

**BETTS, PATTERSON & MINES P.S.**

Christopher W. Tompkins (WSBA #11686)

[CTompkins@bpmlaw.com](mailto:CTompkins@bpmlaw.com)

701 Pike Street, Suite 1400

Seattle, WA 98101-3927

**BLANK ROME LLP**

Henry F. Schuelke III (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[HSchuelke@blankrome.com](mailto:HSchuelke@blankrome.com)

1825 Eye St. NW

Washington, DC 20006

James T. Smith (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[Smith-jt@blankrome.com](mailto:Smith-jt@blankrome.com)

Brian S. Paszament (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[Paszament@blankrome.com](mailto:Paszament@blankrome.com)

Jeffrey N. Rosenthal (admitted *pro hac vice*)

[Rosenthal-j@blankrome.com](mailto:Rosenthal-j@blankrome.com)

One Logan Square, 130 N. 18th Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Attorneys for Defendants Mitchell and Jessen

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SPOKANE**

SULEIMAN ABDULLAH SALIM,  
et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JAMES E. MITCHELL and JOHN  
JESSEN,

Defendants.

NO. 2:15-cv-286-JLQ

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF  
UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS**

Note on Motion Calendar:  
July 28, 2017, 9:30 a.m., at  
Spokane Washington

**DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS STATEMENT OF  
UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS**

Betts  
Patterson  
Mines  
701 Pike Street, Suite 1400  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927  
(206) 292-9988

1 Defendants James Elmer Mitchell and John “Bruce” Jessen (collectively,  
2 “Defendants”) respectfully submit this *Response to Plaintiffs’ Statement of*  
3 *Undisputed Facts* submitted in support of *Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary*  
4 *Judgment* (“Plaintiffs’ Motion”). As set forth in *Defendants’ Response to*  
5 *Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment*, Defendants contend that many  
6 of the facts asserted below are not relevant, and have no bearing on the merits of  
7 Plaintiffs’ Motion. Defendants address the accuracy of these asserted facts in case  
8 the Court finds these facts material and/or rejects Defendants’ legal arguments.  
9

10 Defendants address two discrete sets of facts asserted by Plaintiffs in support  
11 of Plaintiffs’ Motion in order to limit repetitious responses below. First, many of  
12 the facts asserted by Plaintiffs concern the capture, treatment, interrogation, or  
13 responses to interrogation of Abu Zubaydah (“Zubaydah”), the first prisoner  
14 captured by the CIA. The enhanced interrogation techniques (“EITs”) suggested  
15 to the CIA by Defendants were specifically intended for Zubaydah only, although  
16 they were later expanded for use on other High Value Detainees (“HVDs”) such as  
17 Zubaydah. The facts asserted by Plaintiffs concerning Zubaydah’s capture,  
18 treatment, interrogation and response to interrogation are not relevant to the  
19 resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion, which addresses solely  
20 Defendants’ alleged liability under “aiding and abetting.”<sup>1</sup> FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1);  
21

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> Conversely, information concerning Zubaydah is relevant to issues raised in  
24 Defendants’ pending *Motion for Summary Judgment* (ECF 169), which addresses  
25 additional legal issues, including the CIA’s command and control of Defendants.  
26

1 FED. R. EVID. 401, 402. In addition, such facts are more prejudicial than probative  
 2 in this context, and should be excluded from consideration under Rule 403 of the  
 3 Federal Rules of Evidence. Defendants refer below to these multiple grounds for  
 4 their objection to facts asserted concerning Zubaydah's capture, detention,  
 5 interrogation, and response to interrogation shorthand as "Objection—Zubaydah."

6 Second, Plaintiffs make numerous factual assertions concerning  
 7 waterboarding. Waterboarding, generally or of other detainees, is not relevant to  
 8 the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion, FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1);  
 9 FED. R. EVID. 401, 402, because Plaintiffs were not waterboarded. *See* Defs.'  
 10 Resp. to Pls.' SOF ¶ 25. In addition, facts related to waterboarding are more  
 11 prejudicial than probative in light of the fact that Plaintiffs were not waterboarded,  
 12 and should be excluded from consideration under Federal Rule 403. Defendants  
 13 refer below to these multiple grounds for their objection to facts asserted  
 14 concerning waterboarding shorthand as "Objection—waterboarding."  
 15

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
1. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Defendants "played a significant and formative role in the development of [CIA Counterterrorism Center (CTC)'s] detention and interrogation program." Deposition of James Elmer Mitchell 335:22–24 (Ladin Decl., Exh. A, cited hereinafter as " <u>Mitchell Dep.</u> ").	Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the citation to the deposition of James Elmer Mitchell (" <u>Dr. Mitchell</u> ") as testimony when it is, in fact, part of a question posed by Plaintiffs' attorney. Dr. Mitchell did not adopt or agree with the characterization. Deposition of James Elmer Mitchell (" <u>Mitchell Dep.</u> ") 335:22–24.
2. 25 26	When the CIA captured its first prisoner, Abu Zubaydah, the CIA	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
 PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF  
 UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

- 2 -

Betts  
 Patterson  
 Mines  
 701 Pike Street, Suite 1400  
 Seattle, Washington 98101-3927  
 (206) 292-9988

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	Counterterrorism Center had no experience or expertise on interrogation. Deposition of Jose Rodriguez 46:23–48:4 (Ladin Decl., Exh. B, cited hereinafter as " <u>Rodriguez Dep.</u> ").	Summary Judgment (" <u>Plaintiffs' Motion</u> "). Objection—Zubaydah.
3.	Defendants had never interrogated a prisoner before Abu Zubaydah. Deposition of John "Bruce" Jessen 116:3–8 (Ladin Decl., Exh. C, cited hereinafter as "Jessen Dep.>").	Disputed. Plaintiffs imply that Defendants Dr. Mitchell and John "Bruce" Jessen (" <u>Dr. Jessen</u> ") (collectively, " <u>Defendants</u> ") were not qualified to conduct interrogations. Although Defendants had not "done interrogations of live terrorists before", Dr. Jessen had extensive experience designing advanced courses that specifically prepared trainees for capture by terrorist groups and Dr. Mitchell had extensive experience as part of a counterterrorism unit studying how enemy organizations approached interrogations. Defendants Statement of Undisputed Facts (" <u>Defs.' SOF</u> ") (ECF No. 170) ¶¶ 17, 20; Jessen Dep. 116:3-8.
4.	Before the aggressive phase began, Defendant Mitchell recommended that Abu Zubaydah's sleep be disrupted, that he not be provided with any amenities, and that noise be fed into Abu Zubaydah's cell. Am. Answer, ECF No. 77 ¶ 34.	Disputed. These recommendations were made by a three-member behavioral team led by a CIA employed psychologist, of which Dr. Mitchell was merely one member. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 46-51. Objection—Zubaydah.
5.	The plan was that "white noise	Not contested for purposes of

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	generators” would disrupt Abu Zubaydah’s ability to think and would “increase his sense of helplessness by highlighting his inability to alter the environment around him.” The goal was to emphasize that “the only mechanism [Abu Zubaydah] has at his disposal to control the environment will be in providing vital intelligence,” and that pleasing his interrogators was the only way to “earn basic privileges” and receive better conditions. Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001828.	Plaintiffs’ Motion. Defendants further state that the interrogation plan for Zubaydah included the use of “physically non-harmful” white noise generators to “be used in variable lengths of time[.]” Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001826 at ¶ 3, 001828. Objection—Zubaydah.
6.	Defendant Mitchell took part in recommending sensory deprivation, including painting the cell white, installing halogen lights, installing sound-dampening carpeting, and “the sanding of the holding cell bars to reduce AZ’s ability to stimulate his sensorium via rubbing of the bars.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022604; Ladin Decl., Exh. F at U.S. Bates 002000.	Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that these recommendations were made by a three-member behavior team led by a CIA employed psychologist, of which Dr. Mitchell was merely one member. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 46-51. Objection—Zubaydah.
7.	Abu Zubaydah was subsequently kept naked in a cell lit by halogen lamps for 24 hours per day, while being subjected constantly to rock music or other noise. Am. Answer, ECF No. 77 ¶ 38.	Disputed to the extent that this implies that the music or noise was something other than “physically non-harmful” noise. Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001826 at ¶ 3. Disputed to the extent Plaintiffs imply that either Defendant played

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		any role in determining that Zubaydah would be kept naked, as there is no support in the record for Defendants' involvement in that determination. Otherwise not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion. Objection-Zubaydah.
8.	The "deliberate manipulation of the environment" in accordance with these recommendations was "intended to cause psychological disorientation . . . as well as an increased sense of learned helplessness." Ladin Decl., Exh. F at U.S. Bates 002000.	Disputed that "learned helplessness" as described by Dr. Martin Seligman (" <u>Dr. Seligman</u> ") was intended. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 53-56. Individuals affiliated with the CIA often misused the term "learned helplessness" in documents because they did not understand and appreciate the distinction between helplessness to induce cooperation—as utilized in the Survival Evasion Resistance and Escape (" <u>SERE</u> ") training—and "learned helplessness," as described by Dr. Seligman, which would inhibit cooperation. Defs.' SOF ¶ 57. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that the underlying document is accurately quoted. Objection—Zubaydah.
9.	During this phase, the "development of psychological dependence, learned helplessness and short term thinking" were pursued by the deliberate environmental modifications and	Disputed that "learned helplessness" as described by Dr. Seligman was pursued. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 53-56. Individuals affiliated with the CIA often misused the term "learned

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p>sleep deprivation, which aimed to produce “disorientation by not allowing in natural light nor routine of schedule.” Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001826. The desired result was that “the early phases of the process will encourage the development of the necessary mindset where [the CIA prisoner] will have difficulty concentrating, planning, and most importantly resisting the process.” Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001827.</p>	<p>helplessness” in documents because they did not understand and appreciate the distinction between helplessness to induce cooperation—as utilized in SERE—and “learned helplessness,” as described by Dr. Seligman, which would inhibit cooperation. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 57. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that the underlying document is accurately quoted. Objection—Zubaydah.</p>
10.	<p>Eventually, the interrogation team “substituted a stereo to play loud rock music to enhance his sense of hopelessness.” Ladin Decl., Exh. G at U.S. Bates 002146.</p>	<p>Disputed. The April 25, 2002 Cable cited by Plaintiffs as support for this statement (US Bates 002146) states, “<i>We</i> have recently substituted a stereo to play loud rock music to enhance his sense of hopelessness.” (emphasis added) Disputed that the term “we” denotes the interrogation team because the sender of the cable is redacted. Ladin Decl., Exh. G at U.S. Bates 002146. Disputed to the extent this implies that the music was something other than “physically non-harmful” noise. Ladin Decl., Exh. D at U.S. Bates 001826 at ¶ 3. Objection—Zubaydah.</p>
11.	<p>Defendant Mitchell decided that he had sufficient “qualifications to put together a psychologically</p>	<p>Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize MJ00022632, which states “[T]he question was</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	based interrogation program.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022632.	about my qualifications to put together a psychologically based interrogation program that would condition Abu Zubaydah to cooperate and then interrogate him using it. I knew it would need to be based on what was called ‘Pavlovian Classical Conditioning’ . . . and I was very familiar with it because my early training was as a behavioral psychologist.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022632. Objection—Zubaydah.
12.	Mitchell “knew that the bulk of psychologists would probably object” to his actions. Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 270:12–13.	Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Mitchell’s cited testimony. Although the partial quotation is accurate, Plaintiffs incorrectly attribute the statement broadly to all of Dr. Mitchell’s “actions.” In fact, Dr. Mitchell testified that he “knew the bulk of psychologists would probably object” to him being the individual that conducted the interrogations using EITs. Mitchell Dep. 270:12–13; Mitchell Dep. Ex. 4 (Mitchell’s Manuscript) at MJ00022631. Objection—Zubaydah.
13.	At Defendant Mitchell’s recommendation, the CIA contracted his friend, Defendant Jessen to help “put together an interrogation program” and implement it on Abu Zubaydah.	Disputed. The cited documents indicate that Dr. Jessen was contracted to help “put together an interrogation program” for “use” exclusively on Zubaydah. Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022631.



¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 399:22–400:19; Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022631–32.	Objection—Zubaydah.
14.	The program was based on “Pavlovian Classical Conditioning.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022632.	Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that the program that they were contracted to help develop for Zubaydah was based upon Pavlovian Classic Conditioning. Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022631-32. Objection—Zubaydah.
15.	A prisoner subjected to the program would be given “a choice, you can start talking or you can get some more physical pressure.” Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 161:20–162:2.	Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Jessen’s cited testimony. Dr. Jessen explained how the CIA’s interrogation program for HVDs (the “HVD Program”) used helplessness as described in the Army Field Manual. More specifically, temporary helplessness was induced through physical pressures designed to be used in a way that did not harm, but made someone uncomfortable, and the subject knew that the pressures would stop if he cooperated in some way. Jessen Dep. 160:19-163:22. Dr. Jessen also testified that during each HVD interrogation, medical, psychological, administrative and intelligence staff were able to stop an interrogation if there was a physical or psychological threat to

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>the detainee. <i>Id.</i> at 136:5-16. Thus, an interrogation could be stopped even if the prisoner did not cooperate.</p> <p>Defendants further dispute any implication that they were part of an interrogation program that was used on Plaintiffs, or on any detainees who were not HVDs. Defs.' SOF ¶ 208-11 (the interrogation techniques proposed by Defendants were for use only on HVDs).</p>
16.	<p>Mitchell testified that "my thinking on the subject was that, much like with a dental phobia, the time that they're going to be most motivated to get out of it is before the next time" the physical pressures were applied. Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 358:20–24.</p>	<p>Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.</p>
17.	<p>Jose Rodriguez, who was then the head of CTC, explained that he heard Defendant Mitchell use the phrase "learned helplessness," and "explaining these psychological terms," but that Mr. Rodriguez's own interest was "in getting results, not in, you know, the psychological state of people." Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 85:6–86:20.</p>	<p>Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion. But, objected to as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p>
18.	<p>Jose Rodriguez testified that</p>	<p>Not contested for purposes of</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	Defendant Mitchell "had a good vision for what needed to be done," which "was the use of enhanced interrogations to get Abu Zubaydah to cooperate with us." Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 37:8–38:4.	Plaintiffs' Motion. Objection—Zubaydah.
19.	In July 2002, Defendant Mitchell and others within the CIA assessed Abu Zubaydah as uncooperative. Am. Answer, ECF No. 77 ¶ 41.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion. Objection—Zubaydah.
20.	Defendants drafted and submitted to the CIA a recommended list of 12 physically coercive methods that they claimed would "instill fear and despair": "Attention Grasp," "Walling," "Facial Hold," "Facial Slap (Insult Slap)," "Cramped Confinement," "Wall Standing," "Stress Positions," "Sleep Deprivation," "Water Board," "Use of Diapers," "Insects," and "Mock Burial." Ladin Decl., Exh. H at U.S. Bates 0001110–11; Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 114:20–115:11; Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 262:5–21.	Disputed. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that Defendants drafted US Bates 001110-11 (the "July 2002 Memo"). But, Plaintiffs mischaracterize the July 2002 Memo, which characterizes the 12 interrogation methods (i.e. the EITs) as "potential physical and psychological pressures" not as "physically coercive methods," as asserted by Plaintiffs. Additionally, the document states, "[t]he aim of using these techniques is to dislocate the subject's expectations concerning how he is apt to be treated and instill fear and despair." Defendants did not claim that the interrogation methods "would instill fear and despair," as asserted by Plaintiffs. Ladin Decl., Exh. H at U.S. Bates 0001110–11.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
21.	Defendants based their list of coercive methods on techniques used in training in the Department of Defense's Survival, Research, Evasion and Escape ("SERE") program. Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 186:1-187:3.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion, except that the July 2002 Memo does not characterize the EITs as "coercive methods" as asserted by Plaintiffs (as discussed immediately above).
22.	"The techniques used in SERE school, based, in part, on Chinese Communist techniques used during the Korean War to elicit false confessions, include stripping students of their clothing, placing them in stress positions, putting hoods over their heads, disrupting their sleep, treating them like animals, subjecting them to loud music and flashing lights, and exposing them to extreme temperatures." S. Comm. on Armed Servs., 110th Cong., 2d Sess., Report on Inquiry into the Treatment of Detainees in U.S. Custody (Comm. Print 2008) at xiii, xxvi (Ladin Decl., Exh. I, cited hereinafter as "SASC Report").	Defendants object to this "fact" as inadmissible hearsay and irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 802, 401, 402). Defendants do not contest that the SASC Report is accurately quoted, although the relevant portions are not attached as part of Exhibit I to the Ladin Decl. Ladin Decl., Exh. I.
23.	Defendant Jessen admitted that techniques used in SERE training were based in part on coercive interrogation methods inflicted by enemies on American soldiers in the Korean War. He testified that he didn't "know who determines what's legal and illegal, but the	Defendants object to this fact as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402). Defendants further dispute that Dr. Jessen "admitted" that the SERE techniques were based on

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>techniques were to represent what we thought our enemy might do if they weren't adhering to the Geneva Conventions." Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 57:3-14; 65:10-23.</p>	<p>interrogation methods used on American soldiers during the Korean War. In response to the question "Did you ever have an understanding that the SERE techniques were based in part on Chinese Communist techniques from the Korean War?", Dr. Jessen said "I think I do remember that." Jessen Dep. 57:3-14. Defendants do not dispute for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that Dr. Jessen's testimony is otherwise accurately quoted.</p>
24.	<p>(a) SERE training differed from Defendants' proposal: Techniques were used on volunteers, not on prisoners with serious injuries and open wounds. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 134:21-135:20.</p> <p>(b) SERE volunteers knew the start and end date of their training, and could end it at any time, while prisoners were made to believe that their interrogation could last for the rest of their natural lives. Ladin Decl., Exh. I, SASC Report at 31; Ladin Decl., Exh. J at U.S. Bates 001957-58.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this "fact" as compound.</p> <p>(a) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Jessen's testimony. Dr. Jessen testified that SERE training was voluntary and that during his experience at SERE, he did not witness a SERE trainee participate in the program with an open wound or gun-shot wound. Plaintiffs' remaining statements are not supported by Dr. Jessen's testimony. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 134:21-135:20. Furthermore, record evidence indicates that the CIA was aware that the SERE techniques were safely applied to volunteers at SERE, but that there was no assurance</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>that the same would be true if the SERE techniques were applied to detainees; and that this information was provided to the Department of Justice (“DOJ”) Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”) as it was assessing the EITs’ legality. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 150-51, 153, 157.</p> <p>(b) Objected to as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) as there is no evidence in the record that any Plaintiff was “made to believe that [his] interrogation could last for the rest of [his] natural [life].” Disputed that US Bates 001957-58 supports the broad proposition that “prisoners were made to believe that their interrogation could last for the rest of their natural lives[.]” Rather, the document indicates that on August 12, 2002, Zubaydah was told that he would not be leaving the interrogation room for a very long time. Ladin Decl., Exh. J at U.S. Bates 001957–58. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that SERE volunteers knew the</p>

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		start and end date of their training, and could end it at any time.
25.	Waterboarding as carried out by Defendants was different from the technique used in SERE training: it involved much larger volumes of water, and Defendant Jessen or Defendant Mitchell acknowledged that Defendants’ method was “different because it is ‘for real’ and is more poignant and convincing.” Ladin Decl., Exh. K at U.S. Bates 001376.	<p>Objection—waterboarding.</p> <p>Also, disputed. Waterboarding as applied by Defendants on HVDs was consistent with that used in SERE training. In SERE, “the subject is immobilized on his back, and his forehead and eyes covered with a cloth. A stream of water is directed at the upper lip. Resistant subjects then have the cloth lowered to cover the nose and mouth, as the water continues to be applied, fully saturating the cloth, and precluding the passage of air . . . . this process can continue for several minutes, and involve up to 15 canteen cups of water.” OIG Report at US Bates 001489. This is consistent with US Bates 001376’s description of waterboarding an HVD: the Agency interrogator “continuously applied large volumes of water to a cloth that covered the detainee’s mouth and nose.” Ladin Decl., Exh. K at U.S. Bates 001376.</p> <p>Also, the statement in US Bates 001376 cannot be attributed to Defendants. The document identifies the speaker as “one of</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		the psychologists/interrogators”, and psychologists with a SERE background other than Defendants formed part of Zubaydah’s interrogation team. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 69, 146.
26.	Coercive methods were also used on detainees in the CIA program with a higher frequency than permitted in the SERE program. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 156.	Disputed. Plaintiffs misrepresent Dr. Jessen’s cited testimony. Dr. Jessen testified that the SERE pressures were applied to detainees “the same as they were applied in the SMU training, but their frequency was more in the CIA Program.” Dr. Jessen does not state that the pressures were applied more “than permitted in the SERE program” and Plaintiffs present no evidence to support this statement. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 156:14-24.
27.	(a) Defendants knew the effect of their proposed methods might be different for prisoners than for volunteers. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 127:11-24. (b) But when Defendant Mitchell presented his proposal to the Director of the CIA and the head of CTC, he did not mention that fact. Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 281:4-16.	Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. (a) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Jessen’s cited testimony. When asked, “In your mind, is there a difference between having these things pressures done to you by a hostile government versus in training?”, Dr. Jessen responded, “In terms of how they’re employed, no; in terms of where you’re at emotionally, I think it is different . . . I think you’d have more concern about



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

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>the outcome.” Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 127:11-24. Furthermore, the record evidence indicates that the CIA was aware that the SERE techniques were safely applied to volunteers at SERE, but that there was no assurance that the same would be true if the SERE techniques were applied to detainees; and that this information was provided to the OLC as it was assessing the EITs’ legality. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 150-51, 153, 157.</p> <p>(b) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Mitchell’s cited testimony. Dr. Mitchell testified that in one specific meeting with the Director of the CIA and Jose Rodriguez, he did not mention that “the application of SERE techniques, which had been able to be used for many years without producing problems, might nonetheless produce problems in a different setting where the subject is not there voluntarily.” The cited testimony does not indicate that Dr. Mitchell was “presenting” a “proposal” nor that this issue was not discussed at some other time. Ladin Decl., Exh.</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		A, Mitchell Dep. 277:11-281:16. Further, as set out in 27(a), the CIA was aware that the SERE techniques were safely applied to volunteers at SERE, but that there was no assurance that the same would be true if the SERE techniques were applied to detainees.
28.	Defendants told the CIA that these techniques were likely to be safe to use and effective at extracting information from Abu Zubaydah. Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 98:7–11; Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 113:4–22.	Objection—Zubaydah. Also, disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the cited testimony of Dr. Jessen and Rodriguez. Dr. Jessen testified that he was told Dr. Mitchell and Rodriguez had a conversation during which Dr. Mitchell said SERE techniques “had been used for decades without ill effect, and even though the students knew they were in training, they still tended to give up information they were supposed to protect and that that might be something that they could use that would provide more effectiveness and predictable safety.” Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 113:4–22. Additionally, Rodriguez testified that Drs. Mitchell and Jessen told him that there was “a good chance [the SERE program techniques] could work.” Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 98:7–11.

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>Additionally, Dr. Mitchell did not opine on the likely safety of the techniques as applied to detainees, but told the CIA to conduct its own due diligence. Mitchell Dep. at 189:8-22. Furthermore, the record evidence indicates that the CIA was aware that the SERE techniques were safely applied to volunteers at SERE, but that there was no assurance that the same would be true if the SERE techniques were applied to detainees; and that this information was provided to the OLC as it was assessing the EITs’ legality. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 150-51, 153, 157.</p>
29.	<p>(a) Defendants inflicted many of the methods they had proposed over the 19-day “Aggressive Phase” of Abu Zubaydah’s interrogation. Am. Answer, ECF No. 77 ¶ 51; Ladin Decl., Exh. L at U.S. Bates 002382.</p> <p>(b) These methods “were applied in varying combinations, 24 hours a day.” Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002021.</p>	<p>Object to this “fact” as compound. Objection—Zubaydah.</p> <p>(a) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah for 19 days using many of the EITs they had proposed to the CIA via the July 2002 Memo. Am. Answer, ECF No. 77 ¶ 51; Ladin Decl., Exh. L at U.S. Bates 002382. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189.</p> <p>(b) Disputed. US Bates 002021 indicates that for the first 14</p>

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>days, psychological and physical pressures were applied to Zubaydah in varying combinations, 24 hours a day. There is no evidence this occurred for 19 days. Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002021.</p>
30.	<p>(a) On the first day of the aggressive phase of Abu Zubaydah’s interrogation, Defendants began using their proposed methods on him. Either Defendant Mitchell or Defendant Jessen delivered to Abu Zubaydah the “very firm and pointed message that things would continue to get worse for [him]” but that “at any time [Abu Zubaydah] could stop the situation from getting worse by providing the required information.” Ladin Decl., Exh. N at U.S. Bates 001757.</p> <p>(b) Abu Zubaydah “continued to deny any additional knowledge.” Defendants told Abu Zubaydah “their job was to obtain information and that if [he] did not cooperate he was only going to bring more misery onto himself.” Defendants then waterboarded Abu Zubaydah, who “coughed and vomited in small amounts but continued to</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Also, Objection—Zubaydah.</p> <p>(a) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants began interrogating Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001755-59. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189.</p> <p>(b) Objection—waterboarding. Defendants dispute what information Zubaydah provided. US Bates 001758 states Zubaydah “did not have any additional information other than what he had already provided to FBI SA [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].” Ladin Decl., Exh. N at U.S. Bates 001758. Further, Plaintiffs offer no evidence about interrogation methods used by the FBI.</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	maintain his position that he did not have any additional information other than what he had already provided" to the FBI, which had not used Defendants' methods. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001758.	
31.	On the second day of the "aggressive phase," Defendants again inflicted a variety of the methods they had proposed on Abu Zubaydah, including walling, stress positions, confinement boxes, and waterboarding. Abu Zubaydah again vomited after Defendants waterboarded him, and again provided "persistent denials" that he possessed undisclosed threat information. The interrogation team nonetheless concluded that "there still appears to be areas that subject is withholding information on - we have not pinpointed what those areas are." Ladin Decl., Exh. O at U.S. Bates 001801.	Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding.  Additionally, the quoted language in US Bates 001801 cannot be attributed to Defendants. The sender is redacted and the interrogation team included many individuals. Defs.' SOF ¶ 168. Furthermore, all cables went through the COB without review from Defendants and Defendants were unable to draft cables during this time period. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.' SOF ¶ 298.
32.	On the third day of the "aggressive phase," Defendants used their walling method on Abu Zubaydah while demanding "What is it that you do not want us to know?" After inflicting several more of the methods they had proposed, Defendants again told Abu Zubaydah "that he could stop the	Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding. Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 001804-05 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above.  Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>process at any time,” while Abu Zubaydah “continued with his appeal that he has told all that he has and muttered ‘help me.’” Defendants waterboarded Abu Zubaydah and placed him in a confinement box, after which he “appeared despondent” and “cried in an apparently genuine fashion.” Defendants stuffed Abu Zubaydah back in a box for several hours. Afterwards, Abu Zubaydah “started crying and claimed he had given us everything.” The interrogation team noted “At the risk of stating the obvious, there are potentially two reasons” that Abu Zubaydah had not provided the threat information that Defendants demanded: either he was concealing it, or actually did not have the information that his interrogators wanted. The interrogation team noted that, in their opinion, “it is premature” to decide which reason explained the lack of new threat information. Ladin Decl., Exh. P at U.S. Bates 001804–1805.</p>	<p>at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001803-06. Ladin Decl., Exh. P at U.S. Bates 001803–1806; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189.</p>
33.	<p>On the fourth day of the “aggressive phase,” after using their walling and slapping methods on Abu Zubaydah, Defendants told him that they would stop inflicting their methods on him if he</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	provided the threat information they demanded. They warned him not to make up an answer. Abu Zubaydah "began to whimper and was visibly trembling; he continued to deny he had any new info to give." Defendants then waterboarded Abu Zubaydah and left his cell. When they returned, they "noted that [Abu Zubaydah's] distress level increased the moment the team entered the cell, a sign that the conditioning strategy was working." Ladin Decl., Exh. Q at U.S. Bates 001943-44.	interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001942-44. Ladin Decl., Exh. Q at U.S. Bates 001942-44; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189.
34.	On the fifth day of the "aggressive phase," Defendants inflicted a series of their methods on Abu Zubaydah when he told them he did not have the information they demanded. They told him "that he had the choice to stop this treatment at any time by providing the information we sought, that he should not waste our time with denials, and that he better not tell any lies." Ladin Decl., Exh. R at U.S. Bates 001946. They observed that he "continued to cry." He displayed "despair and helplessness" throughout the day. Defendants continued to inflict their methods on him. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001947.	Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001945-48. Ladin Decl., Exh. R at U.S. Bates 001945-48; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189.

