

Camps v. Bravo Trial Monitoring Report

Florida State University, College of Law, International Human Rights Advocacy Clinic

Introduction:

The Florida State University College of Law International Human Rights Clinic (“Clinic”) monitored the trial of former Argentine naval officer, Defendant Roberto Guillermo Bravo, represented by Neal R. Sonnett, P.A. and Haber Law P.A., from June 27 through July 1, 2022, and provides this neutral report of trial events. Observations were recorded by Clinic students by hand daily, transcribed, and translated into Spanish for publication. For his alleged participation in the 1972 massacre of 16 unarmed prisoners, and attempted massacre of three additional unarmed prisoners—an event known as the Trelew Massacre—the Defendant faced civil trial and liability for extrajudicial killing, attempted extrajudicial killing, and torture under the Torture Victim Protection Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350 (“TVPA”). The Plaintiffs who filed the case are four family members of prisoners allegedly attacked during the Trelew Massacre and are represented by the Center for Justice and Accountability (“CJA”), pro bono counsel Keker, Van Nest and Peters, LLP, and Markus and Moss PLLC, with support by the Center for Legal and Social Studies (“CELS”).

Day 1 - Monday, June 27, 2022:

This account summarizes what occurred on the first day of the trial in the case of *Raquel Camps et al. v. Roberto Guillermo Bravo*, No. 1:20-cv-24294-KMM. The first half of the day was spent selecting a jury for the case.

Opening Statements:

At 2:15 p.m., Plaintiffs’ Counsel Ajay Krishnan began his opening statement by describing the events that occurred in Trelew. Mr. Krishnan stated that the Defendant, Roberto

Bravo, along with fellow officers Luis Sosa and Emilio Del Real, went to the cells in the Almirante Zar Naval Base where the prisoners were held. There, he said, the prisoners were told to form two lines on either side of the hallway and were gunned down by the officers. Mr. Krishnan stated that Mr. Bravo's and the military's claims of self-defense are not consistent with the manner or brutality of the deaths, as one victim was shot at point-blank range in the back of the neck and another pregnant victim was shot repeatedly in the abdomen.

Mr. Krishnan argued the military then covered up the events at Trelew, and as part of that plan sent Mr. Bravo to the United States as a military aide. Meanwhile, he stressed, the surviving victims and families were persecuted relentlessly by the military.

Mr. Krishnan described the deceased victims and pointed out their relatives who were present in the courtroom. Mr. Krishnan informed the jury that this is a **civil** trial and indicated that Mr. Bravo *should be* standing for a **criminal** trial in Argentina.

Mr. Krishnan highlighted four key points of the Plaintiffs' claim: (1) that Mr. Bravo and his co-conspirators conspired to kill 19 unarmed prisoners; (2) that Mr. Bravo's claim of self-defense is false and part of a conspiracy to cover up the massacre; (3) that the statute of limitations has been paused and therefore does not act as a valid defense for Mr. Bravo, and (4) that Plaintiffs must be compensated for the suffering Mr. Bravo caused.

Mr. Krishnan emphasized that any chance of justice after the massacre was slim due to the Lanusse regime's rough treatment of civilian "subversives" by subjecting them to military tribunals, arbitrary detention, and other acts of violence. Mr. Krishnan indicated that further information about the Lanusse regime would be presented through an expert witness.

Mr. Krishnan described the break at Rawson Prison in Chubut that happened before the Trelew Massacre. He argued that while there were reports of a guard being killed, the

circumstances of that killing were not clear. He explained that the while some got away, 19 prisoners did not; those prisoners negotiated a surrender and were transferred to Almirante Zar Naval Base in Trelew.

Mr. Krishnan displayed a layout of the cell block area where the prisoners were held at the base, directing the jury's attention to the corridor between the cells where the prisoners were ordered to stand in two rows while holding out his arms to visibly demonstrate the hallway's narrow width. He pointed out the single entrance, resulting in the prisoners being pinned in, and the post where the guard was ordered to leave before the killings began. Mr. Krishnan stated that later evidence would prove that Mr. Bravo and his co-conspirators had planned the killings that took place in the cell block.

Mr. Krishnan displayed pictures of the weapons used in the massacre: a .45 caliber handgun carried by the officers and Pistola Ametralladora Modelo (PAM) machine guns used by personnel on base. He argued the killings were planned because those who escaped back into their cells were pursued by the officers and gunned down there. He pointed to Alberto Camps' supporting statement given while recuperating from injuries sustained in the massacre.

Mr. Krishnan informed the jury that Mr. Bravo's co-conspirators, Sosa and Del Real, were convicted of homicide of 16 prisoners and attempted homicide of three surviving prisoners in 2012 in Argentina. Mr. Krishnan stressed that Mr. Bravo escaped the same fate by living in the United States.

Turning to the Defendant's self-defense claim, Mr. Krishnan alleged that it arose from a military cover-up which involved parroting the official story, threatening witnesses, conducting a biased investigation, exonerating officers, and silencing victims' families and lawyers. Mr.

Krishnan questioned the military's account, asking why so many people with much to live for would throw their lives away in such a hopeless situation by attacking the military guards.

With respect to the statute of limitations defense, Mr. Krishnan claimed that prosecution in Argentina was not possible until 2005, and that Mr. Bravo—very difficult to find—was not located until 2008 with the help of Interpol. Mr. Krishnan argued that the families of the victims pursued all possible remedies in Argentina before seeking justice in U.S. courts. Mr. Krishnan highlighted the irony of the Defendant's claim that his clients had both taken too long pursuing justice in Argentina before bringing a claim under the TVPA, while also failing to exhaust all local remedies before bringing such a claim.

Mr. Krishnan concluded by arguing that his clients deserve justice and compensation. He stressed that while the victims' families have been on the run, Mr. Bravo has lived a comfortable life in Miami: he heads numerous companies and has accumulated wealth around \$5 Million. Mr. Krishnan pointed out that Mr. Bravo was wealthy enough to give each of his three sons gifts of \$500,000 only a few years ago.

Defense Attorney Steve Davis of Haber Law, P.A., began his opening statement at 2:47 p.m. by saying: "This case is about [Mr. Bravo] acting to protect himself at a sudden incident. It was a tragedy, but it was an accident, *not* an execution." Mr. Davis told the jury that for the Plaintiffs to prevail under the TVPA, they need to show both that 1) the killings were intentional, deliberate, and calculated, and 2) that the case was brought in a timely manner. Mr. Davis claimed that the Plaintiffs could not prove either—they could not prove the first element because Mr. Bravo's response occurred in a matter of seconds, and therefore was not planned, and they could not prove the second element provided the relevant events occurred 50 years ago.

Mr. Davis emphasized that Mr. Bravo's interactions with the prisoners at Trelew were very minimal prior to the night of the killings; he never surveilled them, escorted them anywhere on the base, or interrogated them. Mr. Davis explained that the extent of Mr. Bravo's involvement with the prisoners was a daily meeting with the soldiers who monitored them to inquire as to how the prisoners were doing.

Mr. Davis argued that the following events happened on the night of August 22, 1972. Mr. Bravo was summoned to the cells around 3:00 a.m. by Corporals Marandino and Marchan. Later his superior officers, Captain Sosa and Lieutenant Del Real, arrived on the scene, at which point Sosa ordered the cells to be opened and the prisoners to exit. Marandino opened all the cell doors as Marchan left, claiming he did not feel well. Mr. Bravo felt uncomfortable with the situation, grabbing a PAM machine gun for security. Sosa then paced between the two rows of prisoners, yelling at them. At some point, prisoner Pujadas hit and grabbed Sosa's gun, and shot twice. Sosa was on the floor, and Mr. Bravo and Del Real reacted by opening fire to stop him from getting injured. Mr. Davis claimed the shootings were instinctive acts that happened in a split second. Mr. Davis stressed that Mr. Bravo never used a handgun—as the Plaintiffs claim he did to commit execution-style killings—and did not go into the cells or approach any of the bodies after the shootings.

