1	MATTHEW EISENBRANDT, Esq. (SBN 217335 Center for Justice & Accountability)
2	870 Market Street, Suite 684 San Francisco, CA 94102	
3	Tel: (415) 544-0444 Fax: (415) 544-0456	
4	Email: meisenbrandt@cja.org	
5	Counsel for All Plaintiffs Additional Counsel Listed Below	
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10) JANE DOE I, JANE DOE II, HELENE PETIT,)	No. C 02 00672 CW EMC
11	MARTIN LARSSON, LEESHAI LEMISH, and) ROLAND ODAR)	
12)	PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE CHEN'S
13	Plaintiffs,)	AMENDED REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
14	v.)	
15	LIU QI, and DOES 1-5, inclusive)	
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	In response to this Court's Order of Reference of September 17, 2004, Magistrate Judge	
19	Chen issued his Amended Report and Recommendation on October 28, 2004. Judge Chen	
20	recommends that the Court grant in part Plaintiffs' Motion for Default Judgment in the form of declaratory relief for Plaintiffs Jane Doe I and Jane Doe II on their claims for torture and arbitrary	
21		
22		
23	detention and Plaintiff Helene Petit on her claim for cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment.	
24	Plaintiffs disagree with the following three	conclusions reached by Judge Chen. First, Judge
25	Chen found that the act of state doctrine applies in this case. Plaintiffs contend that human rights	
26	abuses which have been disavowed, denounced and denied by a foreign government are not "acts	
27	of state" that can trigger the doctrine of judicial abstention. See Plaintiffs' Objections to Magistrate	
28		

Plaintiffs' Response to Amended R & R Doe v. Liu Qi, No. C 02 00672 CW EMC 1

Judge Chen's Report and Recommendation (D.E. 77) at 5-9. Yet, even if the act of state doctrine applies, the factors enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino*, 376 U.S. 398 (1964), weigh in favor of the Court's granting default judgment in the form of monetary relief, rather than only declaratory relief as Judge Chen recommends, particularly because the assessment of money damages would not interfere with foreign relations. *See* Plaintiffs' Objections to Magistrate Judge Chen's Report and Recommendation at 11-17.

Second, Judge Chen concludes that Plaintiffs' claims for crimes against humanity and interference with freedom of religion or belief are not justiciable in a default proceeding. Plaintiffs addressed this finding in Plaintiffs' Objections to Magistrate Judge Chen's Report and Recommendation, at 17-20.

Third, Judge Chen concludes that the Supreme Court in *Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, ____U.S. ____, 124 S.Ct. 2739 (2004), mandates that "the first step in the [arbitrary detention] analysis is to determine whether the detention was prolonged." Amended Report and Recommendation at 84. Plaintiffs respectfully disagree with this interpretation. The Supreme Court found that the specific circumstances under which the petitioner Alvarez was held failed to measure up to a violation of a norm of customary international law. Specifically, the court ruled, "It is enough to hold that a single illegal detention of less than a day, followed by the transfer of custody to lawful authorities and a prompt arraignment, violates no norm of customary international law so well defined as to support the creation of a federal remedy." *Sosa*, ____ U.S. at ___, 124 S.Ct. at 2769. The court limited its decision to the specific facts of the case before it, namely a detention of less than a day followed by a transfer to lawful authorities. The court held that the particular "relatively brief detention" in that case did not violate an international law norm that meets the stringent requirements of the Alien Tort Claims Act. The Court did not hold that all detentions must be "prolonged" to be arbitrary. *Id*.

Plaintiffs' Response to Amended R & R Doe v. Liu Qi, No. C 02 00672 CW EMC

1	However, Plaintiffs do not object to	Judge Chen's recommendation that this Court enter
2	default judgment against Defendant Liu Qi in the form of declaratory relief for Plaintiffs Doe I and	
3	Doe II on their claims for torture and arbitrary detention and Plaintiff Helene Petit on her claim for	
4	cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. Plaintiffs agree that granting declaratory relief will not	
5	invoke the concerns that the act of state doctrine is designed to avoid.	
6 7		
7 8	Dated: November 9, 2004	
8 9		Respectfully submitted,
9 10		/s/Matthew Eisenbrandt
11		MATTHEW EISENBRANDT, Esq. (SBN 217335) Center for Justice & Accountability
12		870 Market Street, Suite 684 San Francisco, CA 94102
13		Tel: (415) 544-0444 Fax: (415) 544-0456 Email: meisenbrandt@cja.org
14		MICHAEL S. SORGEN, Esq. (SBN 43107)
15		Law Offices of Michael Sorgen 240 Stockton Street, 9th Floor
16		San Francisco, CA 94108 Tel: (415) 956-1360
17		Fax: (415) 956-6342 Email: msorgen@sorgen.net
18		TERRI MARSH, Esq. (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
19		3133 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 608 Washington, D.C. 20008
20		Tel: (202) 369-4977
21		Attorneys for Plaintiffs
22 22		
23 24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	Plaintiffs' Response to Amended R & R Doe v. Liu Qi, No. C 02 00672 CW EMC	3

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
2	I, the undersigned, declare under penalty of perjury that:	
3	On November 9, 2004, I served a true copy of the following document:	
4	PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE CHEN'S AMENDED REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION	
5 6	on the following persons:	
7	Alexander Haas U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch	
8 9	P.O. Box 883 Washington, D.C. 20044	
10	Morton Sklar World Organization Against Torture USA 1725 K St., N.W., Suite 610	
11	Washington, D.C. 20006	
12	Karen Parker 154 5th Ave.	
13	San Francisco, CA 94118	
14 15	Thomas A. Willis Remcho, Johansen & Purcell 201 Dolores Avenue	
16	San Leandro, CA 94577	
17 18	By placing a true copy of said document, enclosed in a sealed envelope, and by placing said envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail in San Francisco, California, addressed to said persons.	
19		
20	Executed in San Francisco, California, on November 9, 2004. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.	
21		
22	/s/Matthew Eisenbrandt	
23	MATTHEW EISENBRANDT	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	Plaintiffs' Response to Amended R & R4Doe v. Liu Qi, No. C 02 00672 CW EMC4	