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
35.	<p>By the sixth day of the “aggressive interrogation phase,” Defendants and the rest of the interrogation team reached a “collective preliminary assessment that it is highly unlikely [Abu Zubaydah] has actionable new information about current threats to the United States.” They nonetheless resolved that “the team plans to maintain the current level of psychological pressures for the time being to develop and refine this preliminary assessment.” Ladin Decl., Exh. S at U.S. Bates 002341. The medical officer at the site also assessed that “under current medical intervention subject’s medical status is likely to deteriorate to an unacceptable level over the next two weeks, and thus will continue to be closely monitored.” <i>Id.</i></p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants dispute that the cited cable was sent on the sixth day of Zubaydah’s interrogation. The cable was sent on August 10, 2002, which was the seventh day of Zubaydah’s interrogation. Exh. S at U.S. Bates 002341; Ladin Decl., Exh. T at U.S. Bates 001955–56 (“The teams assessment remains the same [REDACTED] on 10 August 02 – day seven of the aggressive interrogation phase”).</p> <p>Defendants further dispute the implication that they had the ability to stop Zubaydah’s interrogation. US Bates 002341 states that on the seventh day of the interrogation, the interrogation team did “not recommend escalating the pressure” on Zubaydah and requested that a team from CIA Headquarters (“<u>HQS</u>”) visit the site where Zubaydah was being interrogated within the next week, or at least arrange a videoconference to “discuss the team’s preliminary assessment and post-interrogation steps.” Ladin Decl., Exh. S at U.S. Bates 002340-42. In response, HQS sent a cable to the site the same day demanding that Defendants “stay the course” and “the aggressive</p>



¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>phase must continue.” Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 194-95.</p> <p>Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 002341 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above.</p>
36.	<p>On the seventh day of the “aggressive interrogation phase,” Defendants again subjected Abu Zubaydah to 24 hours of their methods, and he again did not provide any of the new threat information they demanded. Ladin Decl., Exh. T at U.S. Bates 001955–56.</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants do not contest that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001955-56. Ladin Decl., Exh. T at U.S. Bates 001955–56; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95.</p>
37.	<p>On the eighth day of the “aggressive interrogation phase,” Defendants again subjected Abu Zubaydah to their methods, and again acquired no new threat information. Defendants told Abu Zubaydah that “the only way he was going out of that room was in the large box in the corner. They prompted him to tell them what the box was shaped like; he whispered ‘a coffin.’ Interrogators then said subject would not be leaving the room for a long, long, long time, because he was in no imminent danger of dying.” Ladin Decl., Exh. J at U.S. Bates 001957–58. While Defendants inflicted their methods on Abu Zubaydah, he was</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants further dispute the implication that Defendants had the ability to stop Zubaydah’s interrogation. Exh. J at U.S. Bates 001957-60. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95. On this same day, the interrogation team again told HQS that they did not think Zubaydah possessed any further information about new or current threats against the United States and that they “looked forward to the upcoming [videoconference]” so that HQS could see the interrogation first hand. Ladin Decl., Exh. U at U.S. Bates 002345-46.</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	"trembling and shaking" and "frantically pleaded" that "he had given everything he knew." <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001959.	
38.	The interrogation team reported that Defendants' use of the methods they proposed "on a 24/7 basis for the last eight days" had "produced the desired results of almost total compliance on subject's part." Ladin Decl., Exh. U at U.S. Bates 002346. However, the use of Defendants' methods on Abu Zubaydah had not produced any new threat information, and Abu Zubaydah's "persistent responses" had been "I have no more" or "I have nothing more" or "I told you everything." <i>Id.</i>	Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants dispute the assertion that Zubaydah did not provide any new useful information. The document cited by Plaintiffs states that Zubaydah had begun providing "new nuggets of information" about past activities. Ladin Decl., Exh. U at U.S. Bates 002345-47; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95. Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 002346 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above.  Defendants do not contest that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 002345-47.
39.	On the eleventh day of the "aggressive phase," the interrogation team reported that "subject exhibited initial apprehension followed by complete compliance to all verbal and nonverbal commands for movement. . . . He seemed to display a desperate resignation at his inability to convince the interrogators that he was not	Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants further dispute the implication that Defendants had the ability to stop Zubaydah's interrogation. Ladin Decl., Exh. V at U.S. Bates 002363-65; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95. The day before, on August 13, 2002, HQS acknowledged that the interrogation team believed that Zubaydah had no additional

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>holding back information. . . . When the interrogators told him that his protests of ignorance regarding additional information about threats against the U.S. would not stop them from using the water board, subject’s eye teared, his breathing increased, and he appeared desperate.” Ladin Decl., Exh. V at U.S. Bates 002364.</p>	<p>information on current threats and HQS participated in a videoconference during which EITs were applied to Zubaydah. HQS ordered that the interrogation team “continue with the aggressive interrogation strategy for the next 2-3 weeks” because “the HQS consensus” was that Zubaydah possessed additional information that was “critical to saving American lives.” Specifically, HQS directed the interrogation team to continue waterboarding Zubaydah and apply other interrogation pressures. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 198-99, 201-03.</p> <p>Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 002364 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above.</p>
40.	<p>On the fifteenth day of the “aggressive phase,” Abu Zubaydah was “compliant and totally submissive,” and “continue[d] to be fearful of the interrogators. He “continued to maintain that he knows of no threats to the United States or against United States interests beyond what he has already provided.” Defendants walled Abu Zubaydah, and “repeatedly and aggressively pressed” him for new details. He</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 001807-08 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above. Defendants do not contest that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, they interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001807-08. Ladin Decl., Exh. W at U.S. Bates 001807-08; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95, 198-99, 201-03.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>“did not have any significant details on this topic beyond what he already provided,” and the interrogation team noted that “thus far” the aggressive phase had not resulted in any “significant actionable info beyond previously provided details.” Ladin Decl., Exh. W at U.S. Bates 001807–08.</p>	
41.	<p>On the sixteenth day of the “aggressive phase,” Abu Zubaydah “was repeatedly pressured and instructed that revealing the requested information would stop the procedure.” He “again stated that he had no information in addition to that which he had already provided, and alternatively begged and cried that procedure be stopped.” Defendants then waterboarded Abu Zubaydah to the point where he exhibited “involuntary body (leg, chest and arm) spasms.” The interrogation team then resumed the questioning, while Abu Zubaydah “continued to cry, and claim ignorance of any additional information. This resulted in a second full-face watering. At the onset of involuntary stomach and leg spasms, subject was again elevated to clear his airway, which was followed by hysterical pleas. Subject was distressed to the level</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding.</p> <p>Defendants further dispute the implication that Defendants had the ability to stop Zubaydah’s interrogation Ladin Decl., Exh. X at U.S. Bates 002379-81; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95, 198-99, 201-03. At this time, in response to the request from the interrogation team to stop using EITs, HQS had sent a team to the site where Zubaydah was being interrogated, GREEN. The HQS team arrived on August 16, 2002 (three days before this cable), and the HQS team became actively involved in Zubaydah’s interrogation, including observing this interrogation. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 204-06.</p> <p>Additionally, quoted language in US Bates 002380 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	that he was unable to effectively communicate or adequately engage the team.” Defendants then stuffed Abu Zubaydah into a box and bombarded him with noise to continue his “elevated level of disorientation.” Ladin Decl., Exh. X at U.S. Bates 002380.	reasons asserted in #31 above. Defendants do not contest that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, they interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 001807-08. Ladin Decl., Exh. W at U.S. Bates 001807-08; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95, 198-99, 201-03.
42.	On the seventeenth day of the aggressive phase, Abu Zubaydah “cried and begged the interrogators to believe him when he said that he was not holding back information as he was placed in position for watering. Two iterations of the watering cycle were applied. During the watering he cried, begged and pleaded; finally becoming hysterical.” Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002022.	Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding. Defendants do not contest that at the direction and under the supervision of the CIA, Defendants interrogated Zubaydah as set out in US Bates 002019-23. Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002019-23; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 176-181, 186-189, 194-95, 198-99, 201-06.
43.	After seventeen days of the aggressive phase, the interrogation team reported that “psychological and physical pressures have been applied to induce complete helplessness, compliance and cooperation from the subject. Our goal was to reach the stage where we have broken any will or ability of subject to resist or deny providing us information (intelligence) to which he had access.” Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002020.	Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants further respond that the quoted language cannot be attributed to the “interrogation team” for the reasons asserted in #31 above. Also, other documents suggest that the team from HQS, not the Zubaydah interrogation team, drafted this cable. Ladin Decl., Exh. K at U.S. Bates 001423–24 (“A team of senior CTC officers traveled from Headquarters to [REDACTED] to assess Abu Zubaydah’s compliance and

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		witnessed the final waterboard session, after which, they reported back to Headquarters that the EITs were no longer needed on Abu Zubaydah.”).
44.	<p>(a) Defendants had previously claimed Abu Zubaydah was a skilled resistor, Ladin Decl., Exh. Y at U. S. Bates 001771; Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 252:6–255:21,</p> <p>(b) and CIA Headquarters thought Abu Zubaydah might still be withholding information and that the program Defendants had recommended might yet extract new threat information from Abu Zubaydah. Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022666.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Also, Objection—Zubaydah.</p> <p>(a) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize Dr. Mitchell’s cited testimony and US Bates 001771. Dr. Mitchell testified that Zubaydah employed resistance techniques, not that he was a “skilled resistor.” Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 252:6–255:21. Furthermore, US Bates 001771 cannot be attributed to Defendants for the reasons asserted in #31 above. Nevertheless, all US Bates 001771 states is that Zubaydah “is an incredibly strong willed individual which is why he has resisted this long.” Exh. Y at U. S. Bates 001771.</p> <p>(b) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the information in MJ00022666. This document discusses the fact that after HQS viewed the videoconference of Zubaydah’s interrogation, HQS still wanted the interrogation to continue, including waterboarding,</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>despite Defendants' opinion that further interrogation was unnecessary. The document does not discuss why HQS had this view or otherwise support Plaintiffs' implications. Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022666.</p>
45.	<p>Defendants did not believe that the final waterboarding session would result in the extraction of new threat information, but thought it would demonstrate that Abu Zubaydah was compliant. Ladin Decl., Exh. K at U.S. Bates 001423-24. Defendant Mitchell stated that "[i]t was ugly and hard to do." Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022668.</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding.</p> <p>Dispute the implication that Defendants had the ability to stop Zubaydah's interrogation. US Bates 001423-24 goes on to state, "According to this senior officer, the decision to resume use of the waterboard on Abu Zubaydah was made by senior officers of the DO. A team of senior CTC officers traveled from Headquarters to [REDACTED] to assess Abu Zubaydah's compliance and witnessed the final waterboard session, after which, they reported back to Headquarters that the EITs were no longer needed on Abu Zubaydah. Ladin Decl., Exh. K at U.S. Bates 001423-24.</p>
46.	<p>After nineteen days of the aggressive phase Defendants and the rest of the interrogation team issued the "assessment that we have successfully broken subject's willingness to withhold threat and intelligence information. He is</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants dispute the implication that they drafted or assented to the language in this cable. The document states the "team assessment" is that "we have successfully broken subject's willingness to withhold threat and</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	presently in a state of complete subjugation and total compliance.” However, they noted that, having failed to acquire the threat information they had demanded over nineteen days, “[t]he issue of whether subject in fact has specific threat information (not already provided) will always be open to some conjecture.” Ladin Decl., Exh. L at U.S. Bates 002382–83.	intelligence information. He is presently in a state of complete subjugation and total compliance.” It also states “[t]he issue of whether subject in fact has specific threat information (not already provided) will always be open to some conjecture.” Ladin Decl., Exh. L at U.S. Bates 002382–83. Defendants did not draft or review this cable. All cables went through the COB without review from Defendants and Defendants were unable to draft cables during this time period. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.’ SOF ¶ 298. And the interrogation team included many individuals other than Defendants. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 168.
47.	The interrogation team proposed that, although the “aggressive phase” had been stopped, “we will carefully continue to observe [Abu Zubaydah] to ensure he remains ‘compliant’ and [Defendants] will stand by to ‘tune him up’ as required.” After completion of the aggressive phase of Abu Zubaydah’s interrogation, the team planned to “systematically drain him dry of any useful intelligence.” Ladin Decl., Exh. Z at U.S. Bates 002390.	Objection—Zubaydah. Disputed. The quoted language cannot be attributed to the “interrogation team” or “Defendants”. The sender of US Bates 002388-90 is redacted and not otherwise identified. Ladin Decl., Exh. Z at U.S. Bates 002388-90. Also, Defendants did not draft or review this cable. All cables went through the COB without review from Defendants and Defendants were unable to draft cables during this time period. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.’ SOF ¶ 298.
48.	The aggressive interrogation of Abu Zubaydah did not end because	Objection—Zubaydah.



¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>he finally provided threat information, but because Defendants and the CIA determined that “it was no longer useful” to continue. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 145:21–46:9, 148:6–12.</p>	<p>Disputed. Plaintiffs misrepresent the record. Dr. Jessen testified that after he and Dr. Mitchell thought further interrogation of Zubaydah was “no longer useful,” the CIA “told us we had to continue” because “we worked for them and they wanted to continue.” In fact, Zubaydah’s interrogation did not stop until the CIA, at Defendants urging, came to GREEN where Zubaydah was being interrogated and witnessed the interrogation. Only then did the CIA allow Defendants to stop interrogating because HQS determined that Zubaydah was “total[ly] compliant”. Jessen Dep. 145:21–46:9, 147:18–149:7; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 191-207. Furthermore, the record cited by Plaintiffs does not state whether or not Zubaydah provided threat information, and this assertion is not supported by admissible evidence.</p>
49.	<p>(a) Defendant Mitchell “had a visceral reaction to the tapes” of Defendants’ using their methods on Abu Zubaydah, and “thought they were ugly.” He “didn’t like the fact that the tapes were out there” and recommended they be destroyed. Ladin Decl., Exh. A, Mitchell Dep. 386:10–A23; 389:2–22; 392:10–17.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Also, Objection—Zubaydah. (a) Disputed. Contrary to Plaintiffs’ statement, Dr. Mitchell did not “recommend” that the tapes be destroyed but “thought [the tapes] should be destroyed”. Ladin Decl., Exh.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>(b) A senior CIA official, Jose Rodriguez, agreed: he believed the tapes “would make the CIA look bad,” and, if released, would “almost destroy the clandestine service.” Rodriguez Dep: 92:18–93:25.</p> <p>(c) On Rodriguez’s orders, the CIA destroyed the tapes. Mitchell Dep: 387:21–388:7.</p>	<p>A, Mitchell Dep. 386:10–23; 389:2–22.</p> <p>(b) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion. Defendants further object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p> <p>(c) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion. Defendants further object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p>
50.	<p>Although they had failed to acquire any new threat information, the interrogation team was “satisfied” that they had “applied the techniques aggressively and conditioned subject to the point that we can assess he is compliant.” The interrogation team was satisfied that Abu Zubaydah did not possess undisclosed threat information, and observed that the intelligence they had was consistent with what Abu Zubaydah had told them. Ladin Decl., Exh. L at U.S. Bates 002383; Ladin Decl., Exh. Z at U.S. Bates 002389–90.</p>	<p>Objection—Zubaydah. Disputed. The quoted language in US Bates 002388-90 cannot be attributed to the “interrogation team” or “Defendants” because the sender is redacted and not otherwise identified. Ladin Decl., Exh. Z at U.S. Bates 002388-90. All cables went through the COB without review from Defendants and Defendants were unable to draft cables during this time period. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.’ SOF ¶ 298.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
51.	Defendant Mitchell later wrote in response to a question as to why Defendants had waterboarded Abu Zubaydah so many times: "As for our buddy, he capitulated the first [sic] time. We chose to expose him over and over until <u>we</u> had a high degree of confidence he wouldn't hold back. He said we [sic] was ready to talk during the first exposure." Ladin Decl., Exh. AA at U.S. Bates 002581 (emphasis in original).	Objection—Zubaydah and Objection—waterboarding.  Defendants dispute the implication that Defendants had the ability to stop Zubaydah's interrogation. As set forth above, Defendants requested to stop waterboarding Zubaydah, but the CIA demanded they continue. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 190-207.
52.	Defendant Mitchell, summing up Defendants' interrogation of Abu Zubaydah, wrote: "I left feeling good about what we had accomplished." Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022671.	Objection—Zubaydah. Otherwise, not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
53.	After seventeen days of the "aggressive phase," the interrogation team, which included Defendants, wrote to CIA headquarters that "the aggressive phase" of Abu Zubaydah's interrogation "should be used as a template for future interrogation of high value captives." Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002023.	Objection—Zubaydah. Defendants respond that US Bates 002019-23 cannot be attributed to the "interrogation team" or "Defendants". The sender is redacted and not otherwise identified. Ladin Decl., Exh. M at U.S. Bates 002019-23. All cables went through the COB without review from Defendants and Defendants were unable to draft cables during this time period. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.' SOF ¶ 298.
54.	Defendants' methods became the basis for the CIA's enhanced	Disputed that the interrogation methods posed by Defendants were

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	interrogation program. Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 59:19–60:25, 63:6–10.	the basis of one overarching CIA interrogation program, and specifically that the interrogation methods posed by the Defendants were the basis of interrogation for any Plaintiff. The interrogation methods proposed by Defendants became the basis only for the CIA's interrogation of Zubaydah and later the CIA's HVD Program. Rodriguez Dep. 183:22-184:25; 186:17-20; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 209-11.
55.	<p>(a) Defendants participated in the program's initial expansion, opining on potential lessons from Abu Zubaydah's interrogation for future interrogations. Ladin Decl., Exh. BB at U.S. Bates 001611; Ladin Decl., Exh. DD at U.S. Bates 001891–92.</p> <p>(b) Defendants' contracts expanded after Abu Zubaydah's interrogation as well. For example, less than two months after Abu Zubaydah's interrogation, the value of Defendant Jessen's contract had already doubled. Ladin Decl., Exh. CC at U.S. Bates 000086, 000092, 000094.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this "fact" as compound.</p> <p>(a) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the underlying documents. Contrary to Plaintiffs' statement, the documents do not indicate that Defendants participated in "the program's" initial expansion. Rather, US Bates 001611 indicates that all those involved in Zubaydah's interrogation, including CTC Legal, the incoming and outgoing Chief of Base, the Usama Bin Laden taskforce, the Office of Technical Services, IC SERE psychologists, and additional personnel, were asked for observations,. Similarly, US Bates 001891-92 indicates that in December 2002, after the CIA had already designed and</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>operated a training for “High-Value Target” interrogation techniques, Defs.’ SOF ¶ 226, Dr. Mitchell, as “one data point” was asked for feedback from Zubaydah’s interrogation. Ladin Decl., Exh. DD at U.S. Bates 001891–92. As stated at US Bates 001891, CTC was “[c]learly . . . in charge of the operation” and thus the CIA determined how to use the information it requested from Defendants and had complete control over any “expansion.”</p> <p>(b) Defendants object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402). Disputed that Dr. Mitchell’s contract value increased, as Plaintiffs present no such evidence. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that Dr. Jessen’s original contract amount was to be a maximum amount of \$135,000 from July 22, 2002 until July 21, 2003 and that in October 2002, Dr. Jessen’s maximum contract amount was increased to \$267,500, with the same duration. Ladin Decl., Exh. CC</p>

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		at U.S. Bates 000086, 000092, 000094.
56.	Defendants were aware of a phenomenon called “abusive drift”: once coercion was employed, interrogators would tend to exceed any approved limits, resulting in even more severe abuse of prisoners. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 35:24–36:17; Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022633, MJ00022857.	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402). Plaintiffs make no allegation that Defendants exceeded the legal boundaries set by DOJ for the EITs because of abusive drift or otherwise.</p> <p>Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the record. Dr. Jessen testified that abusive drift is a phenomenon that occurs when, “without proper oversight and [] independent eyes on authorities, people can start to push the limits of what they’re authorized to do.” Dr. Jessen’s role at SERE was to “make sure that [he] identified that and stopped it.” He also indicated that “abusive drive” was more likely to happen in real life than in training scenarios. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 35:24–36:17. Dr. Mitchell wrote about his similar role at SERE when he was responsible for determining what went wrong in interrogations and specifically “monitor[ing] and directly intervene[ing] to prevent escalating abusive drift . . . that could lead to increased risk of</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>lasting mental or physical harm among students.” He further wrote that when he saw photographs from Abu Ghraib—which was not part of any CIA interrogation program—he was “dismayed” and “angry” because he “had studied the psychological mechanisms that lead to that sort of abusive drift.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022633, MJ00022857. Defendants do not contest that they were aware of “abusive drift.” The remainder of Plaintiffs’ statement is disputed. Plaintiffs’ statement that “once coercion was employed, interrogators would tend to exceed any approved limits, resulting in even more severe abuse of prisoners” is unsupported by the record and contrary to Dr. Jessen’s testimony explaining that abusive drift occurs when there is not proper oversight.</p>
57.	<p>Defendants “designed a program for the CIA to get prisoners to talk, but the CIA would decide which prisoners to apply it to.” Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 244:9–12.</p>	<p>Disputed that the interrogation methods posed by Defendants were the basis of one overarching CIA interrogation program and, specifically, that the interrogation methods posed by Defendants were the basis for interrogation of any Plaintiff. The interrogation methods proposed by Defendants became the basis only for the CIA’s interrogation of Zubaydah</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		and later the CIA's HVD Program. Rodriguez Dep. 183:22-184:25; 186:17-20; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 209-11. Not contested that the CIA would decide which HVDs would be interrogated and how interrogations would be conducted. Rodriguez Dep. 125:23-126:3, 167:15-19, 169:4-8, 174:6-10, 183:22-184:25, 186:17-20; US Bates 001631-32; US Bates 001593; US Bates 001594; Rizzo Dep. 60:10-25, 85:1-12, 187:2-25, 188:1-7, 192:23-25. Also, the CIA assessed and approved all interrogation plans. US Bates 001592; US Bates 001635. The CIA
58.	When the CIA sought approval for the program, it submitted to the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel only the 12 methods Defendants had proposed. Deposition of John Rizzo 47:4-15 (Ladin Decl., Exh. EE, cited hereinafter as "Rizzo Dep.").	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that the CIA asked the DOJ's OLC to evaluate the legality of the EITs because they had been recommended "by CTC management[.]" Rizzo Dep. 47:4-48:1.
59.	By January 2003, the methods that Defendants had proposed and used on Abu Zubaydah were standardized as the official "Enhanced Interrogation Techniques" in the "enhanced interrogation program" used on CIA prisoners. Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001170-72; Ladin Decl., Exh. EE, Rizzo Dep. 64:8-	Disputed. Contrary to Plaintiffs' statement, Mr. Rizzo, Deputy General Counsel at the CIA in January 2003, did not testify that "the methods that Defendants had proposed and used on Zubaydah were standardized as the official 'Enhanced Interrogation Techniques.'" Rather, Mr. Rizzo testified that US Bates 001170-72



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

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	23.	<p>represented instructions as to how interrogations were to be conducted within the legal authorization and stated that the techniques developed for Zubaydah “served as a template for the enhanced interrogation techniques that were used on a number of subsequent high value detainees.” Ladin Decl., Exh. EE, Rizzo Dep. 64:8–65:15.</p> <p>Defendants further respond that US Bates 00170-72 does not reflect “methods Defendants had proposed and used on Abu Zubaydah,” but includes interrogation techniques not contained in the July 2002 Memo. Specifically, it includes the use of isolation, reduced caloric intake, deprivation of reading material, use of loud music or white noise (non-harmful), and the abdominal slap. Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001170–72.</p> <p>Finally, it is disputed that the interrogation methods posed by Defendants were the basis of one overarching CIA interrogation program for use on all CIA detainees and, specifically, that the interrogation methods posed by Defendants were the basis for interrogation of any Plaintiff. The EITs were proposed by Defendants</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		for use on Zubaydah and later for use in the CIA's HVD Program. Rodriguez Dep. 183:22-184:25; 186:17-20; Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 209-11. Even then, EITs were applied to HVDs in only specific circumstances when the proper approvals were granted. Defs. SOF ¶¶ 216-24.
60.	The list of "Enhanced Techniques" standardized in the January 2003 guidelines are "the attention grasp, walling, the facial hold, the facial slap (insult slap), the abdominal slap, cramped confinement, wall standing, stress positions, sleep deprivation beyond 72 hours, the use of diapers for prolonged periods, the use of harmless insects, [and] the waterboard." Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001172. The list of "standard techniques" included "isolation, sleep deprivation not to exceed 72 hours, reduced caloric intake . . . use of loud music or white noise . . . and the use of diapers for limited periods." <i>Id.</i>	Disputed. US Bates 001170-72 does not indicate EITs had become "standardized" but that "the use of each specific [EIT] must be approved by Headquarters in advance, and may be employed only by approved interrogators for use with the specific detainee, with appropriate medical and psychological participation in the process." Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001170-72. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that US Bates 001170-72 is accurately quoted.
61.	(a) With the exception of the "abdominal slap" technique, the standardized "Enhanced Techniques" are the methods Defendants proposed in July 2002. Ladin Decl., Exh. H at U.S. Bates 001110-11.	Defendants object to this "fact" as compound. (a) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion. Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001170-72; Exh. H at U.S. Bates 001110-11.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	(b) The "abdominal slap" was a technique that Defendants used on Abu Zubaydah in an interrogation that they claimed was successful. ECF No. 77 ¶ 49.	(b) Disputed. Defendants' Answer at ¶ 77 does not state the abdominal slap was used "in an interrogation that they claimed was successful" and this assertion is unsupported by admissible evidence. ECF No. 77 ¶ 49. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that Defendants used the "abdominal slap" on Zubaydah during interrogation.
62.	"As initially proposed, sleep deprivation was to be induced by shackling the subject in a standing position, with his feet chained to a ring in the floor and his arms attached to a bar at head level, with very little room for movement." Office of Professional Responsibility, Rep. on Investigation into the OLC's Memoranda Concerning Issues Relating to the CIA's Use of "Enhanced Interrogation Techniques" on Suspected Terrorists 36 n.35, U.S. Bates 000643 (2009) (Ladin Decl., Exh. GG, cited hereinafter as "OPR Report"). "[D]etainees were typically shackled in a standing position, naked except for a diaper." OPR Report 126, U.S. Bates 000733; Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 228:20–229:2.	Defendants deny any implication that they played a role in the development of methodologies for inducing sleep deprivation. The OPR Report does not identify who made this proposal. Otherwise, not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
63.	Defendants' list of methods was specifically sent to COBALT. Ladin Decl., Exh. FF at U.S. Bates 001170-72. Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 71:20-73:24.	Disputed that US Bates 001170-72 was "Defendants' list of methods," as it was drafted by the CTC Legal Department at the direction of the CIA's then General Council, Scott Muller, with no involvement from Defendants. Rizzo Dep. at 185:23-186:21. Rizzo Decl. ¶ 51. Not contested that US Bates 001170-72 was transmitted to COBALT.
64.	Prisoners at COBALT were subjected to total darkness "to disorient prisoners so they didn't know if it was day or night." Ladin Decl., Exh. HH at U.S. Bates 001126.	Disputed to the extent this implies Defendants had any involvement in determining conditions at COBALT. CIA Staff Officer stated the prisoners were kept in total darkness because "he wanted to disorient prisoners so they didn't know it was day or night." Ladin Decl., Exh. HH at U.S. Bates 001126. And because there was only one light switch for all the lights in the cell area, CIA Staff Officer decided to keep them off all the time. Defs.' SOF ¶ 262.
65.	Prisoners at COBALT were deprived of amenities: "A prisoner begins his confinement with nothing in his cell except a bucket used for human waste," but can be given "rewards for cooperation." These "rewards" included lights to cut the endless darkness, earplugs to block out the endless music, a mat to sleep on, and extra blankets against the cold. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates	Disputed to the extent this implies Defendants had any involvement in setting the conditions at COBALT. CIA Staff Officer was responsible for the final construction of COBALT and for detainee affairs. Defs. SOF ¶ 255-57.