Mr. Davis emphasized that Sosa was the superior officer in the situation and in charge of the events leading up to the killings. Mr. Davis alleged that the Plaintiffs want Mr. Bravo to pay for the crimes of the Argentine military, *not* the crimes of Mr. Bravo himself.

In arguing the Plaintiffs cannot win under the TVPA, Mr. Davis contended that Mr. Bravo was acting in self-defense, and that the Plaintiffs failed to pursue the action within the 10-year statute of limitations.

Mr. Davis concluded by describing Mr. Bravo's life in the United States, stressing that he spent years working hard to build himself up—receiving an education, building his own businesses, and creating a successful life for himself and his family. Mr. Davis argued that because Mr. Bravo's businesses were publicly listed, he was easily findable dating back to the 1990s, giving the Plaintiffs no excuse for not pursuing legal action sooner. Mr. Davis claimed the Plaintiffs could have sued Mr. Bravo from 1995 onward in U.S. courts but did not, therefore the statute of limitations had passed. Finally, Mr. Davis emphasized that the military investigation into the massacre already proved that Mr. Bravo never acted deliberately.

Opening statements ended at 3:07 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 1:

The Plaintiffs' first expert witness, James Brennan, Ph.D., a professor from the University of California – Riverside, took the stand at 3:29 p.m. Plaintiffs' Counsel CJA Attorney Ela Matthews questioned the witness starting with his credentials. Dr. Brennan testified that he is an expert on Argentine history post-1945 and has studied the country's history for over 40 years. Dr. Brennan stated that he was present to provide "historical context about Argentina, Trelew, and the obstacles the families faced in pursuit of justice."

Ms. Matthews asked for a description of the state of Argentina following the Trelew Massacre. Dr. Brennan characterized that time as rife with conflict followed by multiple military coups until 1983, when a democratic government was established. Ms. Matthews directed the witness to an exhibit which he identified as Argentine President Lanusse, whom he said infringed on the civil liberties of the Argentinian people.

Dr. Brennan was directed to another exhibit which he identified as Rawson Prison. He explained that this distant prison was used to hold political prisoners and to make them

“invisible” by removing them from the public eye. Ms. Matthews asked whether there were governmental death squads, and the witness confirmed their existence. When asked what types of people were targeted by these death squads, Dr. Brennan explained that many were young people between the ages of 18-25, including students, lawyers, and those that pursued justice against the military. Dr. Brennan confirmed that a previous lawyer of one of the Plaintiffs was among those targeted.

Dr. Brennan testified he is familiar with the prosecution of Trelew victim survivors and families such as the Pujadas and Santuchos. Dr. Brennan recognized another exhibit as a photograph of Alberto Camps recovering from a gunshot wound, explaining that Mr. Camps was killed a year after the Trelew Massacre. When showing another exhibit featuring Ricardo Haidar suffering from a gunshot wound, Dr. Brennan confirmed that Haidar was also killed a year after the Trelew massacre.

Ms. Matthews asked Dr. Brennan if Argentina tried to remedy the atrocities committed by the military. Dr. Brennan responded that Argentina did not do anything directly to address the Trelew massacre, but in 1985 a truth commission was formed, and some judicial proceedings were attempted. However, he said the military began stonewalling, attempted a coup, and allegedly threatened those seeking justice. Ms. Matthews concluded her questioning at 4:21 p.m.

At 4:22 p.m., Defense Attorney Neal Sonnett began questioning the credibility of Dr. Brennan. Dr. Brennan clarified that he is not an expert on the events of Trelew, nor is he familiar with the Trelew trial. He described his purpose at the trial as providing historical context. Mr. Sonnett asked if the witness had any knowledge about ballistics, and he responded that he did not. Mr. Sonnet inquired if Dr. Brennan knew who fired the shots at Trelew and why those shots were fired, and the witness said he did not. Dr. Brennan testified that he has never been to

Trelew. Finally, Dr. Brennan stated that he has no knowledge of Mr. Bravo's participation in any violence after the events at Trelew and that he knows Mr. Bravo was not in Argentina following the massacre. Mr. Sonnett concluded at 4:45 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 2

The second witness, Plaintiff Eduardo Cappello II, took the stand at 4:46 p.m. Plaintiffs' counsel, CJA Attorney Claret Vargas, asked Mr. Cappello about his connection to the events at Trelew. Mr. Cappello explained he was the nephew of one of the victims, Eduardo Cappello I, and that he is the only surviving member of the Cappello family. He described being taken in by his grandparents after his family was "disappeared." When asked whether his namesake had any siblings besides the witness's father, Mr. Cappello responded no.

While Mr. Cappello expressed that he never met his uncle because he was born after his uncle's death, he recalled that his family spoke about his uncle daily in his childhood.

Judge Louis concluded the day's proceedings at 5:02 p.m. and indicated that Mr. Cappello's testimony would continue the following day.

Day 2 - Tuesday, June 28, 2022:

This account summarizes what occurred on the second day of the trial in the case of *Raquel Camps et al. v. Roberto Guillermo Bravo*, No. 1:20-cv-24294-KMM. Judge Lauren Louis began proceedings at 9:14 a.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 2 (cont.)

CJA Attorney Claret Vargas continued her direct examination of Plaintiff Eduardo Cappello II, eliciting testimony about the extraordinary impact of his uncle and namesake's death on his family and life. Mr. Cappello revealed that although he was born after his uncle Eduardo Cappello I died and never met him, Eduardo Cappello I was an important figure in his life. Mr.

Cappello was raised by his grandparents after his immediate family was disappeared when he was very young. Mr. Cappello's grandparents, the parents of Eduardo Cappello I, spoke about his uncle almost daily while Mr. Cappello was growing up. Mr. Cappello explained that he did not fully appreciate the pervasive fear he lived with as a child until he was older. With age, he recognized that his uncle's death—and an associated fear of retaliation from the Argentine military—followed him everywhere. For example, Mr. Cappello understood from his grandparents at an early age that he could not speak openly about his uncle's death or his family's disappearance without placing his life in danger.

When asked why the family did not seek justice for the death of Eduardo Cappello I, Mr. Cappello explained that fear prevented him and his grandparents from taking significant action. However, his grandparents made one effort in the 1970s; he found a copy of a lawsuit they filed in 1974, but the case did not advance, and his grandparents did not feel safe pursuing it. This fear was so intense that Mr. Cappello's grandparents chose to move with him out of Buenos Aires to the small town of Villa Gesell, 400 kilometers south of Buenos Aires, to escape threats in hiding. However, Mr. Cappello explained that the passage of time did not diminish the Cappello family's desire for justice for Eduardo Cappello I, and in 2005 Mr. Cappello and his grandmother got involved in the Argentine government's criminal investigation into the perpetrators of the Trelew Massacre, including Mr. Bravo. When asked why Mr. Cappello did not sue Mr. Bravo in the U.S. either after he was located in Miami in 2008 or after his failed extradition attempt in 2009, Mr. Cappello clarified that he believed he should wait until the criminal proceedings in Argentina against the other perpetrators were completed before taking further action because a conviction in that case could be helpful in any future litigation against Mr. Bravo.

