

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

BASHE ABDI YOUSUF, et al., . Civil Action No. 1:04cv1360

Plaintiffs,

vs. . Alexandria, Virginia

January 7, 2005

MOHAMED ALI SAMANTAR, . 10:00 a.m.

Defendant.

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTIONS HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:

ROBERT R. VIETH, ESQ.
Cooley Godward LLP
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5656

and

HELENE SILVERBERG, ESQ.

Center for Justice & Accountability

870 Market Street, Suite 684

San Francisco, CA 94102

FOR THE DEFENDANT:

HARVEY J. VOLZER, ESQ.

Shaughnessy, Volzer & Gagner, P.C. 1101 15th Street, N.W., Suite 202

Washington, D.C. 20005

and

FRED B. GOLDBERG, ESQ. Spirer & Goldberg, P.C.

7101 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1201

Bethesda, MD 20814

(Pages 1 - 12)

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: U.S. District Court, Fifth Floor 401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314 (703)299-8595 

## PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Civil Action 2004-1360, Bashe Abdi Yousuf, et al. v. Mohamed Ali Samantar. Will counsel please note their appearance for the record.

THE COURT: Counsel, put your names on the record, please.

2.0

MR. VIETH: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert Vieth of Cooley Godward for the plaintiffs, and, Your Honor, I would like to introduce to the Court my co-counsel, Helene Silverberg, from the Center for Justice & Accountability. Ms. Silverberg is admitted in the State of California, and I do believe Your Honor has granted her pro hac vice paper.

THE COURT: As I said, I think half the California Bar has been admitted to this case. Good morning. Nice to meet you.

MS. SILVERBERG: Good morning, Your Honor.

MR. VIETH: Your Honor, with the Court's permission, I would -- I am prepared to handle argument on the first filed motion to dismiss today while Ms. Silverberg will handle the what I would call the cross-motions regarding the ability of the plaintiffs to proceed anonymously.

THE COURT: All right. You know how this Court operates. I've already made up my mind on some issues.

MR. VIETH: I do, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. And for the defendant?

MR. VOLZER: Good morning, Judge Brinkema. Harvey

Volzer for the defendant, and this is Fred Goldberg, who's been admitted previously pro hac vice, and he will handle the arguments today.

2.0

2.2

THE COURT: All right. Well, there are before the Court this morning the defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction, the defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim, and the plaintiffs' motion for leave to proceed anonymously. Obviously, I'm going to deal with that last motion first.

The allegations in this case are that the various plaintiffs, who are Somalian natives, are seeking compensatory and punitive damages for alleged torture that they suffered at the hands of the defendant, and they have sued in this court under the Torture Victim Protection Act and the Alien Tort Claims Act, as I understand it.

The named defendant, Mr. Samantar, is a former prime minister, first vice president, and minister of defense of the Democratic Republic of Somalia; and the plaintiffs have alleged that he was responsible for acts of torture; cruel and inhumane and degrading treatment; arbitrary detention; rape; extraditional killing; and attempted extraditional killing against the plaintiffs and their family members; and plaintiffs John Does 1 and 2 also allege that the defendant was responsible for war crimes against them.

The defendant, it is alleged is now, although a citizen

of Somalia, resides in Fairfax County, Virginia.

Obviously, the nature of the charges that have been filed in this case are very serious. My understanding is that many of the plaintiffs allegedly still reside in Somalia, and therefore, they are seeking at this point protection of their identities.

My understanding is that the plaintiffs' counsel is willing to reveal the names of the plaintiffs privately to counsel for the defendant but are requesting that those names not be publicly noticed at this point and that they not be shared -- and actually have agreed to let them be shared, as I understand it, with the defendant as well.

Is that right?

MS. SILVERBERG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Goldberg -- Mr. Volzer, I don't see why that's any problem for the defendant.

MR. VOLZER: I would agree with those, you know, stipulations.

THE COURT: Now, the further stipulation, of course, is that your client would not be permitted to reveal the names of those people to anyone without Court permission, so you can talk freely with your client, and if down the road -- if this case were to stay on the docket, if down the road you needed to conduct discovery and if for some reason the name of the individual was necessary, then, you know, we'd have to work out some parameters

for that. But I assume you can live with that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VOLZER: Your Honor, we -- Mr. Vieth and I have handled cases together before, and we get along very well, so I think if there's any problem, we can probably work it out between counsel, but we do have experts that we intend to use in this case, and I think it's important for those experts to know -these are not, you know, these are not people from Somalia, but they're being retained to talk about the law of those countries.

THE COURT: They wouldn't need the names of the people to do that, would they?

MR. VOLZER: Well, I think they might, Your Honor, and we can bring that up again.

THE COURT: All right. At the present time then, I'm going to grant the plaintiffs' motion for leave to proceed anonymously. There is -- the first plaintiff has permitted his name to be used --

MS. SILVERBERG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- Mr. Yousef, and so that name is publicly available. 19

The rest of the plaintiffs will remain John or Jane Does at this point. Counsel will have access to their names, and the defendant will have access to their names, but neither counsel nor the defendant may reveal the John or Jane Doe names to any other individual without permission from Court unless you've gotten written permission from the plaintiffs. All right?

MR. VOLZER: Understood, Your Honor.

1.3

THE COURT: And certainly that will not interfere with your ability to conduct any discovery or to consult with expert witnesses, all right?

MR. VOLZER: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Now, as to defendant's motions to dismiss, I am concerned before we get any further into this case as to what the positions are, if any, of the United States Department of State and the government of Somalia as to this issue of head-of-state immunity. So what I want to know, Mr. Vieth, from the plaintiffs is have you approached either or both of those governmental entities to get their views on that issue?