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	001127.	
66.	<p>Prisoners at COBALT were kept in diapers “solely to humiliate the prisoner for interrogation purposes.” When guards ran out of diapers, they either used “a handcrafted diaper secured by duct tape,” or kept the prisoners nude. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001126.</p>	<p>Disputed that prisoners at COBALT were kept in diapers “solely to humiliate the prisoners for interrogation purposes.” There was also “hygienic reasons” for the use of diapers because there were “no drains in the cells” that would facilitate clean-up if a detainee had an accident between breaks. Tompkins Decl., Ex. 18 at US Bates 001086. Defendants do not dispute for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that when guards ran out of diapers, they either used “a handcrafted diaper secured by duct tape,” or kept the prisoners nude. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001126.</p>
67.	<p>(a) In November 2002, Mr. Rahman was abducted and taken to COBALT.</p> <p>(b) Defendants traveled to COBALT that same month, during which Defendant Jessen personally participated in multiple interrogations of Mr. Rahman at COBALT during which Mr. Rahman was kept naked or in a diaper, “in cold conditions with minimal food and sleep,” and subjected to physical assault. Ladin Decl., Ex. II at U.S. Bates 001076; Ladin Decl., Ex. JJ at 001051; Ladin Decl., Ex. KK at</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Defendants further respond that Plaintiffs mischaracterize the record.</p> <p>(a) Disputed. Mr. Rahman was captured in Pakistan in October 2002. He was transferred to COBALT in November 2002. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 284-85; Exh. KK at 001547.</p> <p>(b) Disputed that Defendants had control over Mr. Rahman’s treatment at COBALT. Dr. Jessen was at COBALT when Mr. Rahman arrived. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 287. It was the COBALT COB’s responsibility</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
	001547–49.	to monitor COBALT. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 288. At the request of COBALT’s COB, Dr. Jessen observed interrogations of Mr. Rahman and then participated in other interrogations of Mr. Rahman. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 289, 291-92. During this time, Mr. Rahman was sometimes naked and sometimes had clothing. When Mr. Rahman was naked, he had a blanket. Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at 001050-51. Dr. Jessen observed Mr. Rahman being subjected to rough treatment on one occasion. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 299. Dr. Mitchell arrived at COBALT later. Ladin Decl., Exh. KK at 001548. Dr. Mitchell did not interrogate Rahman or observe the application of any interrogation techniques on Rahman, although Dr. Mitchell did observe one custodial debriefing of Rahman. Defs.’ SOF ¶ 308.
68.	(a) Defendant Jessen advised the CIA that Mr. Rahman displayed a “sophisticated level of resistance training,” because he “complained about poor treatment,” and said he couldn’t think because he was so cold. Ladin Decl., Exh. LL at U.S.	Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. (a) Disputed. Dr. Jessen specifically testified that he did not recall Mr. Rahman complaining about poor treatment or complaining about the violation of his human

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p>Bates 001073.                      (b) Defendant Jessen was asked to assess Mr. Rahman for resistance methods and to design an interrogation plan. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 238:11–241:15.</p>	<p>rights. Jessen Dep. 211:20-213:20. He further testified that he did not recall ever assessing that Mr. Rahman used health and welfare behaviors as a resistance technique. Jessen Dep. 232:10-14. Furthermore, Dr. Jessen did not draft or review US Bates 001072-74 or any other cable at COBALT so the information contained in it cannot be attributed to him. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.' SOF ¶ 298.                      (b) Disputed. Jessen testified only that he was asked to look at Rahman "to give the Chief of Base recommendations on how they should continue interrogating him, try to get information." He does not state he was asked to "design" an interrogation plan.</p>
69.	<p>Defendant Mitchell participated in one of Defendant Jessen's sessions with Mr. Rahman. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001290.</p>	<p>Disputed. Dr. Mitchell did not interrogate Rahman or observe the application of any interrogation techniques on Rahman, although Dr. Mitchell did observe one custodial debriefing of Rahman. Defs.' SOF ¶ 308. The document cited by Plaintiff does not indicate that Dr. Jessen was present in the debriefing that Dr. Mitchell observed, and there is no other</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		evidence that he was. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001290.
70.	Defendant Jessen conducted an assessment as to whether Mr. Rahman “would be profoundly or permanently affected by continuing interrogations, to include HVT-enhanced measures.” As part of his assessment, Defendant Jessen used one of the “enhanced interrogation techniques” that Defendants had proposed for use on Abu Zubaydah—a facial slap “to determine how he would respond.” Defendant Jessen concluded that Mr. Rahman “was impervious to it,” and assessed that Mr. Rahman would not be “profoundly and permanently affected” by the use of any of the methods Defendants had proposed for use on Abu Zubaydah. Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 238:22–241:15, 211:7–15.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion.
71.	Defendant Jessen advised that rather than using the more active “enhanced interrogation techniques,” Mr. Rahman’s interrogators should instead focus on “deprivations”: “it will be the consistent and persistent application of deprivations (sleep loss and fatigue) and seemingly constant interrogations which will be most effective in wearing down	Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize US Bates 001057-58. Dr. Jessen did not characterize “enhanced interrogation techniques” as active or inactive. Rather, Dr. Jessen concluded the following, “Because of [Mr. Rahman’s] remarkable physical and psychological resilience and determination to persist in his effective resistance posture



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

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>this subject’s resistance posture.” Ladin Decl., Exh. NN at U.S. Bates 001057–58.</p>	<p>employing enhanced measures is not the first or best option to yield positive interrogation results. . . . The most effective interrogation plan for Gul Rahman is to continue the environmental deprivations he is experiencing and institute a concentrated interrogation exposure regimen. This regimen would ideally consist of repeated and seemingly constant interrogations . . . . It will be the consistent and persistent application of deprivations (sleep loss and fatigue) and seemingly constant interrogations which will be most effective in [] wearing down [] this subject’s resistance posture. It will be important to manage the deprivations so as to allow the subject adequate rest and nourishment[.]” Ladin Decl., Exh. NN at U.S. Bates 001057–58.</p>
72.	<p>(a) During the weeks Mr. Rahman spent in the CIA prison before his death, Rahman was mostly naked or wearing a diaper. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001291. (b) Defendant Jessen admitted that Mr. Rahman’s diaper and clothes were removed at the interrogators’ direction. <i>Id.</i></p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Defendants further respond that Plaintiffs mischaracterize the record. (a) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001291. (b) Disputed. This information is not supported by US Bates 001291. Furthermore, the record indicates that CIA Officer, not Dr. Jessen, used</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		Mr. Rahman's clothing "to try to manipulate and motivate Rahman." US Bates 001050.
73.	<p>(a) The diaper and nudity were used to humiliate Mr. Rahman, and had the intended effect: Mr. Rahman was "particularly concerned with being naked in front of . . . the guards," and "asked to be covered" during every interrogation. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001293.</p> <p>(b) This was in accord with Defendants' proposal that diapers be used to "leverage" a prisoner's being "very sensitive to situations that reflect a loss of status or are potentially humiliating." Ladin Decl., Exh. H at U.S. Bates 001110-11.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this "fact" as compound.</p> <p>(a) Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize US Bates 001293. The document does not discuss why CIA Staff Officer had Mr. Rahman naked. US Bates 001293 states only that "Rahman was particularly concerned with being naked in front of [REDACTED] the guards. Every time Rahman came to the interrogation room, he asked to be covered."</p> <p>(b) Disputed. Plaintiffs present no evidence that CIA Staff Officer was aware of Defendants' proposals, which were specifically related to Zubaydah, in US Bates 001110-11 or that Mr. Rahman being in a diaper was related to Defendants' proposal. Also, Plaintiffs again mischaracterize US Bates 001110-11 which discusses the use of diapers specifically with Zubaydah who "spen[t] much time cleaning himself and seem[ed] to go out of his way to avoid circumstances likely to bring him in contact with potentially</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>unclean objects or material. And who was "very sensitive to situations that reflect a loss of status or are potentially humiliating." Defendants therefore stated, as specific to Zubaydah, "One way to leverage his concerns, while helping ensure his wound doesn't become infected with human waste . . . is to place him in an adult diaper." Even if CIA Officer had knowledge of US Bates 001110-10, there is no evidence Rahman was similarly "fastidious" or that diapers were used in response to such fastidiousness. Ladin Decl., Exh. H at U.S. Bates 001110-11.</p>
74.	<p>According to Defendant Jessen, Mr. Rahman was subjected to consistent sleep deprivation for days, with Mr. Rahman "chained to the overhead bar in his cell," to induce "sleep deprivation right from the beginning." Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001049, 001051.</p>	<p>Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize US Bates 001049 and 001051. The document states only that "Jessen stated that the use of sleep deprivation with Rahman started very early. The sleep deprivation was consistent for the first few days. He was chained to the overhead bar in his cell." The documents do not contain the second quoted excerpt. Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001049, 001051.</p>
75.	<p>According to Defendant Jessen, Mr. Rahman "was without clothes</p>	<p>Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	very early on in his incarceration," and "didn't have clothing more than he did have clothing." <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001050.	
76.	<p>Defendant Jessen observed other interrogators and guards using a "hard takedown" on Mr. Rahman: the renditions team dragged Mr. Rahman out of his cell, cut his clothes off, taped him, and put a hood over his head. They slapped him and punched him as they ran him up and down the long corridor adjacent to his cell. When Mr. Rahman stumbled, the team dragged him along the ground. Afterwards, Mr. Rahman had abrasions on his head and leg and crusty contusions on his face, leg, and hands. Defendant Jessen told a CIA interrogator at COBALT that he had not used the technique, but it was worth trying. Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 1051. Defendant Jessen suggested to the CIA interrogator that if you do a hard takedown, you should "leverage that in some way" Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 197:12-198:7. Defendant Jessen said an interrogator should speak to the prisoner afterwards, to "give them something to think about." Ladin Decl., Exh. HH at U.S. Bates 001133.</p>	<p>Disputed to the extent that it implies Dr. Jessen approved of or otherwise ordered the hard takedown. The rough treatment/hard takedown was not one of the interrogation techniques in the July 2002 Memo. Dr. Jessen advised COBALT's COB that he should not use unauthorized techniques such as rough treatment/hard takedown. Dr. Jessen specifically told COBALT's COB that he did not use the hard takedown and that even if it was effective at dislocating Rahman's expectations, for that to be useful, Rahman would have to be interviewed after it was implemented instead of being placed back in his cell alone, which is what COBALT's COB had done with Rahman. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 299-303.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
77.	Defendant Jessen said the hard takedown was a "good technique, but these kinds of things need to be written down and codified with a stamp of approval or you're going to be liable." Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001049.	Disputed to the extent that it implies Dr. Jessen approved of or otherwise ordered the hard takedown. Dr. Jessen advised COBALT's COB that he should not use unauthorized techniques such as rough treatment/hard takedown. Defs.' SOF ¶¶299-300. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that the underlying document is accurately quoted.
78.	After several days during which Mr. Rahman had been kept in a diaper, his hands chained to an overhead bar in accord with Defendants' sleep deprivation method, and after Defendant Jessen observed that Mr. Rahman displayed early signs of hypothermia, Defendant Jessen recommended that the CIA "continue the environmental deprivations [Mr. Rahman] is experiencing." Ladin Decl., Exh. NN at U.S. Bates 001057.	Disputed. After conducting a captivity assessment, Dr. Jessen recommended to "continue the environmental deprivations [Mr. Rahman] is experiencing" instead of enhanced interrogation techniques. US Bates 001057 does not indicate that Dr. Jessen's assessment occurred after Mr. Rahman had spent several days "kept in a diaper, his hands chained to an overhead bar in accord with Defendants' sleep deprivation method and after Defendant Jessen observed that Mr. Rahman displayed early signs of hypothermia." Ladin Decl., Exh. NN at U.S. Bates 001057.
79.	(a) Defendant Jessen claimed that Mr. Rahman "continues to use 'health and welfare' behaviors and complaints as a major part	Defendants object to this "fact" as compound. (a) Disputed. Dr. Jessen specifically testified that he did

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p>of his resistance posture.” Ladin Decl., Exh. II at U.S. Bates 001077.</p> <p>(b) Defendant Jessen explained that “health and welfare behavior” is “[a]ny complaint dealing with health and welfare,” and gave as an example the complaint “I’m cold.” Ladin Decl., Exh. C, Jessen Dep. 234:10–235:4.</p> <p>(c) Defendant Jessen also identified as specific examples of Mr. Rahman’s “sophisticated level of resistance training” that Mr. Rahman’s “claimed inability to think due to conditions (cold),” that he “complained about poor treatment,” and that he “complained about the violation of his human rights.” Ladin Decl., Exh. LL at U.S. Bates 001073.</p> <p>(d) Jessen stated that after he saw Mr. Rahman “showing the early stages of hypothermia,” he “ordered the guards to give him a blanket.” Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at 1050.</p>	<p>not recall ever assessing that Mr. Rahman used health and welfare behaviors as a resistance technique. Jessen Dep. 232:10-14. Furthermore, Dr. Jessen did not draft or review US Bates 001077 or any other cable at COBALT, and there is no evidence to support attributing the information to him. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs.’ SOF ¶ 298.</p> <p>(b) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion.</p> <p>(c) Disputed. Dr. Jessen explained that he would assume “I’m cold” was a resistance technique if it was not cold. But, if it was cold, he would go get a doctor and ask them if it was too cold. Jessen Dep. at 234:22-235:14. Dr. Jessen specifically testified that he did not recall Mr. Rahman complaining about poor treatment or complaining about the violation of his human rights. Jessen Dep. 211:20-213:20. Furthermore, Dr. Jessen did not draft or review US Bates 001072-74 or any other cable at COBALT so the information contained within cannot be attributed to him. Jessen Dep. 143:2-13; Defs. SOF ¶ 298.</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		(d) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
80.	Four days after Defendant Jessen left COBALT, an interrogator conducted a brief question session with Mr. Rahman "based on Jessen's recommendation that Rahman be left alone and environmental deprivations continued." Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001312.	Disputed. Dr. Jessen's recommendations had included "continue the environmental deprivations he is experiencing and institute a concentrated interrogation exposure regimen. This regimen would ideally consist of repeated and seemingly constant interrogations . . . . It will be important to manage the deprivations so as to allow the subject adequate rest and nourishment[.]" Ladin Decl., Exh. NN at U.S. Bates 001057-58. CIA Officer conducting one brief interrogation session four days later is not consistent with Dr. Jessen's recommendation that Mr. Rahman be subject to "repeated and seemingly constant interrogations." Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001312.
81.	Two days later, Mr. Rahman—deprived of food, sleep, clothing, and warmth—died of hypothermia. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001272-73.	Disputed. US Bates 001272-73 does not support the assertion that Mr. Rahman was deprived of food or sleep after Defendants departed COBALT. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001272-73. Not contested that six days after Defendants left COBALT, Mr. Rahman died of hypothermia. Ladin Decl., Exh. MM at U.S. Bates 001272-73.