Finally, Ms. Vargas asked Mr. Cappello what he would say to his uncle if he could speak to him today. Mr. Cappello responded: “I hope he would be just as proud of me as I was of him. It took us 50 years to get here, but we never gave up, and I’m quite sure after we conclude this proceeding the world will be just a little more just.” This concluded direct examination of Mr. Cappello at 10:16 a.m.

Under cross-examination by Defense Attorney Steve Davis, Mr. Cappello discussed his educational and professional background. Mr. Davis questioned Mr. Cappello’s family’s participation in prior proceedings regarding his uncle’s death. Mr. Cappello explained that his grandmother was compensated by the Argentine government for her son’s death in 1998-1999, but Mr. Cappello did not qualify for compensation.

Mr. Davis pressed Mr. Cappello about his knowledge of Mr. Bravo’s location prior to the extradition attempts. Mr. Cappello acknowledged that he had done some internet research about Mr. Bravo. His findings included the general whereabouts of Mr. Bravo: he knew Mr. Bravo was in Miami and that he owned a business. However, but did not know Mr. Bravo’s exact address, nor did he try to contact an American lawyer or private investigator. He also did not know that Mr. Bravo’s addresses were publicly accessible over the internet.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Cappello about his grandmother’s contact with other victims’ families. Mr. Cappello testified that his grandmother was in contact with other families around 2005-2006 in relation to seeking criminal prosecution of Mr. Bravo. Mr. Davis pressed for an exact date by showing the Plaintiff a letter between his grandmother and some of the families signed August 24, 2005, to which Mr. Cappello sternly responded, “yes, this corrects the year minimally from 2006 to 2005.”

Mr. Davis inquired into Mr. Cappello’s fears of the Argentine government, asking

whether they ended in the 1990's during the time when he was actively pursuing and seeking resources from the Argentine government. Mr. Cappello responded, "[no], no way, not at all."

Mr. Davis concluded the cross-examination by asking Mr. Cappello whether he now has a right to receive money from Argentina. Mr. Cappello testified he does not because his grandmother already received compensation. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Cappello when he was contacted for the current lawsuit, and Mr. Cappello responded that he was contacted by CJA Attorneys in 2018.

Plaintiffs' Attorney Claret Vargas began redirect examination at 11:31 a.m. She asked Mr. Cappello whether he and his family were offered protection when they were seeking criminal prosecution in 2005. Mr. Cappello explained that there was a program offered to provide security and it was the first time such a program had been offered to the victims' families. Ms. Vargas asked Mr. Cappello what he knew about Mr. Bravo prior to finding information online in 2008. Mr. Cappello indicated he did not know much about Mr. Bravo; there was some news coverage, but he did not have access to or read that information.

Questioning ended at 11:34 a.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 3

At 11:35 a.m. Plaintiff Alicia Krueger delivered testimony through a video deposition because she could not travel to Miami due to poor health. She testified that she would have done anything possible to pursue justice for her late husband, including by testifying at this trial if possible.

Ms. Krueger has been married twice. Her first husband was Trelew Massacre victim Ruben Bonet, with whom she had two children. She explained that although her late husband was arrested in 1972, she had no knowledge of him ever being charged with or convicted of any

crimes. Mr. Bonet was originally incarcerated near Buenos Aires, where the Bonet family lived. While Mr. Bonet was imprisoned nearby, Ms. Krueger and her children were able to visit him and take him food, blankets, and books. In early 1972, Mr. Bonet was transferred to Rawson Prison, 1500 kilometers from Buenos Aires, following an order by President Lanusse. After the Rawson Prison escape on August 15, 1972, Ms. Krueger was informed that Mr. Bonet was one of the escapees and she flew to Rawson. Learning of his surrender and imprisonment at Almirante Zar Naval Base, Ms. Krueger attempted to take food and blankets to him there, but military personnel told her she either needed to leave or she would be imprisoned on the base as well. On August 26, 1972, Ms. Krueger heard about the Trelew Massacre. Her husband was among the dead. She was told that the victims were killed after attempting to escape the base.

Ms. Krueger reported that she was able to view Mr. Bonnet's body when it was taken in a casket to the morgue in Pergamino, near where Mr. Bonet's parents lived. An experienced schoolteacher, Ms. Krueger brought pencil and paper and recorded everything she could about what his body looked like. She described his body as riddled in bullet holes that looked distinctly like cigarette burns with gunpowder tattoo rings. He was also covered in bruises, and his head was destroyed and barely reconstructed. She said she received an autopsy report at that time and later independently requested a second autopsy to be conducted in Buenos Aires. She received another report from the second autopsy but lost her copies of both autopsy reports when her family later fled for their safety. Many years later she found a copy of his autopsy in a book by Francisco Uronde. This copy would be used as evidence in the 2012 trial of the perpetrators of the Trelew Massacre.

Fearing for their lives after the lawyers who represented Mr. Bonet were killed, Ms. Krueger and her family fled their home in 1974 and never returned. Her family remained in

hiding in Argentina for several years. In the late 1970's, Ms. Krueger's fears escalated when she was required to submit her children's birth certificates for school, which would reveal the identity of their birth father. They decided to flee Argentina with nothing but the clothes on their backs and took refuge in France. Over the years, Ms. Krueger requested relief numerous times; she wrote an open letter in the newspaper asking for public support to push for a trial and another letter to President Carlos Menem. None of her communications received a response. However, she did receive the documents related to Resolution 24.411 from the Argentine government addressed to all family members of victims of the Trelew Massacre. Ms. Krueger concluded by stating that her life and that of her family was greatly impacted by the death of Mr. Bonet. Her video deposition ended at 12:21 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 4:

The trial resumed at 1:32 pm with Plaintiffs' Attorney Franco Muzzio of Keker, Van Nest & Peters, LLP, introducing a reading of the testimony of Alberto Camps, a victim and survivor of the Trelew Massacre, taken from his hospital bed. Mr. Muzzio and his colleague Bryan Booth narrated the role of interrogator and Mr. Camps, respectively.

Mr. Camps reported that his treatment on the base was largely fair with one exception—Mr. Bravo—who mistreated the prisoners, often subjecting them to stress-positions and threats. Mr. Camps explained that on the night of the massacre, Mr. Bravo forced the prisoners out of their cells and instructed them to line up in two rows. Once the prisoners formed two lines, Mr. Bravo and his fellow soldiers began firing without provocation as Mr. Camps retreated into his cell.

Mr. Bravo followed him into the cell and demanded that Mr. Camps answer questions from a previous interrogation. When Mr. Camps refused, Mr. Bravo fired a single shot into his

stomach with his pistol, leaving without calling for medical aid. While Camps lay bleeding, he described the rhythmic sound of gunshots emanating from the other cells. Later Mr. Camps was placed on a stretcher and taken to the infirmary by nurses. The reading concluded at 1:32 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 5:

The Defendant, Roberto Guillermo Bravo, took the stand at 1:51 p.m. for questioning by Mr. Krishnan. Mr. Bravo confirmed he was in Trelew at the time and that 19 prisoners were killed, but he declared that their deaths were the result of an “exchange of fire” between parties. Focusing on the events directly before the massacre at Trelew, Mr. Bravo avowed that he was certain he had only two glasses of wine with his dinner in the officer’s “mess” that evening. Mr. Krishnan questioned why he was suddenly *certain* that he had only two glasses, when before he merely *thought* as much. Mr. Bravo said he was now certain about his alcohol intake that evening. When asked if any other documents or testimony would corroborate his testimony on this point, Mr. Bravo responded no.