MR. VIETH: Your Honor, let me just take up Somalia first. There is no recognized government in Somalia. It is certainly no government recognized by the United States government.

As Your Honor may have gleaned from the papers -- and what I'm telling you today, Your Honor, I think there's a fair amount of source in the record, but it's also material that I've come to learn working on this case, frankly.

Somalia is almost, it's almost fair to say, is divided into two regions. There is a region of Somaliland in the northwest portion of the former Somalia. That region formerly was a British protectorate, and after the collapse of the Barre regime in 1991, Somaliland essentially declared its own independence, but

it is not a recognized country by any other country in the world, at least to my understanding, certainly not by the United States.

The remainder of Somalia is in, I would say to put it charitably, in formative stages of trying to establish a government, but there really is no -- not much going there. All of the available public record information indicates that it is in a complete state of chaos. Somaliland is a little bit better.

THE COURT: And that may be the case, but as you know, these issues about head-of-state immunity, etc., are very tough issues, and traditionally what the courts do is they want if it's possible -- a determination as to who qualifies as a head of state is normally made by the executive branch.

MR. VIETH: I --

2.2

THE COURT: It's not properly a factual issue that a court should be determining, and therefore, at least I would like to know whether you've approached the State Department on this issue.

MR. VIETH: We have not approached any Somali entity --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VIETH: -- that's part of Your Honor's question, and no, we have not approached the State Department.

As I understand how this process normally works, a defendant who seeks immunity may request of the State Department a certification.

THE COURT: Well, we were going to get to that question,

but I wanted to find --

MR. VIETH: And I am curious to know -- we have not approached the State Department about it. We feel it, frankly, is the defendant's burden to do so, and I am curious if the defendant has done so. I don't know if he has.

THE COURT: All right. But again, you've answered my question about anybody in a governmental position of Somalia.

Thank you.

MR. VIETH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, Mr. Volzer, since you're raising the issue of immunity -- co-counsel -- have you approached the State Department on this issue?

MR. GOLDBERG: No, we have not approached the State

Department as of yet. We do believe that there is ample case law,
however, to support the notion that absent a determination by the

State Department or a letter of interest from the State

Department, it is up to the Court to make a determination, and
that's happened in many cases. We've cited them in the brief, the

Abiola case as well as the case involving Aristide.

The courts can make that determination absent a letter from the State Department.

THE COURT: But they're the fair minority of the courts that have looked at this issue. The far majority of the courts have said first that this is a matter that the executive branch ought to look at. If they choose not to invoke any immunity, then

obviously, we go on from there. If the government does feel that immunity -- if they give the necessary indication that this person is the head of the state and immunity would apply, then, you know, we look at that.

I think that's a huge piece of the puzzle that's missing in this case, and since you're moving to dismiss on the ground of immunity, without some indication, even an indication that there's not going to be any indication, I don't feel this record is adequately complete, and so what the Court is going to do is I'm going to defer ruling on the motions to dismiss subject to your promptly approaching the Department of State to get its view as to this issue, and after we've gotten whatever response they choose to give us, then the Court will advise you-all, and we'll re-docket this matter for argument on the motions to dismiss. The case will stay on the docket at this point.

Have you been -- you've been before a magistrate judge for the initial pretrial, or is that coming up next week?

MR. GOLDBERG: That's coming up next week.

Your Honor, I'd like to be heard on the other issues as well, however, the --

THE COURT: No, I'm not going to hear any other issues at this point. What I'm going to do, though, is I'm going to defer for 30 days the pretrial conference. I expect the defendants to move expeditiously on this; that is, I want a report back within 30 days as to what you've done vis-a-vis the State

```
Department, what its position is, where you are, and at that
 1
 2
    point, we will decide how we want to proceed.
 3
              Thank you.
 4
              MR. VOLZER: Your Honor, if I may, just one point of
    clarification?
 5
 6
              THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Volzer.
 7
              MR. VOLZER: Do you want us to continue the conference
    next week with Judge Poretz?
 8
              THE COURT: No, I'm going to take that off. The case is
 9
10
    not going to linger on the docket, but I'm giving you 30 days to
11
    get this addressed, and then you'll report back to the Court.
    I'll determine at that point whether we're going to go ahead with
12
    the motions to dismiss and/or get this initial pretrial --
14
              MR. VOLZER: Your Honor, is discovery stayed during that
15
    period?
              THE COURT: Yes, I'm staying discovery for 30 days.
16
17
              MR. VOLZER: Thank you.
18
              THE COURT:
                          We'll move fast enough, it's not going to be
19
    a problem.
20
              MR. VOLZER: I understand. Believe me, I understand.
21
              MR. VIETH: Your Honor, one further point of
22
    clarification in light of Your Honor's stay of discovery.
                                                               We have
23
    issued some third-party discovery already to agencies of the
24
    government by 2(a) requests and subpoenas. Your Honor --
25
              THE COURT:
                          Those take so long.
```

MR. VIETH: -- given the turnaround time, I would prefer 1 that that not be stayed. 2 THE COURT: I'll make that for both sides. Either side 3 who feels it's going to need discovery from governmental agencies 4 may continue with that discovery because the process does take so 5 long. I don't want to slow this case down unnecessarily. All 6 right? Thank you, Your Honor. MR. VIETH: 8 9 THE COURT: Thank you. (Which were all the proceedings had 10 11 at this time.) 12 13 CERTIFICATE OF THE REPORTER 14 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 15 16 17 18 Anneliese J. Thomson 19 20 21 22 23 24 25