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
82.	After Mr. Rahman's death, Defendant Jessen told an investigator that Mr. Rahman "knew how to use physical problems or duress as a resistance tool." Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001053.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
83.	Defendant Jessen also told the investigator that "if a detainee is strong and resilient, you have to establish control in some way [sic] or you're not going to get anywhere. If bound by the Geneva Convention, this person would not break. You have to try different techniques to get him to open up. . . . You want to instill fear and despair." <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001050-51.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
84.	Defendant Jessen reported that the atmosphere at COBALT "was excellent for the type of prisoners kept there—'nasty but safe,'" and that the CIA officer who had ordered that Mr. Rahman be chained during his final days, pantless, to a freezing concrete floor "was very level headed and acted in a measured manner." Defendant Jessen stated he would work with the CIA officer "anytime, anyday." Ladin Decl., Exh. HH at U.S. Bates 001124; Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001053.	Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize the cited documents. Dr. Jessen described CIA Staff Officer as "very level headed and acted in a measured manner" and further stated that "he would work with [REDACTED] anytime, anyday [sic]" in reference to his experience with that officer prior to Mr. Rahman's death. The underlying documents do not discuss CIA Staff Officer ordering Mr. Rahman to be short chained, nor is there any indication that Dr. Jessen knew how Mr. Rahman died or that that CIA Staff Officer had



¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		ordered Mr. Rahman's short chained, ultimately causing Mr. Rahman's death. Ladin Decl., Exh. HH at U.S. Bates 001124; Ladin Decl., Exh. JJ at U.S. Bates 001053. Dr. Jessen left COBALT six days before Mr. Rahman's death. Ladin Decl., Exh. KK at 001549.
85.	Mr. Salim was held at COBALT for two months, between March 2003 and May 2003. Salim Decl. ¶ 3.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
86.	While he was held at COBALT, Mr. Salim was subjected to conditions that included deprivation of natural light and any ability to distinguish between day and night, continuous loud music and noise, isolation. Mr. Salim felt that he was "treated like I wasn't human, worse than an animal." Salim Decl. ¶ 6.	Defendants state that they played no role in determining the conditions under which Mr. Salim was held or the interrogation techniques employed while he was in CIA custody. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 266-273. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
87.	Interrogators also subjected Mr. Salim to forced nudity, diapers, and sleep deprivation through shackling in a painful position that made it impossible to sleep. For about a week he was "chained[], naked except for a diaper, by [his] arms and legs to a rusty hoop that was attached to the wall, [his] arms outstretched and at eye level. The only position [he] could safely adopt was a squatting position that	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	very quickly became uncomfortable and extremely painful. The excruciating stress position, together with the putrid smell and deafening noise, made it impossible for [him] to sleep.” Salim Decl. ¶ 7.	
88.	Mr. Salim was deprived of any “amenities,” including clothing, a toilet, and any ability to keep himself clean. Salim Decl. ¶¶ 6, 9.	Disputed that clothing, toilet, and washing facilities were considered “amenities.” Further disputed that Mr. Salim was always deprived of clothing, which he received when he was interrogated. Salim Decl. (ECF No. 181) ¶¶ 6, 9.
89.	Forced nudity and use of diapers had the desired impact on Mr. Salim: “The forced nudity left [him] feeling vulnerable, helpless, and deeply humiliated.” Salim Decl. ¶ 9.	Disputed. Plaintiffs offer no support for their characterization of the “desired impact” of forced nudity and diapers. Defendants do not contest the description of Mr. Salim’s feelings. Salim Decl. ¶ 9.
90.	The “aggressive phase” of Mr. Salim’s interrogation began about a week after his initial detention, once he was examined by someone he believed to be a doctor. Shortly after the examination, his torture increased in severity. Salim Decl. ¶ 8.	Disputed there was an “aggressive phase” of Mr. Salim’s interrogation or that Mr. Salim was subject to “torture” because Plaintiffs offer nothing to support these statements. Defendants do not contest for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion that Mr. Salim’s interrogation began about a week after his initial detention, after he was examined by someone he believed to be a doctor, and that after the examination, interrogators increased his “ill-treatment” and “used a variety of abusive

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		interrogation methods[.]” . Salim Decl. ¶ 8.
91.	CIA records confirm that interrogators subjected Mr. Salim to “enhanced interrogation techniques” that included “nudity” and “sleep deprivation, water dousing, cramped confinement, facial slap, attention grasp, belly slap, and walling.” Ladin Decl., Exh. PP at U.S. Bates 001567; Ladin Decl., Exh. QQ at U.S. Bates 001609.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion.
92.	Mr. Salim was stuffed, while “naked, chained and shackled,” inside “a small wooden box, measuring about three square feet.” Once interrogators locked him in the pitch black, rancid-smelling box, he “vomited out of pain and fear.” Interrogators locked him in the box only once, but used it repeatedly as a threat, stuffing him inside the box for short intervals without locking the door. “Even the threat of the small box filled [Mr. Salim] with dread.” Salim Decl. ¶ 11.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion.
93.	Interrogators subjected Mr. Salim to repeated walling, combined with the repeated use of the attention grasp, facial slap, and abdominal slap methods. They wrapped his neck in a cloth collar, pulled him towards them, then slammed him	Disputed. Mr. Salim’s declaration does not use the terms “walling,” “attention grasp,” “facial slap,” or “abdominal slap.” Salim Decl. ¶ 12. The terms “walling,” “facial slap,” and “attention grasp” had very specific meanings as

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	into a wooden wall over and over while assaulting him in the face and stomach, before interrogating him. "As the session continued, it became more and more painful," for Mr. Salim, inflicting physical pain, and "severe headache[s] and dizziness immediately after the session ended [and that] lasted for hours." Salim Decl. ¶ 12.	described in the July 2002 Memo, and Mr. Salim describes actions that are different from the descriptions set forth in the July 2002 Memo. For instance, "walling" does not include being struck in the stomach and the "facial slap" was to be done in a specific way so as not to cause severe pain, but to induce shock. Furthermore, the "abdominal slap" was not included in the July 2002 Memo. US Bates 001109-1111.
94.	Shortly after the walling and physical assault session, interrogators subjected Mr. Salim to cramped confinement in a "tall, thin, coffin-like box." He was forced inside, and his hands were chained above his head in a painful position. He was left in darkness, with music blasting him, for two or three hours. After he was released from the box, he experienced a splitting headache, and his shoulders felt dislocated. Salim Decl. ¶ 13.	Disputed. Mr. Salim's declaration does not use the term "cramped confinement." Salim Decl. ¶ 13. "Cramped confinement," as described in the July 2002 Memo, is different from what Mr. Salim describes. Defendants, in their July 2002 Memo, described "cramped confinement" as being "placed in a confined space the dimensions of which restricts movement. The container is usually dark." Defendants did not suggest an individual should be chained to a metal rod in the box or that music should be blasted into the box. US Bates 001109-1111.
95.	Interrogators subjected Mr. Salim to a prolonged period of sleep deprivation through forced standing in a painful position. His hands were chained above his head,	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.

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

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>and he was positioned so that his feet barely touched the floor. He was left to hang from his chains, naked, in the darkness, barraged with music played at ear-splitting levels for what seemed like four or five days. He was provided only sips of water, and remained standing with his arms chained above his head even when he had to relieve himself. He was taken down only for interrogation. Whenever he would drift into sleep, he “was immediately jolted awake from the excruciating pain that shot through [his] arms and shoulders as they momentarily supported [his] full body weight.” Afterwards Mr. Salim suffered searing pain in his upper and lower back. His legs became swollen, a large cut had opened on his hand, and the cast covering his broken fingers began giving off a sickening smell. Mr. Salim received only limited medical treatment from a doctor or nurse for these years. Salim Decl. ¶ 15.</p>	
96.	<p>Interrogators subjected Mr. Salim to various sessions in which he was subjected to “enhanced interrogation techniques” in combination without questioning, interspersed with sessions in which he was assaulted while</p>	<p>Disputed. Mr. Salim’s declaration does not use the term “enhanced interrogation techniques.” Rather, it states only that after he was examined by a doctor, he was subjected to “a variety of abusive</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	interrogators demanded information. Salim Decl. ¶ 8.	interrogation methods.” Salim Decl. ¶ 8.
97.	Interrogators also subjected Mr. Salim to water dousing that approximated the water board method. They stripped him naked and forced him to lie on a large plastic sheet, after which they repeatedly doused him with gallons of icy water. The water was so cold it stopped his breathing. In between dousings, he was subjected to slaps and other physical assault. During some of the later sessions, a hood was placed over Mr. Salim’s head. When the hood was soaked, it clung to his face, causing to “choke and suffocate” and feel like he was drowning. After each 20-30 minute session, his interrogators “pulled up the corners of the freezing cold sheet and rolled [him] inside, leaving him “to shiver violently in the cold for about 10 or 15 minutes” before further interrogation. This procedure was repeated over and over for days. Salim Decl. ¶ 10.	Disputed. There is no evidentiary support for Plaintiffs’ assertion that “water dousing” was similar to the “water board.” The July 2002 Memo describes the water board as follows: “individuals are bound securely to an inclined bench. Initially a cloth is placed over the subject’s forehead and eyes. As water is applied in a controlled manner, the cloth is slowly lowered until it also covers the mouth and nose. Once the cloth is saturated and completely covering the mouth and nose, subject would be exposed to 20 to 40 seconds of restricted airflow. Water is applied to keep the cloth saturated. After the 20 to 40 seconds of restricted airflow, the cloth is removed and the subject is allowed to breach unimpeded. After 3 or 4 full breaths, the procedure may be repeated. Water is usually applied from a canteen cup or small watering can with a spout.” US Bates 001110-11. “Water dousing” on the other hand, as described by Mr. Salim, involved laying a detainee on a plastic sheet or towel and pouring water on the detainee from a container while the interrogator questions the detainee. Water is

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		applied so as not to enter the nose or mouth and interrogators were not supposed to cover the detainee's face with a cloth. Water dousing was proposed by someone other than Drs. Mitchell and Jessen in March 2003. Defs.' SOF ¶ 265(b); Mitchell Dep. 374:19-375:2. Plaintiffs do not dispute that Mr. Salim was subjected to "water dousing" as described in Mr. Salim's declaration, but not waterboarding. Salim Decl. ¶ 10.
98.	Interrogators also strapped Mr. Salim to a water board and threatened to pour water directly into his mouth and nose. But instead they spun him around 360 degrees several times, until he was "dizzy, nauseous, and completely disoriented." Salim Decl. ¶ 14.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
99.	The use of all these abuses, applied repeatedly and in combination produced in Mr. Salim "a constant state of terror." Salim Decl. 17.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
100.	Mr. Salim also suffered severe physical and mental pain as a result of interrogators subjecting him to Defendants' methods. Salim Decl. ¶ 18; Deposition of Suleiman Abdullah Salim 162:3-12, 167:7-19, 168:24-169:14, 171:9-21 (Ladin Decl., Exh. OO, cited hereinafter as "Salim Dep.").	Disputed. Plaintiffs present no evidence that "Defendants' methods" were used on Mr. Salim. Defendants had no involvement with how detainees were treated at COBALT. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 253-265. In fact, as stated above, the interrogation methods used on Mr. Salim differed from those proposed by Defendants. Plaintiffs' also

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

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>mischaracterize Mr. Salim's testimony. Mr. Salim testified that his long term injuries include "dizziness," "pain in [his] arms," and "pains in [his] back and around [his] waist." Mr. Salim also claimed that he has an "eye problem" but admitted that no doctor ever told him his eye problem was related to his detention at COBALT. Furthermore, Mr. Salim does not categorize any of these injuries as "severe" and was unable to describe the level of pain he allegedly endured. Salim Dep. at 162:3-12, 167:7-19, 168:24-169:14, 171:9-21.</p> <p>Additionally, Mr. Salim admitted to experiencing flashbacks, but those flashbacks were not limited to his time at COBALT, but included his time at Bagram in military custody. Salim Dep. at 265:22-266:17.</p>
101.	<p>Interrogators' repeated application of Defendants' methods broke Mr. Salim physically and mentally to the point that he attempted to take his own life by overdosing on painkillers that CIA medics had given to him and that he had stockpiled over the weeks of his confinement at COBALT. Salim</p>	<p>Disputed. Plaintiffs present no evidence that "Defendants' methods" were used on Mr. Salim. Defendants had no involvement with how detainees were treated at COBALT. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 253-265. In fact, as stated above, the interrogation methods used on Mr. Salim differed from those proposed</p>



¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	Decl. ¶ 17.	by Defendants. Plaintiffs also misrepresent Mr. Salim's declaration. Mr. Salim states that as a result of the "interrogators' abusive methods and the inhumane conditions" he decided to end his life and he attempted to swallow painkillers that he had stockpiled. Mr. Salim does not connect Defendants to his treatment at COBALT nor does he claim that he was "broke[n] physically or mentally[.]" Salim Decl. ¶ 17.
102.	Interrogators stopped the "aggressive phase" of Mr. Salim's immediately after his unsuccessful suicide attempt and transferred him from the interrogation cell at COBALT to another CIA facility nearby. Ladin Decl., Exhibit OO, Salim Dep. 180:12-181:12.	Disputed. Mr. Salim testified only that he was at the other CIA facility, which he called "Salt Pit," for one year and some months. The testimony does not state there was an "aggressive phase" of Mr. Salim's interrogation nor does it state Mr. Salim was transferred to the "Salt Pit" immediately after he unsuccessfully attempted to commit suicide. Plaintiffs do not provide any other admissible evidence to support these statements. Salim Dep. 180:12-181:12.
103.	Mr. Salim was detained by the CIA without charge or trial for another year and several months. Salim Decl. ¶ 17.	Disputed. Mr. Salim's declaration states only that he was transferred to another CIA prison nearby. Salim Decl. ¶ 17.
104.	On June 9, 2004, the CIA transferred Mr. Salim from its custody to the custody of the U.S.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF  
UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	Department of Defense at Bagram Air Force Base, where Mr. Salim was held without charge or trial, until August 2008. Ladin Decl., Exh. PP at U.S. Bates 001567; Ladin Decl., Exhibit OO, Salim Dep. 218:12-16.	
105.	While he was detained at Bagram, the Department of Defense determined that Mr. Salim had not been involved in terrorist operations, and that there was no basis to detain him. Ladin Decl., Exh. RR at U.S. Bates 001529.	Disputed. US Bates 001529 states a "review led to the conclusion that although [Salim] was an associate of the conspirators, he was uniformly considered too addicted to drugs to be trusted with operations." US Bates 001529 does not support Plaintiffs' statements that the DoD determined he "had not been involved in terrorist operations" or that there had been "no basis to detain him." Ladin Decl., Exh. RR at U.S. Bates 001529.
106.	In August 2008, the Department of Defense released Mr. Salim with a certification that he "has been determined to pose no threat to the United States Armed Forces or its interests in Afghanistan." Ladin Decl., Exh. SS.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
107.	Mr. Ben Soud was held at COBALT for over a year, between April 2003 and April 2004. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 3.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
108.	At COBALT, Mr. Ben Soud was subjected to conditions that included deprivation of natural	Defendants state that they played no role in determining the conditions under which Mr. Ben

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	light and any ability to distinguish between day and night, continuous loud music and noise, isolation, and deprivation of amenities beyond a bucket for human waste. These "extremely harsh and debilitating" conditions caused him "severe mental anguish and distress." Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 6.	Soud was held or the interrogation techniques employed while he was in CIA custody. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 274-282. Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.
109.	Mr. Ben Soud was deprived of sleep by being chained and shackled in painful positions. Guards chained him in three different stress positions, which caused him acute back and knee pain and exacerbated the pain in his broken left foot. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 7. When Mr. Ben Soud could not be forced to stand because of his broken foot, guards would bang loudly on the door to his cell to keep him awake. Once the cast on his leg was removed, guards would unchain him and forcibly march him around the prison, naked, every half-hour throughout the night. Mr. Ben Soud found the experience "extremely humiliating and degrading," and "incredibly painful, especially in [his] foot, which had only recently healed." Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 8.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion
110.	For the first two months at COBALT, Mr. Ben Soud was kept naked or in diapers. In May 2003,	Disputed. Mr. Soud's declaration states only that Mr. Soud was kept naked until May 2003. The

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	after the worst of his torture was over, interrogators finally provided Mr. Ben Soud with clothing for the first time. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 11.	declaration does not indicate Mr. Soud was subject to "torture." Plaintiffs do not provide any other admissible evidence to support this additional statement. Ben Soud Decl. (ECF No. 180) ¶ 11.
111.	Deprivation of clothing and use of diapers had the desired impact on Mr. Ben Soud, who, as a devout man, found the forced nudity "especially humiliating and degrading," and felt "vulnerable and helpless." Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 11.	Disputed. Plaintiffs offer no admissible evidence to support their assertion as to the "desired impact" on Mr. Ben Soud. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 11. Defendants do not contest the description of Mr. Salim's feelings. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 11.
112.	The "aggressive phase" of Mr. Ben Soud's interrogation began some two weeks after his initial detention at COBALT, after CIA interrogators had repeatedly asked him the same questions. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 9, 10.	Disputed. Mr. Ben Soud's declaration states only that Mr. Ben Soud's interrogation increased in severity about two weeks after his initial detention at COBALT, after CIA interrogators had repeatedly asked him the same questions. The declaration does not indicate there was an "aggressive phase" of Mr. Ben Soud's interrogation. Plaintiffs do not provide any other admissible evidence to support this assertion. Ben Soud Decl. ¶¶ 9, 10.
113.	CIA records confirm that interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to "enhanced interrogation techniques" that included "nudity, sleep deprivation, insult slap, abdominal slap, attention grasp, cramped confinement, water dousing, walling, stress positions,"	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>dietary manipulation, and “facial hold.” Ladin Decl., Exh. PP at U.S. Bates 001581; Ladin Decl., Exh. QQ at U.S. Bates 001609.</p>	
114.	<p>Interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to repeated sessions of the walling method in combination with facial slap and abdominal slap methods over a four or five week-long period. The sessions followed a methodical procedure: an interrogator would place a foam collar around Mr. Ben Soud’s neck, slap him firmly in the face and then the stomach, and then throw him repeatedly against a wooden wall. Each time he was smashed into the wall, the noise was “deafening and terrifying.” The process would be repeated for 20 or 30 minute sessions, and was interspersed with questioning. The walling method and questioning were repeated over and over, “on a daily basis for many hours. As the sessions continued, they became increasingly painful. [Mr. Ben Soud] developed a severe headache and dizziness immediately after a session ended, which lasted for hours thereafter.” As Mr. Ben Soud’s interrogations became more aggressive, the sessions increased in ferocity resulting in “more acute pain in [his] body, headaches and</p>	<p>Disputed. Mr. Ben Soud’s declaration does not use the terms “walling,” “facial slap,” or “abdominal slap.” Terms “walling,” “facial slap,” or “abdominal slap” had very specific meanings described in the July 2002 Memo, and Mr. Ben Soud describes actions that are different from the descriptions for the EITs in the July 2002 Memo. For instance, “walling” does not include being struck in the stomach and the “facial slap” was to be done in a specific way so as not to cause severe pain, but to induce shock. Furthermore, the “abdominal slap” was not included in the July 2002 Memo. US Bates 001109-1111.</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
	dizziness.” Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 12.	
115.	Interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to cramped confinement in a tall thin wooden box, with his arms chained over his head and loud music blasting in his ears. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 15. Interrogators also subjected Mr. Ben Soud to cramped confinement in a significantly smaller box, measuring approximately 3 ft by 3 ft. He was locked inside for roughly forty-five minutes, and experienced physical and mental pain, including “acute lower back pain,” severe leg pain—particularly in the leg with the broken foot, and in his knees, neck, and elbows. He was filled with dread when interrogators would later repeatedly threaten to stuff him back inside the box. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 16.	Disputed. Mr. Ben Soud’s declaration does not use the term “cramped confinement.” The “Cramped confinement” as described in the July 2002 Memo is different from what Mr. Ben Soud experienced. Defendants, in the July 2002 Memo, described “cramped confinement” as being “placed in a confined space the dimensions of which restricts movement. The container is usually dark.” Defendants did not suggest an individual should be chained to a metal rod in the box or that music should be blasted into the box. US Bates 001109-1111.
116.	Towards the end of the “aggressive phase” of Mr. Ben Soud’s interrogation, interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to a new sleep deprivation method, involving a painful standing stress position. For roughly 36 hours he was hung by the arms from a metal rod, naked and positioned so that the balls of his feet (one of which was broken) barely touched the ground. Although the room was pitch-black it was impossible to fall	Disputed that Mr. Ben Soud’s declaration states there was an “aggressive phase” of Mr. Ben Soud’s interrogation. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 17. Further disputed that the pain Mr. Ben Soud experiences has remained the same, when Mr. Ben Soud testified that the pain he feels in his back has lessened over time. Soud Dep. at 250:11-252:1.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>asleep, and loud music was blasted for the duration of his time in the sleep deprivation cell. "After a very short time, alone in that room and unable to sleep, [Mr. Ben Soud] began to hallucinate and slowly became hysterical." Once he was released, he was unable to walk and guards had to carry him to an examination room for treatment. His legs "had become engorged and swollen with fluid," in particular the leg that had been broken. "Both limbs were excruciatingly painful," as were his arms and back. The pain lasted for many days, and remains with him. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 17.</p>	
117.	<p>During the "aggressive phase," interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to additional coercive methods, including water dousing and another approximation of waterboarding. During the water dousing sessions, guards would force him, naked, onto a large plastic sheet, which they pulled up to form a shallow basin. They doused him with buckets of cold water until he was partially submerged. The water was so cold that it was physically painful, and he shivered violently. The sessions lasted about half an hour to forty minutes, sometimes longer, and</p>	<p>Disputed. There is no evidentiary support for Plaintiffs' assertion that "water dousing" was similar to the "waterboard". Defendants' July 2002 Memo describes the water board as follows: "individuals are bound securely to an inclined bench. Initially a cloth is placed over the subject's forehead and eyes. As water is applied in a controlled manner, the cloth is slowly lowered until it also covers the mouth and nose. Once the cloth is saturated and completely covering the mouth and nose, subject would be exposed to 20 to 40 seconds of restricted airflow.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>were interspersed with interrogations where Mr. Ben Soud, naked and shivering, was questioned. After about two weeks, the method's intensity was increased by placing a hood over Mr. Ben Soud's head prior to pouring the water. The addition of the hood caused him to feel like he was drowning. Mr. Ben Soud was subjected to this water treatment multiple times a day for four or five weeks. Ben Soud Decl. ¶13.</p>	<p>Water is applied to keep the cloth saturated. After the 20 to 40 seconds of restricted airflow, the cloth is removed and the subject is allowed to breach unimpeded. After 3 or 4 full breaths, the procedure may be repeated. Water is usually applied from a canteen cup or small watering can with a spout." US Bates 001110-11. "Water dousing" on the other hand, as described by Mr. Ben Soud, was when a detainee is laid down on a plastic sheet or towel and water is poured on the detainee from a container while the interrogator questions the detainee. Water is applied so as not to enter the nose or mouth and interrogators were not supposed to cover the detainee's face with a cloth. Water dousing was proposed by someone other than Drs. Mitchell and Jessen in March 2003. Defs.' SOF ¶ 265(b); Mitchell Dep. 374:19-375:2. Furthermore, Mr. Ben Soud's declaration does not indicate there was an "aggressive phase" of his interrogation and Plaintiffs do not provide any other admissible evidence to support this additional statement. Defendants do not dispute that Mr. Ben Soud was subject to "water dousing" as</p>



¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
		described in Mr. Ben Soud's declaration. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 13.
118.	Mr. Ben Soud was also strapped to a waterboard with a hood placed over his head. He was then spun around, and buckets of cold water were poured over him while his feet were elevated. The water ran into his mouth and up his nose, causing him to feel like he was drowning as he choked and struggled for breath. "Although interrogators did not pour water directly over [his] mouth and nose, they threatened to do so if [he] didn't cooperate." The threat terrified him. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 14.	Disputed to the extent Plaintiffs' claim this constituted waterboarding, which had a specific meaning as set forth in the July 2002 Memo. US Bates 001109-11. Furthermore, Plaintiffs admit that what Mr. Ben Soud was subject to was not an authorized technique. Mr. Soud's Response to Jessen's RFA at No. 7.
119.	Interrogators subjected Mr. Ben Soud to various sessions in which he was subjected to "enhanced interrogation techniques" in combination, interspersed with interrogation sessions when he would be assaulted while interrogators demanded information. During these sessions, the combined physical assaults (consisting of repeated uses of the attention grasp, facial hold, facial slap, and abdominal slap methods) caused him "acute pain" which lasted for hours after the interrogations. Ben Soud Decl. ¶18.	Disputed. Mr. Ben Soud's declaration does not use the term "enhanced interrogation techniques," "walling," "facial hold," "facial slap," or "abdominal slap." In fact, it does not even use the term "assault." Rather, it states that Mr. Ben Soud was subject to repeated beatings, which caused him "acute pain." Salim Decl. ¶ 18. Defendants further respond that the July 2002 Memo did not propose beatings, nor is it apparent from Mr. Ben Soud's description whether any of the treatment described is consistent with Defendants' suggestions. US Bates 001109-11.