Mr. Krishnan asked if Captain Sosa had been drinking that evening, and Mr. Bravo “guessed” that might be the case as it was the norm for officers. When asked if Captain Sosa was known as a regular drinker, Mr. Bravo responded no. Mr. Krishnan asked Mr. Bravo to detail who accompanied him to the cells that night and what personnel were there when he arrived. Mr. Bravo explained that Captain Sosa and Lieutenants Del Real and Herrera accompanied him, and when they arrived, they were greeted by Corporals Marandino and Marchan. When asked how he came to know the name of the latter Corporal after claiming not to know as much during his deposition, Mr. Bravo replied that he had learned his name from documents presented as part of the current case.

Mr. Krishnan inquired into whether it was the 2012 decision from the Argentine court, and Corporal Marandino's testimony therein, that changed Mr. Bravo's testimony. Mr. Bravo answered: "No, no, no I tried to reach in[to] my mind." Mr. Krishnan questioned Mr. Bravo about a previous statement in which he stated he had read that decision to refresh his memory. Mr. Bravo replied: "No, I remembered." When asked who it was that gave the order to open the cells and form lines, Mr. Bravo declared it was Captain Sosa who had made such a risky request.

With respect to the weapons used that night, Mr. Bravo said he and Captain Sosa entered with only their .45 caliber handguns, as they were both marines, and that the two corporals were armed with PAM sub-machine guns. As this testimony was given Mr. Krishnan displayed images of each weapon for the jury. Mr. Krishnan then asked Mr. Bravo to confirm whether he ordered the men to shoot at the prisoners. Mr. Bravo answered that he had not "ordered [but] said fire" to his fellow soldiers.

When pressed on whether he intended to shoot the prisoners, Mr. Bravo maintained that his only intent was to "stop them from coming for us." Mr. Krishnan asked whether it was his intent to shoot *all* the prisoners when he said "fire!" and again Mr. Bravo said, "all who came for us." When asked about his intent when he personally fired Mr. Bravo said he had "no time to think" before shooting and that his adrenaline was "running high."

Mr. Krishnan probed into an earlier statement by Mr. Bravo at his deposition that all the prisoners moved toward the soldiers. Mr. Bravo indicated that he could not remember what he had said previously. Mr. Krishnan asked whether the prisoners taking one step forward prompted Mr. Bravo to shoot them all. Mr. Bravo responded, "not to shoot them all." Mr. Krishnan inquired into the aftermath and confirmation that all 19 prisoners had been shot. Mr. Bravo reported that he could not recall due to chaos after the initial burst of fire, describing the hallway

as filled with blood and smoke from the shooting; he remembered that more soldiers arrived, but could not recall the exact timing.

When asked why he went to the cells that night, Mr. Bravo recounted receiving a message complaining of suspicious activity amongst the prisoners that was putting the guards on edge. Mr. Krishnan asked if Mr. Bravo knew that Corporal Marandino, one of the men tasked with watching the prisoners, had denied having any issues with the prisoners that evening. Mr. Bravo indicated that he was not aware of any such testimony.

A lengthy exchange ensued in which Mr. Bravo had difficulty squaring his current testimony with previous drawings he created depicting the placement of all the officers in the cell block. Mr. Bravo disagreed vehemently with one of the drawings presented, indicating that its placement of the officers when the shooting began was inaccurate. After demonstrating the take-down of Captain Sosa and subsequent stealing of his service weapon, Mr. Bravo indicated that two shots were fired toward the officers, rather than the one indicated in his previous testimony, before Mr. Bravo exclaimed: "Fire! Fire!"

After the incident at Trelew, Mr. Bravo testified that he was sent to the United States. He testified that Captain Sosa was also on the same flight, though he later returned to Argentina. Mr. Krishnan asked if Mr. Bravo had ever returned to Argentina after deciding to stay in the United States. Mr. Bravo explained that he visited Argentina in 1995 on vacation and again in 1997 when his mother passed away.

Mr. Krishnan questioned Mr. Bravo about his finances, referring to a summary of his assets signed by his accountant. The document valued Mr. Bravo's net worth over \$6 million. When asked if personal possessions were missing from the total, Mr. Bravo replied affirmatively and added that personal assets were shared with his wife. Questioning then focused on real estate

transactions in which Mr. Bravo received an undisclosed amount of money, possibly numbering in the tens of millions. Mr. Bravo concluded by stating that he cannot remember exactly how much money he received. Questioning ended at 4:37 p.m.

Defense Attorney Steve Davis began questioning Mr. Bravo at 4:38 p.m. Mr. Bravo recounted his youth and explained that as a young man he joined the Argentine navy in search of adventure. Mr. Bravo said that he worked for a long time to become an officer, serving mostly in combat roles, but eventually was transferred to Trelew where he began working in a staff position focusing on logistics. In 1972 he was sent to the United States for further training, eventually retiring from the Navy. Mr. Bravo explained that he decided to stay in the United States as he felt it was a safer environment to raise a family, though the decision pained him. Mr. Bravo and his family moved to Miami where he became a U.S. citizen and worked odd jobs to put himself through school and earn a degree. Court adjourned at 4:56 p.m., with Mr. Bravo's testimony scheduled to resume the following day.

Day 3 - Wednesday, June 29, 2022:

This account summarizes what occurred on the third day of the trial in the case of *Raquel Camps et al. v. Roberto Guillermo Bravo*, No. 1:20-cv-24294-KMM.

Plaintiffs' Witness 5 (cont.)

The day began with the continuation of the questioning of defendant Bravo by Defense Counsel Steve Davis. Mr. Davis confirmed Mr. Bravo's educational background at St. Thomas University before digging into the story everyone wanted to hear: what happened in August of 1972? Answering this question would take several hours of detailed testimony, during which Mr. Bravo testified to the following.

He began working at Almirante Zar Naval Base in January of 1972 as an officer in charge of logistics. On August 15, 1972, the day of the Rawson Prison break, Mr. Bravo was on vacation with his family in Buenos Aires, 1500 kilometers from the base. He remembers receiving a phone call that day alerting him to the prison break and ordering him back to base immediately. He arrived around 4:00 a.m. on August 16. Although he had no previous experience overseeing prisoners, he was tasked with guarding the 19 prisoners. Regardless, his interactions with the prisoners were extremely minimal; he was required to check in with the guards on duty twice per day to ensure the prisoners were kept silent and still. His duties centered on verifying that the guards were properly carrying out their duties. On the night of the massacre, Mr. Bravo was completing paperwork in working quarters near the dining area when a sailor informed him around 3:00 a.m. that he was needed at the prisoners' cells. Mr. Bravo got up, strapped on his gun and other equipment, and walked to the cells. Three officers, including Sosa, were in the dining area at the time and Mr. Bravo knew they overheard the exchange because they began to follow him to the prisoners' cell area.

