovereign immunity because it does  
2 not contain language similar to 18 U.S.C. § 2712(a), which expressly states that aggrieved persons may  
3 sue “the United States” for various statutory violations that include specified provisions of FISA other  
4 than section 1810. *See* Defs.’ Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 10. But the comparison with section  
5 2712(a) actually assists plaintiffs, not defendants. The three provisions of FISA as to which section  
6 2712(a) waives sovereign immunity all prohibit certain activity by “Federal officers and employees.”  
7 50 U.S.C. §§ 1806(a), 1825(a) & 1845(a). By authorizing lawsuits against “the United States” for  
8 activity by “Federal officers and employees,” section 2712(a) equates the two, reflecting the notion that  
9 a lawsuit against federal officers and employees in their official capacities – as to which section 1810  
10 waives sovereign immunity via the definition of “person” in section 1801(m) as including “Federal  
11 officer and employees” – is considered a suit against the United States. Section 2712(a) states  
12 explicitly what sections 1801(m) and 1810 state necessarily.

13 Even if defendants could invoke sovereign immunity in their official capacities, they cannot  
14 do so in their personal capacities. *See Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 166-67 (1985); *Butz v.*  
15 *Economou*, 438 U.S. 478, 501 (1978). Plaintiffs’ complaint may be characterized as alleging both  
16 official and personal capacity liability. *See Graham*, 473 U.S. at 167 n.14 (where complaint does not  
17 specify whether defendants are sued in official or personal capacities or both, course of proceedings  
18 typically will indicate nature of liability sought to be imposed). And to the extent defendants are being  
19 sued in their personal capacities, they could enjoy only qualified immunity, which does not apply if  
20 they “discharge their duties in a way that is known to them to violate the United States Constitution  
21 or in a manner that they should know transgresses a clearly established constitutional rule.” *Butz*, 438  
22 U.S. at 507. Given that at least some of plaintiffs’ surveillance occurred at a time when the warrantless  
23 surveillance program continued unabated without DOJ certification, despite former Attorney General  
24 Ashcroft’s admonitions that the program was unlawful and defendant Mueller’s “serious reservations”

25  
26  
27 

---

*Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 64 (1989). FISA differs from section 1983 by giving  
28 “person” a special *legal* definition – including “any officer or employee of the Federal Government”  
and “any group, entity, association, corporation, or foreign power,” 50 U.S.C. § 1801(m) – which  
transcends common usage.

1 about its legality, *see supra* at 3-4, defendants cannot claim qualified immunity.<sup>9/</sup>

2 As for defendants' claim that plaintiffs lack standing to obtain prospective relief because the  
3 warrantless surveillance program has ceased, *see* Defs.' Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 7, that  
4 argument is meritless because defendants have insisted that the President retains power to conduct  
5 warrantless electronic surveillance outside the framework of FISA. *See, e.g.*, Letter from Attorney  
6 General Alberto R. Gonzales to Senator Patrick Leahy (Jan. 17, 2007) (announcing suspension of  
7 warrantless surveillance program "[a]lthough, as we have previously explained, [it] fully complies with  
8 the law"), Decl. of Jon B. Eisenberg, Ex. K. This means defendants cannot sustain their "stringent"  
9 burden of making it "absolutely clear that the allegedly wrongful behavior could not reasonably be  
10 expected to recur." *Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Environmental Services (TOC), Inc.*, 528  
11 U.S. 167, 189-90 (2000). The "heavy burden of persuading" the court that the challenged conduct  
12 cannot reasonably be expected to recur "lies with the party asserting mootness." *Adarand*  
13 *Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 528 U.S. 216, 221-22 (2000) (emphasis in original); *accord, Friends of the*  
14 *Earth*, 528 U.S. at 189 ("formidable burden" rests with defendant).

15 Defendants should not be allowed to have it both ways, evading prospective relief by  
16 suspending the warrantless surveillance program while simultaneously claiming power to resume the  
17 program at any time. Absent any assurance by defendants that they will not resume their FISA  
18 violations, it is anything but clear that the misconduct could not reasonably be expected to recur. *See,*  
19 *e.g., City of Mesquite v. Aladdin's Castle, Inc.*, 455 U.S. 283, 288-89 (vagueness challenge to  
20 ordinance repealed during litigation not moot because repeal "would not preclude [the city] from  
21 reenacting precisely the same language if the District Court's judgment were vacated").

22 //

23 //

24 //

---

25  
26 <sup>9/</sup> Plaintiffs have not yet served the defendants individually. Defendants claim "it is far too late  
27 to cure that defect." Defs.' Second Mo. To Dismiss etc. at 9 n.8. Defendants are wrong. Upon a  
28 showing of "good cause for the failure," this Court may "extend the time for service for an  
appropriate period." Fed. R.Civ. P. 4(m). Plaintiffs shortly will request leave to serve the defendants  
individually upon an extension of the time for such service.

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

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should deny defendants' motion and proceed to determine plaintiffs' standing and, thereafter, the merits of this lawsuit.

DATED this 28th day of March, 2008.

/s/ Jon B. Eisenberg  
Jon B. Eisenberg, Calif. Bar No. 88278  
William N. Hancock, Calif. Bar No. 104501  
Steven Goldberg, Ore. Bar No. 75134  
Thomas H. Nelson, Oregon Bar. No. 78315  
Zaha S. Hassan, Calif. Bar No. 184696  
J. Ashlee Albies, Ore. Bar No. 05184  
Lisa Jaskol, Calif. Bar No. 138769

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Al-Haramain Islamic  
Foundation, Inc., Wendell Belew, and Asim Ghafoor