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
120.	Interrogators stopped the aggressive phase of Mr. Ben Soud's torture about five or six weeks after they had started it. Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 5, 19.	Disputed. Mr. Ben Soud's declaration does not indicate there was an "aggressive phase" of his interrogation, nor does it claim Mr. Ben Soud was "tortured." Plaintiffs do not provide any other admissible evidence to support these statements. Defendants do not dispute that Mr. Ben Soud's interrogation lessened around the end of May 2003. Ben Soud Decl. ¶¶ 5, 19.
121.	Mr. Ben Soud suffered severe mental and physical pain as a result of the combination of abuses he was subjected to, in combination with the humiliating and degrading conditions of his confinement. He felt "completely hopeless and helpless," and experienced "a constant state of terror, apprehension and dread," which began to let up only "once interrogators stopped using some of the worst of their interrogation methods, around the end of May, 2003." Ben Soud Decl. ¶ 19.	Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion
122.	(a) Mr. Ben Soud was detained by the CIA until August 2004, when the CIA transferred Mr. Ben Soud to the custody of the Qaddafi dictatorship in Libya. Mr. Ben Soud was imprisoned by the Qaddafi regime for his membership in a group opposed	Defendants' object to this "fact" as compound. (a) Not contested for purposes of Plaintiffs' Motion that Mr. Ben Soud was detained by the CIA until August 2004. Defendants object to the remainder of this asserted fact as irrelevant to the

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>to the dictatorship, and remained in prison until Qaddafi's overthrow in January 2011. Deposition of Mohamed Ahmed Ben Soud 225:17–226:7, 228:4–16, 238:16–23 (Ladin Decl., Exh. TT).</p> <p>(b) Mr. Ben Soud never fought against the United States. Ben Soud Decl. 20.</p>	<p>resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p> <p>(b) Through his dealings with the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group ("LIFG"), Mr. Ben Soud had meetings with Abu Faraj al-Libi, who Mr. Ben Soud knew was a member of Al-Qa'ida. After September 11, 2001, members of LIFG started cooperating with Al-Qa'ida. Defs.' SOF ¶¶ 275-76.</p>
123.	<p>After Qaddafi was killed in 2011, President Obama announced that "the dark shadow of tyranny has been lifted" from Libya. Remarks by the President on the Death of Muammar Qaddafi, Oct. 20, 2011. <a href="https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/10/20/remarks-president-death-muammar-qaddafi">https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2011/10/20/remarks-president-death-muammar-qaddafi</a> (Ladin Decl., Exh. UU).</p>	<p>Defendants object to this "fact" as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p>
124.	<p>As the years progressed, Defendants remained "involved in the selection and development of interrogation and exploitation techniques" and were "instrumental in training and mentoring other CIA interrogators and debriefers." Ladin Decl., Exh. VV at U.S. Bates 001585–86.</p>	<p>Disputed as related to Plaintiffs. The CIA conducted training in "High-Value Target" interrogation techniques in late 2002. The training was designed, developed, and conducted by individuals from CTC other than Drs. Mitchell and Jessen, and Drs. Mitchell and Jessen played no role in the interrogation training. Individuals from JPRA were instructors at this training. Defs.' SOF ¶ 226. Dr.</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>Mitchell testified that he was not involved in training or mentoring until after 2005. Mitchell Dep. 343:6-344:11. Defendants further object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because as of August 2004, Plaintiffs were not in CIA custody. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324.</p>
125.	<p>Defendants formed Mitchell, Jessen &amp; Associates to meet the “growing demand for expert consultation, operational interrogation and exploitation capabilities” in the CIA program. <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001586. Defendants’ company acquired a “sole source contract to support CTC’s rendition, detention, and interrogation program.” Ladin Decl., Exh. WW at U.S. Bates 001629. Mitchell, Jessen &amp; Associates contracted with the CIA to continue providing “professional services by Drs. Mitchell and Jessen.” Ladin Decl., Exh. XX at U.S. Bates 001906. Defendants submitted a technical proposal for their company, claiming they would respond to a need “to continue developing and refining the program,” as “an outside source</p>	<p>Not disputed for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion, but Defendants object to these facts as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because when Mitchell, Jessen &amp; Associates (“<u>MJA</u>”) was formed in 2005, Plaintiffs were no longer in CIA custody. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324, 336.</p>

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	of professional expertise in the area of human exploitation, interrogation, debriefing, and the management of detainees in ways that facilitate intelligence collection.” Ladin Decl., Exh. VV at U.S. Bates 001585.	
126.	In 2006, Defendants spent several days considering refinements to their list of methods, and decided that “nudity, slaps, facial holds, dietary manipulation, and cramped confinement,” were, in fact, “completely unnecessary.” Defendants believed walling and sleep deprivation were essential. They briefed their “recommendations to the mid-level CIA officers who were working the issue for CIA leadership.” Ladin Decl., Exh. E at MJ00022862:	Not disputed for purposes of Plaintiffs’ Motion, but Defendants object as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because as of August 2004, Plaintiffs were no longer in CIA custody. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324.
127.	In 2007, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice wanted a personal briefing on the program from its original architects. Defendants, accompanied by John Rizzo, met with the Secretary. Ladin Decl., Exh. EE, Rizzo Dep. 68:14-69:8. During the discussion of sleep deprivation, the Secretary of State expressed concern that Defendants’ method—which involved shackling a prisoner’s hands to an overhead tether—evoked an image similar to the	Defendants object to this “fact” as compound. Defendants further object to this fact as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because as of August 2004, Plaintiffs were no longer in CIA custody. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324.  Defendants do not dispute that Defendants met with Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and John

¶	<b>Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>prisoner abuse scandal that had taken place at Abu Ghraib. Ladin Decl., Exh. YY at U.S. Bates 001175–76. Defendants “indicated the possibility of devising alternative methods to deprive sleep,” and resolved to “work on alternative methods for implementing sleep deprivation EIT and propose courses of action.” <i>Id.</i> at U.S. Bates 001176–77.</p>	<p>Rizzo as set out in US Bates 001175-76 and that Mr. Rizzo referenced Defendants as “the original architects of the program.”</p> <p>Disputed that there was one overarching CIA interrogation program, and specifically that the interrogation methods posed by the Defendants were the basis of interrogation for any Plaintiff. The interrogation methods proposed by Defendants became the basis only for the CIA’s interrogation of Zubaydah and later the CIA’s HVD Program. Rodriguez Dep. 183:22-184:25; 186:17-20; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 209-11.</p>
128.	<p>Defendants played additional leading roles in the program, including “provid[ing] high-level briefings to the 7th floor,” i.e., to CIA’s top management, as well as the production of papers evaluating and justifying the use of “coercive physical pressures” as part of interrogation. Ladin Decl., Exh. ZZ at U.S. Bates 001909; Ladin Decl., Exh. AAA at U.S. Bates 002285–2291.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because US Bates 001909 discusses the actions of MJA, which was formed in 2005 and US Bates 002285-91 was drafted in February 2005. Ladin Decl., Exh. ZZ at U.S. Bates 001909; Ladin Decl., Exh. AAA at U.S. Bates 002285-91. As of August 2004, Plaintiffs were no longer in CIA custody. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324.</p>

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

¶	Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence
		<p>Disputed. Plaintiffs mischaracterize US Bates 002285-91, which is a paper titled “Interrogation and Coercive Physical Pressures: A Quick Overview.” This document explains some pros and cons to applying “legal and approved coercive interrogation techniques” on “high value detainees[.]” In this paper, Defendants again reiterated that if interrogation techniques were applied improperly, it could induce a “severe sense of hopelessness” that would undermine efforts to obtain intelligence. Ladin Decl., Exh. AAA at U.S. Bates 002285–2291</p> <p>Disputed that there was one overarching CIA interrogation program, and specifically that the interrogation methods posed by the Defendants were the basis of interrogation for any Plaintiff. The interrogation methods proposed by Defendants became the basis only for the CIA’s interrogation of Zubaydah and later the CIA’s HVD Program. Rodriguez Dep. 183:22-184:25; 186:17-20; Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 209-11.</p> <p>Plaintiffs also mischaracterize US Bates 001909. The document does</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		not state that "Defendants played additional leading roles in the program", but outlines the areas in which the CIA contracted with MJA. As discussed earlier, Defendants were involved only in the CIA's HVD Program, and specifically were not involved with the interrogation for Plaintiffs Salim and Ben Soud. Ladin Decl., Exh. ZZ at U.S. Bates 001909; <i>see</i> Defs.' Resp. Pls.' SOF ¶ 54.
129.	Defendants were personally paid millions of dollars by the CIA as independent contractors for "research and development as well as operational services." Ladin Decl., Exh. XX at U.S. Bates 001906.	Defendants object to these "facts" as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs' Motion (Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(1); Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402). Disputed that Defendants were individually paid millions of dollars. From 2001-05, Dr. Mitchell was paid \$1,459,601.43 as an independent contractor to the CIA. From 2002-05, Dr. Jessen was paid \$1,204,550.42 as an independent contractor to the CIA. Ladin Decl., Exh. XX at U.S. Bates 001906.
130.	After the program was investigated by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the CIA agreed with the Committee's conclusion that the CIA "allowed a conflict of interest to exist wherein the contractors who helped design and employ the enhanced interrogation	Disputed. As discussed above, there was not one overarching CIA interrogation program and Defendants were involved only with the CIA's HVD Program and not with interrogation of Plaintiffs Salim and Ben Soud. <i>See</i> Defs.' Resp. Pls.' SOF ¶ 54.



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

¶	<b>Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence</b>	<b>Defendants’ Response and Supporting Evidence</b>
	<p>techniques were also involved in assessing the fitness of detainees to be subjected to such techniques and the effectiveness of those same techniques.” Ladin Decl., Exh. BBB, CIA Response at 10; Ladin Decl., Exh. B, Rodriguez Dep. 133:2–20.</p>	<p>Additionally, the CIA did not “agree” with the Committee’s conclusion. Rather the CIA responded to the Committee’s conclusion by stating, that the Committee’s Report “correctly points out that the propriety of the multiple roles performed by contracted psychologists— particularly their involvement in performing interrogations as well as assessing the detainees’ fitness and the effectiveness of the very techniques they had devised— raised concerns and prompted deliberation within CIA, but it fails to note that at least some of these concerns were addressed” in early 2003. Ladin Decl., Exh. BBB, CIA Response at 10. Further, objected to as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402).</p>
131.	<p>Until the CIA program was shuttered and Defendants’ contract was terminated in 2009, Mitchell, Jessen, and Associates received \$81 million in taxpayer money. ECF No. 77 ¶ 68; Ladin Decl., Exh. BBB, CIA Response at 11, 49.</p>	<p>Defendants object to this “fact” as irrelevant to the resolution of the issues presented in Plaintiffs’ Motion (FED. R. CIV. P. 56(e)(1); FED. R. EVID. 401, 402) because MJA was not formed until 2005, after Plaintiffs were released from C. Defs.’ SOF ¶¶ 273, 277-78, 324. Disputed. As discussed above, there was not one overarching CIA interrogation program and</p>

¶	Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence	Defendants' Response and Supporting Evidence
		Defendants were involved only with the CIA's HVD Program and not with the interrogations of Plaintiffs Salim and Ben Soud. <i>See</i> Defs.' Resp. Pls.' SOF ¶ 54. From 2005 through 2009, MJA was paid approximately \$72 million. Dr. Mitchell's profit percentage from MJA was in the "small single digits." Defs.' SOF ¶ 336-37.

DATED this 12th day of June, 2017.

*s/ Christopher W. Tompkins*  
 Christopher W. Tompkins, WSBA #11686  
[ctompkins@bpmlaw.com](mailto:ctompkins@bpmlaw.com)  
**Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.**  
 701 Pike St, Suite 1400  
 Seattle, WA 98101

James T. Smith, admitted *pro hac vice*  
[smith-jt@blankrome.com](mailto:smith-jt@blankrome.com)  
 Brian S. Paszamant, admitted *pro hac vice*  
[paszamant@blankrome.com](mailto:paszamant@blankrome.com)  
 Jeffrey N. Rosenthal, admitted *pro hac vice*  
[rosenthal-j@blankrome.com](mailto:rosenthal-j@blankrome.com)  
**Blank Rome LLP**  
 130 N 18th Street  
 Philadelphia, PA 19103

Henry F. Schuelke III, admitted *pro hac vice*  
[hschuelke@blankrome.com](mailto:hschuelke@blankrome.com)  
**Blank Rome LLP**  
 1825 Eye St. NW  
 Washington, DC 20006

*Attorneys for Defendants Mitchell and Jessen*

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
 PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF  
 UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

Betts  
 Patterson  
 Mines  
 701 Pike Street, Suite 1400  
 Seattle, Washington 98101-3927  
 (206) 292-9988

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 12th day of June, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

<p>Emily Chiang  <a href="mailto:echiang@aclu-wa.org">echiang@aclu-wa.org</a>          ACLU of Washington Foundation          901 Fifth Ave, Suite 630          Seattle, WA 98164</p>	<p>Paul Hoffman  <a href="mailto:hoffpaul@aol.com">hoffpaul@aol.com</a>          Schonbrun Seplow Harris &amp; Hoffman, LLP          723 Ocean Front Walk, Suite 100          Venice, CA 90291</p>
<p>Andrew I. Warden  <a href="mailto:Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov">Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov</a>          Senior Trial Counsel          Timothy A. Johnson  <a href="mailto:Timothy.Johnson4@usdoj.gov">Timothy.Johnson4@usdoj.gov</a>          Trial Attorney          United States Department of Justice          Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch          20 Massachusetts Ave NW          Washington, DC 20530</p>	<p>Steven M. Watt, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:swatt@aclu.org">swatt@aclu.org</a>          Dror Ladin, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:dladin@aclu.org">dladin@aclu.org</a>          Hina Shamsi, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:hshamsi@aclu.org">hshamsi@aclu.org</a>          ACLU Foundation          125 Broad Street, 18th Floor          New York, NY 10007</p>
<p>Avram D. Frey, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:afrey@gibbonslaw.com">afrey@gibbonslaw.com</a>          Daniel J. McGrady, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:dmcgrady@gibbonslaw.com">dmcgrady@gibbonslaw.com</a>          Kate E. Janukowicz, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:kjanukowicz@gibbonslaw.com">kjanukowicz@gibbonslaw.com</a>          Lawrence S. Lustberg, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:llustberg@gibbonslaw.com">llustberg@gibbonslaw.com</a>          Gibbons PC          One Gateway Center          Newark, NJ 07102</p>	<p>Anthony DiCaprio, admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>  <a href="mailto:ad@humanrightslawyers.com">ad@humanrightslawyers.com</a>          Law Office of Anthony DiCaprio          64 Purchase Street          Rye, NY 10580</p>

By           s/ Karen L. Pritchard            
Karen L. Pritchard  
[kpritchard@bpmlaw.com](mailto:kpritchard@bpmlaw.com)  
Betts, Patterson & Mines, P.S.

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO  
PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF  
UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS  
NO. 2:15-CV-286-JLQ

Betts  
Patterson  
Mines  
**One Convention Place**  
Suite 1400  
701 Pike Street  
Seattle, Washington 98101-3927  
(206) 292-9988