Mr. Davis provided a demonstrative schematic of the cell area for Mr. Bravo to point to and write on to show where different actors were located at different times in the night while he was relating the story. When Mr. Bravo entered the cell block, corporals Marandino and Marchan were guarding the prisoners. Marchan left after soliciting permission from Mr. Bravo, his superior, because he was not feeling well. At the same time Sosa, Del Real, and Herrera entered. Marandino told Mr. Bravo that the prisoners were trying to communicate with each other. Sosa likely overheard Marandino say this, because he started issuing orders for the prisoners to be released from their cells. Mr. Bravo picked up Marchan's machine gun and Del Real took Mr. Bravo's pistol. Marandino opened the cells and Sosa ordered the prisoners to stand

outside of the cells and form two rows. Sosa began pacing up and down the hallway between the rows of prisoners, lecturing them loudly. When Sosa returned to the start of the hallway, Mr. Bravo says things changed very rapidly. Sosa's knee buckled and prisoner Pujadas grabbed Sosa's .45 caliber pistol. Mr. Bravo does not remember seeing Pujadas move before he seized the gun and began shooting. Mr. Bravo thought he saw the flame explode from the end of the pistol twice, while pointed in his general direction. Then, it seemed as if all the prisoners moved toward Mr. Bravo at once, and Mr. Bravo had no time to think. He knew that firing at them also meant firing at Sosa, but his only thought was: "I [have] to stop them." Mr. Bravo was not aware of anything else; he did not even realize in the moment or after the fact that another soldier was near him, also shooting at the prisoners. Shooting was a split-second reaction, and it was over in seconds. Mr. Bravo says in the moments after the shooting, he was "overwhelmed by the stench of gunpowder and smoke." He called for guards and medics. He recalls a commanding officer telling him to sit and smoke a cigarette.

In the aftermath, Mr. Bravo was isolated for days while the incident was investigated. He was allowed out of isolation twice to aid in the investigation through (1) a demonstration at a firing range, and (2) a play-by-play reenactment of the shooting in the cell area. During the reenactment, Mr. Bravo and the other soldiers involved were asked to recount the night step-by-step while pictures were taken to aid the ad hoc judge overseeing the investigation who would create a report of the incident.

Mr. Davis presented the report published by the Argentine military in December 1972. It was addressed to the President of Argentina, and it was released after the military's investigation of the incident. This report concluded that Mr. Bravo complied with his duties as a leader guarding the detainees and that he should not be convicted. Mr. Bravo did not have access to this

“top secret” document until 2009, nor did he participate in its drafting. Before then, all he knew was “there was nothing against [him].” Mr. Bravo also pointed out certain discrepancies in the report. He emphasized that on the night of the incident, the order to open the prison cells was commanded by Officer Sosa, not by Mr. Bravo as stated in the report. He also clarified the sequence of events, explaining that Marchan was given permission to leave before the prisoners were let out of their cells.

When asked to describe his life following the incident, Mr. Bravo testified that he remained in Argentina for four months before being transferred to the United States, where he completed military school and obtained his bachelor’s degree. He then began his career as a businessperson in Florida. Mr. Davis introduced a document which showed that Mr. Bravo founded RGB Group, his first company, in 1990. The company employed approximately 500 people and provided medical staffing to fulfill government contracts within the United States, Colombia, Venezuela, and Central America. The information and address for this prominent company have been publicly available since 1990 through registry with the Florida Secretary of State. Mr. Bravo identified several additional businesses he founded that were registered and publicly accessible. Mr. Bravo concluded by describing one of his charitable endeavors where he connected high schools in Miami with local businesses; through that experience he enjoyed engaging with and helping high school students.

In the afternoon beginning at 1:43 p.m., Mr. Bravo faced additional questioning by Plaintiffs’ Counsel Ajay Krishnan, initially relating to his role in logistics at Almirante Zar Naval Base. Mr. Bravo confirmed that his duties did not entail guarding the prisoners and that he had no experience in the matter.

Mr. Krishnan directed Mr. Bravo to draw the positions of everyone present that night on a rendering of the cell block. Mr. Bravo sketched two rows of prisoners on either side of the hallway between cells. He marked the soldiers and himself at the end of the hallway, except for Captain Sosa who was placed at the end of the line of prisoners standing directly next to his alleged assailant: Mariano Pujadas. When asked if he had trouble seeing Captain Sosa due to the gore from Mr. Pujadas' wounds, Mr. Bravo claimed there was no blood. Mr. Krishnan pressed Mr. Bravo, asking how that could be possible if Mr. Pujadas had just been shot. Mr. Bravo then indicated that he had trouble remembering the scene and confirming the presence of blood.

Mr. Krishnan displayed a prior drawing by Mr. Bravo and questioned why he had previously indicated that the prisoners were all facing each other. Mr. Bravo said that it was difficult for him to see where the prisoners were facing. Mr. Krishnan then played a portion of his video deposition in which he claimed that the prisoners were all facing each other. Mr. Krishnan asked why Mr. Bravo could not provide a consistent account of the events that took place that night. Mr. Bravo responded that he was working entirely from his memory today and had not given much thought to the details outside of the current case. When asked about another discrepancy in Mr. Bravo's testimony—that two shots rather than one shot had been fired by Mr. Pujadas—Mr. Bravo responded that he had just remembered the accurate count today. When Mr. Krishnan reminded him that in the Defense's opening statement two days prior two shots were also mentioned, Mr. Bravo exclaimed: "Don't play with my mind!"

Mr. Krishnan displayed excerpts from Judge Bautista's investigation as well as the Auditor General's report. During Judge Bautista's investigation the soldiers were separately detained. However, the written summary of the investigation indicated that Mr. Bravo and the

other soldiers were brought together to re-enact their roles in the massacre. Mr. Bravo denied using this opportunity to confer with his fellow officers.

Mr. Krishnan concluded by asking Mr. Bravo if these documents were created under the auspices of dictator Alejandro Lanusse and his military junta. Mr. Bravo disagreed with Mr. Krishnan's choice of words, stating that Lanusse "was only a dictator to the opposition." Mr. Krishnan then asked if Lanusse was the Joint Chief of Staff and Mr. Bravo indicated that was inaccurate. Mr. Bravo declared that Lanusse was the President, and the role of Joint Chief was held by another military official. Mr. Krishnan ended his cross-examination at 2:34 p.m.

On re-direct examination at 2:35 p.m., Mr. Davis allowed Mr. Bravo to finish detailing the structure of the Argentine military junta, and examination ended at 2:37 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 6:

The video deposition of Dr. Julio Ulla, brother of victim Jorge Ulla, was played for the jury at 2:38 p.m. Dr. Ulla testified that after learning of his brother's tragic death, his family received his brother's body from the government. After this time, he reported that his family was constantly watched. Dr. Ulla remembered odd cars parked across the street from his house and being followed. Dr. Ulla noted that his family examined his brother's body and noticed two wounds, one surrounded by soot on the chest and another on his thigh. However, the military did not disclose a cause of death and no doctor would perform an autopsy. When asked why, he stated that the doctors feared being "detained, tortured, and killed." Dr. Ulla recounted that many protestors attended the victim Ulla's funeral procession and despite its peaceful proceeding, security forces began beating and tear-gassing protestors. Dr. Ulla recalled that he clung to his brother's coffin and sped off to the cemetery. Finally, Dr. Ulla indicated that his family defiantly called for justice, at great risk to themselves. The video deposition concluded at 2:59 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 7:

Plaintiffs' Counsel Neha Sabharwal called expert witness Dr. William Anderson to the stand at 3:00 p.m. When asked to discuss his credentials, Dr. Anderson explained that his extensive background in forensic pathology has allowed him to participate in over 7,000 autopsies. Dr. Anderson discussed the wounds on Jorge Ulla's body and his unofficial autopsy. Ms. Sabharwal introduced a photo of Mr. Ulla after his death. Dr. Anderson focused on the soot tattooing left around the wound on the victim's chest, emphasizing that this could only be present if a shot were fired with the gun barrel placed on the skin.

Dr. Anderson read from an unofficial autopsy report that detailed the head wound of victim Rubén Bonet, indicating that he was shot through the left hemisphere of his brain, from ear to brow. Dr. Anderson testified that the gunpowder grains described in the autopsy report were consistent with a shot at close range, "within six inches."

Under cross-examination by Mr. Davis beginning at 3:58 p.m., Dr. Anderson acknowledged that he was not present during Ruben Bonet's autopsy and that he had only reviewed an unofficial report. Dr. Anderson agreed that he did not know the credentials of the person who performed the autopsy or whether the body had been altered before the autopsy. Dr. Anderson indicated his preference for an autopsy would be a fresh and undisturbed cadaver. Mr. Davis concluded his cross-examination at 4:07 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 8:

The video deposition of Miguel Marileo was played for the jury at 4:08 p.m. A carpenter who constructed coffins in the town of Trelew, Mr. Marileo recounted being taken to Almirante Zar Naval Base after the massacre. He already knew that a shooting occurred at the base because "everyone was talking about it." He explained that after being awoken in the middle of the night,

he was told to get into a truck that was waiting for him outside. Once the truck arrived at the base, he knew why he was there. He saw three wounded survivors “moaning” on gurneys—one woman and two men. He identified the woman as Maria Berger. He was then led to a room which contained 16 naked dead bodies. Two female bodies particularly stood out to him: one visibly pregnant with gunshot wounds from the breasts down, and one with a single gunshot wound at the nape of her neck. After completing his work, he reported being threatened by a military officer to never disclose what he had witnessed, and to remember he has a son. He considered the statement a threat which he heeded for 30 years. The video deposition concluded at 4:28 p.m.

Plaintiffs’ Witness 9:

The video deposition of Corporal Carlos Marandino was played for the jury at 4:30 p.m. Corporal Marandino was present the night of the massacre and recounted being told to leave his post by Mr. Bravo after opening the prisoners’ cells. However, Corporal Marandino testified he did not leave his post entirely and stood guard in the hallway. After hearing gunfire, he returned to the prisoners’ cells and discovered their bodies. When asked who it was that ordered him to open the cells, Corporal Marandino testified it was Mr. Bravo who issued the command. Corporal Marandino related that he returned to Argentina to stand trial because he did nothing wrong. The video deposition concluded at 4:28 p.m.

Plaintiffs’ Witness 10:

The video deposition of Plaintiff Marcela Santucho was played for the jury at 4:43 p.m. The daughter of Trelew Massacre victim Ana Maria Villarreal de Santucho, Ms. Santucho recalled the hardships her family faced following her mother’s death. At the age of nine, Ms. Santucho learned of her mother’s killing after seeing her name on a list of victims on television.

At her mother's funeral, she remembered chaos as security forces tear-gassed the procession. Ms. Santucho's aunt, a lawyer, filed a complaint against the government for its role in the death of Ms. Villarreal de Santucho. The government retaliated by disappearing Ms. Santucho's aunt. Ms. Santucho detailed being kidnapped and taken to a detention camp by security forces, where she was locked in a vehicle overnight without food or water before being released the next day. Ms. Santucho eventually received asylum in Switzerland where she remained for most of her adult life, only returning to Argentina when the country began taking accountability for its actions.

After playing the majority of Marcela Santucho's deposition, the video was paused and Court adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Day 4 - Thursday, June 30, 2022:

This account summarizes what occurred on the fourth day of the trial in the case of *Raquel Camps et al. v. Roberto Guillermo Bravo*, No. 1:20-cv-24294-KMM.

Plaintiffs' Witness 10 (cont.)

The morning began with the conclusion of Plaintiff Marcela Santucho's video deposition. She testified that after the Trelew Massacre and the loss of her mother, her family was obliged to leave their homes, change their documents, and go into hiding. She described a very difficult time when she felt completely alone. For her suffering, Ms. Santucho applied for benefits by completing the necessary paperwork. She reported she was not aware of Mr. Bravo's involvement in the massacre until the 2008 criminal trial in Argentina. Ms. Santucho concluded by emphasizing her admiration for her mother and her aim in this trial: to seek justice.

Plaintiffs' Witness 11

Plaintiffs' Counsel Ajay Krishnan called expert witness Dr. Rodolfo Guillermo Pregliasco to the stand. Director of the Forensic Physics Department at the Atomic Center in

Buenos Aires, Dr. Pregliasco's testimony centered on his reconstructed blueprint of the Almirante Zar Naval Base as it was in 1972 and an analysis of the trajectory of a bullet that formed a hole in the wall.

Dr. Pregliasco referred to a Google Earth image of the base in 2008, highlighting its main entry. He showed an image illustrating the reconstruction of the base's layout in 1972. Dr. Pregliasco conducted an analysis of the different paint layers and wall markings at the base in 2008 to determine its previous layout. From this analysis, he was able to ascertain where an old bathroom and cells were located. He then created a diagram of the cell block and a scaled image depicting 19 prisoners standing side-by-side in the hallway spanning four feet, eleven inches.

Dr. Pregliasco analyzed a bullet hole found in the wall at the base. He was able to determine its trajectory depending on firing location which he physically demonstrated for the jury: if from back where the prisoners stood at the beginning of the hallway, he held the imaginary gun overhead; if from between the hallway and wall, he held the imaginary gun at chest level; and if from closer to the wall, he held the imaginary gun at waist level. In other words, the farther away, the higher the shot was taken.

After a brief break, Defense Attorney Steve Davis began his cross-examination of Dr. Pregliasco. Dr. Pregliasco confirmed the base had been renovated numerous times between the Trelew Massacre in 1972 and the first time he visited in 2007, meaning Dr. Pregliasco could not analyze the actual scene of the massacre as it existed at the time. Mr. Davis asked if Dr. Pregliasco ever saw blueprints, records, or plans for any of the renovations. Dr. Pregliasco said no, explaining that when he requested this information from the military, the military was so lacking in information that it asked for copies of *his* plans showing the renovations done to the building based on his analysis.

Dr. Pregliasco was questioned about two photographs published in an Argentine newspaper days after the Trelew Massacre showing outer and inner doors to the bathroom located near the cells, the rear wall of which contained a visible bullet hole (mentioned above) as well as a second higher bullet hole in a window (that no longer exists). Dr. Pregliasco explained that he used the photographs to help create the reconstruction because the original outer bathroom door remained in the same place when he visited in 2007, and the images helped him locate the patched area where the lower bullet hit. This in turn, Dr. Pregliasco explained, aided him in determining the trajectory of the bullet when it was fired.

Mr. Krishnan questioned Dr. Pregliasco briefly on redirect. Dr. Pregliasco clarified that he scraped paint off the wall to find the bullet hole, which had been repaired by synthetic plaster or filler. When asked how he used the bullet hole to determine the trajectory of the bullet, Dr. Pregliasco explained that after uncovering it, he used a rod the same diameter as a .45 caliber bullet and stuck it through the hole. Because the door was made of two pieces of plywood roughly an inch apart, angling the rod to pass through both holes created a line of the bullet's trajectory. Using a rod of that size also confirmed for Dr. Pregliasco that it is very likely the bullet was in fact .45 caliber because it fit snugly through the holes. This concluded redirect examination, after which time the Court broke for lunch.

Plaintiffs' Witness 12:

The trial resumed at 1:41 p.m. with the direct examination of expert witness Maximo Langer, a Professor from the University of California, Los Angeles School of Law who specializes in comparative analysis of the Argentine and American legal systems. Professor Langer began his testimony by outlining his extensive credentials, including his experience as a professor of law in both Argentina and the United States.

Professor Langer explained that his field of study attempts to bridge the legal systems of both countries while highlighting substantive differences and similarities. Professor Langer testified that he was appearing pro bono in the case. In preparation for his testimony, Professor Langer reviewed legal documents, media reports and analyses from other legal experts and authorities in Argentina and the United States relating to Trelew Massacre. In reviewing those materials, Professor Langer paid particular attention to the remedies and redress available to the victims of the massacre and their families.

Professor Langer highlighted five lawsuits brought by victims or surviving family members of the massacre between 1972 and 1974. However, Professor Langer explained, these cases never moved forward and were formally dismissed in 1977 as the claimants were being persecuted by the Argentine government. Professor Langer elaborated that directly after the massacre the military government released a decree “essentially criminalizing” any alternative accounts of Trelew that differed from the one provided by the military.

With respect to the initiation of criminal proceedings in Argentina in 2005, Professor Langer explained that because Argentina’s attempt to extradite Mr. Bravo was unsuccessful the trial proceeded without him, resulting in his fellow soldiers’ convictions in 2012. After securing these convictions, Argentina pursued a second extradition of Mr. Bravo which remains pending. Direct examination ended at 2:45 p.m.

Under cross-examination beginning at 2:45 p.m. by Defense Attorney Roger Slade of Haber Law, Professor Langer confirmed that the first attempt to extradite Mr. Bravo to Argentina failed. Cross-examination concluded at 2:47 p.m.

In a brief re-direct examination by Plaintiffs' Attorney Franco Muzzio starting at 2:48 p.m., Professor Langer explained the negative impact of the Dirty War on all civilians who sought justice in the period following the Trelew Massacre. This concluded at 2:49 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 13:

Carlos Celi's video deposition was played at 2:50 p.m. Mr. Celi served as a conscript at Almirante Zar Naval Base during the Trelew Massacre. Mr. Celi explained that his job at the base was to man the only phone available to take outside calls. He emphasized that the "room was to be manned at all times" and that it was located next to the cell block where the massacre took place. He indicated that on the night of the massacre, however, the telephone room was unmanned. When asked how he remembered that it was not manned that evening, he explained that it was common knowledge on the base amongst conscripts.

Mr. Celi recounted that he never saw Captain Sosa or Mr. Bravo after the events at Trelew. He highlighted that their absence was noticeable due to their distinct look and notoriety around the base. Both men were tall, athletic, and sported blonde hair, with Captain Sosa being the taller of the two. Further, Mr. Celi recalled that both men had fearsome reputations with Sosa specifically being known as a heavy drinker who inspired both "fear and respect" in the conscripts.

Mr. Celi reported that in the aftermath the conscripts were told to stick to the official story propagated by the military. But Mr. Celi did not believe that the prisoners had attempted to escape as the base had too many guards, too few exits, and was too remote. The video deposition concluded at 3:12 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Witness 14:

Plaintiff Raquel Camps, daughter of victim Alberto Camps, faced questions on direct examination by her counsel Franco Muzzio starting at 3:14 p.m. Through tears, she explained how she never truly knew her father, and was told by her grandparents that he had been killed along with her mother in a car crash. This story shattered when she found a newspaper clipping detailing the true nature of her parents' deaths. She learned that her father was a victim and survivor of the Trelew Massacre who was later killed on its fifth anniversary, and that both her mother and uncle were subsequently disappeared.

Ms. Camps described her current job providing legal access to rural and underserved communities. She testified that her father shared a similar passion, which provided her with a connection to him, while explaining that this passion also grew from her own denial of justice.

Ms. Camps confirmed that the disappearances also took place on or near the anniversary of both the Rawson Prison break and Trelew Massacre that followed a week later. Therefore, the anniversary dates of these events continued to play a significant role in her life. She realized as an adult that during her childhood her grandparents often left home around these dates to hide in the rural outskirts of Buenos Aires for weeks.

Ms. Camps testified that after learning of the true nature of her parents' deaths, she could not pursue justice for fear of being persecuted by the military. Ms. Camps said her greatest desire at that time was to learn who her father was—to know him as a person. She described how painful it was not to know even basic facts like his favorite sport or food.

It was not until 1998 that Ms. Camps received further information about her parents after Argentina began paying reparations to the victims of the military's abuse. In the course of acquiring reparations, Ms. Camps received her father's death certificate detailing his tragic death

and the remains of her father from a forensic anthropology team. Her mother's body was never found. She stated that upon recovering her father's body she was once again struck by how little she knew him, and how painful it was to be robbed of that opportunity.

Ms. Camps later began seeking justice for the abuse her family had endured, though her pursuit was delayed by persistent fear of persecution. It was not until 2005 that she got involved in a criminal case against three of the soldiers that were responsible for the shootings. When asked about her safety during this prosecution, she explained that she was very fearful for her family but took comfort in being placed in witness protection. She recounted calling other victims' families and flying on a plane to Trelew to visit the Almirante Zar Naval Base. She stated that she served as a representative of other surviving family members due to her residence in Buenos Aires. Ms. Camps explained that after the exhausting litigation, the three soldiers were convicted, but Mr. Bravo remained free as he could not be located. It was not until 2008 that she discovered that Mr. Bravo was in Miami, Florida.

Ms. Camps explained that she is currently waiting for an extradition hearing to finish in hopes it will result in Mr. Bravo being sent back to Argentina to stand trial. When Mr. Muzzio displayed two pictures of victim Alberto, one smiling and one lying on his hospital bed, Ms. Camps tearfully confirmed those were the only pictures she had of her father. She could not tolerate that the last perpetrator of the massacre walked free.

Ms. Camps explained that even though a second extradition proceeding is still pending, she advanced this civil case against Mr. Bravo because she had waited too long for justice. She stated that Mr. Bravo had been a free man for too long. Mr. Muzzio then ended his questioning of Ms. Camps and at 4:40 p.m. Court was adjourned.

Day 5 - Friday, July 1st, 2022:

This account summarizes what occurred on the fifth and final day of the trial in the case of *Raquel Camps et al. v. Roberto Guillermo Bravo*, No. 1:20-cv-24294-KMM.

Plaintiffs' Witness 14 (cont.)

The morning began with Defense's Counsel cross-examination of Plaintiff Raquel Camps. She testified that she was born in 1976, one year prior to her father's killing. As a child, she was not aware of her father's job or political activities; she only knew that her father was killed in 1977 by the Argentine military.

In 1999-2000, Ms. Camps received reparations from the Argentine government. She first received approximately 200,000 Argentine pesos for her father's killing, and later received a second payment of an unknown amount for her mother's disappearance. These amounts were equally remitted to her older brother as well.

When asked about her involvement in the 2005 letter to the Argentine President written by Ms. Alicia Krueger, Ms. Camps stated she did not remember it. Though she recalled the request for justice, she did not recall signing the letter. This concluded questioning.

Judge Lauren Louis then asked the jury to leave the courtroom and heard oral arguments from the attorneys. Defense Counsel argued that the case should be dismissed based on how much time passed between the Trelew Massacre and the initiation of this lawsuit. After hearing Plaintiffs' Counsel's opposing arguments, the Judge decided the trial would continue, and that the jury would decide the verdict.

After the jury returned to the courtroom, Plaintiffs' Counsel read a portion of a 2008 document stating that Interpol had located Mr. Bravo in Miami. Plaintiffs then rested their case.

Defense's Witness 1

The Defense began its case by returning to the video testimony of Carlos Celi, a former soldier who worked at the Almirante Zar Naval Base at the time of the Trelew Massacre. Mr. Celi testified that no one was on duty in the telephone office next to the prisoner's cell area on the night of the massacre.

Mr. Celi remembered Mr. Bravo but had no interaction with him in August 1972. When asked whether Mr. Bravo had a good reputation as a soldier, Mr. Celi reported that Mr. Bravo was "rough" or "hard," but had a good reputation. Mr. Celi did not know if Mr. Bravo was a dedicated soldier but assumed so because Mr. Bravo was an officer. Mr. Celi had no contact with the prisoners, though he knew they had escaped from Rawson Prison and killed a guard in the process. He testified that Rawson was a maximum-security prison, and therefore known to be difficult to escape.

Defense's Witness 2

The Defense revisited the video testimony of Plaintiff Marcela Santucho in which Defense Counsel inquired about her childhood and life after fleeing Argentina. Ms. Santucho testified that she mostly lived with her mother during the first seven years of her life. After that, she primarily lived with her grandparents because her parents were traveling extensively while being persecuted by the Argentine government. Her parents and grandparents thought she and her siblings would be safest living with her grandparents, although their house was raided by the military when persecuting her parents. Ms. Santucho relayed she was too young to understand why her parents were imprisoned. Her parents were killed when she was nine years old.

Ms. Santucho fled Argentina to live in exile in Cuba in 1977 at the age of 14 or 15. She lived at a boarding school most of her time in Cuba. In 1985 she moved to Switzerland. She

wanted to return to Argentina in 1994 but was unable to find employment because of her last name. She finally moved back to Argentina in 2008 after finishing her studies in Switzerland. At that time, she was able to receive compensation for both her mother's death and her own kidnapping as a child. Altogether, she received approximately 450,000 Argentine pesos. She did not collect compensation for her father's persecution and death.

Mr. Davis asked Ms. Santucho what she learned about Mr. Bravo starting in 2008. She relayed that she knew he was in Miami, that he was possibly arrested or placed under house arrest, and that there was a request for his extradition. She did conduct investigation on her own, relying on her lawyers to handle that.

Finally, Mr. Davis asked if Ms. Santucho had any first-hand knowledge of what happened at Rawson Prison. She said that she did not because she was not imprisoned.

Defense's Witness 3

The Defense returned to Plaintiff Alicia Krueger's video deposition. She explained that her first husband, a victim of the Trelew Massacre, was a factory worker. She did not recall him taking any political stances against the Argentine military when he was arrested in 1972. She did not know why he tried to escape from Rawson Prison. After his arrest, Ms. Krueger was able to visit her husband, but did not have any further contact; she was not able to call or write to him.

When Resolution 24.411 was passed in 2000, Ms. Krueger was given 30,000 Argentine pesos, which was divided between her and her two children. She also received 531,059 Argentine pesos in 2011, which again was divided between her and her children.

When asked about the time she returned to Argentina after seeking refuge in France, Ms. Krueger explained that she only felt safe to go back after the military junta was finished. Therefore, the first time she returned was in 2005.

When questioned about her knowledge of Mr. Bravo's location in Miami, Ms. Krueger asserted that although she knew he was in Miami in 2008, she did not know how to prosecute him. She did not understand she could call a lawyer and have him tried in the United States. Finally, when asked about her letter to the Argentine President, Ms. Krueger emphasized that she wrote it to seek justice, not compensation.

The Defense rested its case, and the Court broke for lunch.

Plaintiffs' Closing Statement:

Court resumed at 2:00 p.m., when Plaintiffs' Counsel Ajay Krishnan presented the Plaintiffs' closing statement. Mr. Krishnan thanked the jury for listening to the tale of each Plaintiff and for sitting through painful statements, reenactments, and photographs depicting the tragedy at Trelew. Mr. Krishnan discussed the importance of the charges against Mr. Bravo as they relate to each Plaintiff. He explained that the charge for each victim other than Mr. Camps was extra-judicial killing—that is, a killing not sanctioned by a court of law. For Mr. Camps, due to his survival of Trelew, the charges were attempted extra-judicial killing and torture by gunshot for the wound he received following his refusal to cooperate with interrogation.

Mr. Krishnan outlined the Plaintiffs' main arguments: (1) Mr. Bravo conspired to kill the prisoners in cold blood; (2) Mr. Bravo did not act in self-defense; (3) the Plaintiffs filed their complaint in a timely manner; and (4) Mr. Bravo should be held accountable for his actions. Mr. Krishnan displayed photographs of the victims, detailing the injuries sustained by Mr. Camps and the deaths of Mr. Bonet, Ms. Santucho, and Mr. Cappello. Mr. Krishnan emphasized that it was the jury's role to determine which party's statements were more plausible.

Mr. Krishnan reminded the jury of the shots suffered by the victims, highlighting the press contact wound of one victim, the shot to the back of the head of another, and Mr. Camps'

testimony of the attempted execution he suffered via shot to the stomach. He contrasted this evidence with Mr. Bravo's account that he fired from 9-10 feet when the prisoners attacked him.

Mr. Krishnan argued that Mr. Bravo's account was not believable and lacked any corroborating evidence. He asked the jury how all 19 prisoners could be killed or injured after the "attack" without a single guard sustaining an injury. He pointed to the numerous inconsistencies between Mr. Bravo's sworn testimony in his deposition and at trial. Mr. Krishnan contended that the testimony presented at trial by both experts and third-party witnesses disproved Mr. Bravo's narrative.

Mr. Krishnan concluded by requesting that the jury award his clients around \$20 million in compensatory damages, and triple that amount in punitive damages to deter any future actors from committing atrocities like those at Trelew.

Mr. Krishnan finished his closing statement at 2:59 p.m.

Defense's Closing Statement:

At 3:03 p.m. Defense Counsel Steve Davis began his closing statement. Mr. Davis thanked the members of the jury for their time and emphasized that he was not defending the deplorable actions of the Argentine government, but rather representing Mr. Bravo. Mr. Davis reminded the jury about who the prisoners were, arguing that they were dangerous individuals who had escaped a maximum-security prison, killed a prison guard, and were labeled as extremists. Therefore, Mr. Bravo, a mere logistics officer whose secondary job was to watch prisoners in unfit cells, reasonably perceived them and the situation to be dangerous.

Mr. Davis argued that there was no evidence of a conspiracy to kill the prisoners; rather, in response to prisoner Pujadas shooting at the guards, Mr. Bravo acted in self-defense. Mr.

Davis alleged that even after acting in self-defense, Mr. Bravo had been the one to call additional guards for first aid.

Mr. Davis denied that Mr. Bravo ever attempted to hide in the United States as implied by the Plaintiffs. He argued this was evidenced by his working with the U.S. military, attending university, and creating multiple businesses publicly registered with the Florida Secretary of State bearing his name and address.

Finally, Mr. Davis doubled down on his position that, despite the tragic events that happened to the Plaintiffs, the law of the United States required them to file a timely case within ten years to allow Mr. Bravo to put on a fair defense. Mr. Davis emphasized that the Plaintiffs, despite the fear they experienced, should have only been able to bring the case through 2018 at the latest. Mr. Davis concluded his closing statement at 3:49 p.m.

Plaintiffs' Rebuttal in Closing:

Mr. Krishnan delivered brief rebuttal at 3:52 p.m., stressing that the jury should not allow the Defendant to blame the victims. He argued that the Plaintiffs' fear extended into 2010 and that they initially tried holding Mr. Bravo criminally liable in 2005. Mr. Krishnan concluded by emphasizing that this case is not about money, but a last attempt to hold Mr. Bravo accountable if he is not sent back to Argentina. Mr. Krishnan finished his rebuttal at 3:54 p.m.

Jury Deliberations and Verdict:

Judge Louis read the jury its instructions, and the jury adjourned to deliberate. After 2.5 hours of deliberations, the jury returned a verdict finding Mr. Bravo liable on all charges and awarding \$24.25 million in total damages.