1 THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 AT SEATTLE 10 ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, et al., on behalf of CASE NO. C17-00094RAJ himself and other similarly situated, 11 **DEFENDANTS' CERTIFICATION** 12 Plaintiffs. OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE MEET AND CONFER REQUIREMENT OF LCR 26(c)(1); 13 v. DECLARATION OF BRENDAN T. MOORE IN SUPPORT THEREOF 14 DONALD TRUMP, President of the United States, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Pursuant to LRC 26(c)(1), of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the 18 Western District of Washington, Defendants, through counsel, hereby certify that they have fully 19 complied with the requirement that they meet and confer with counsel for Plaintiffs prior to the filing 20 of the motion for a protective order filed contemporaneously herewith. 21 This certification is based on the declaration of Brendan T. Moore that is attached hereto. 22 23 Dated: March 7, 2019. 24 25 ANDREW BRINKMAN JOSEPH H. HUNT 26 Trial Attorney Assistant Attorney General Office of Immigration Litigation Civil Division 27 28 DEFENDANTS' CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE

DEFENDANTS' CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE MEET AND CONFER REQUIREMENT OF LCR 26(c)(1); DECLARATION OF BRENDAN MOORE IN SUPPORT THEREOF - (Case No. C17-00094RAJ)

United States Department of Justice Civil Division, Office of Immigration Litigation Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 878 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 616-4900

	Case 2:17-cv-00094-RAJ	Document 226-4	Filed 03/07/19	Page 2 of 4
1 2	AUGUST FLENTJE Special Counsel U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Di	Т	EON B. TARANT rial Attorney orts Branch	O
3 4	ETHAN B. KANTER Chief, National Security Unit Office of Immigration Litigation	S	OANIEL BENSINC enior Trial Counse ederal Programs B	1
5 6 7 8 9	DEREK C. JULIUS Assistant Director Office of Immigration Litigation ANNETTE L. HAYES United States Attorney BRIAN C. KIPNIS	C N C <u>/s</u> B	INDSAY M. MUR Counsel for National lational Security Use Office of Immigrations S/Brendan Moore BRENDAN T. MOO Trial Attorney	l Security nit on Litigation
10	Assistant United States Attorney Western District of Washington		rial Attorney Office of Immigration	on Litigation
11 12		C	Counsel for Defenda	ants
13 14				
15				
16 17				
18				
19 20				
21				

DEFENDANTS' CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE MEET AND CONFER REQUIREMENT OF LCR 26(c)(1); DECLARATION OF BRENDAN MOORE IN SUPPORT THEREOF -(Case No. C17-00094RAJ)

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CIVIL DIVISION, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION Ben Franklin Station, P.O. Box 878 Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 616-4900

9

10

7

13

DECLARATION OF BRENDAN T. MOORE

- I, Brendan T. Moore, declare and say:
- I am a trial attorney in the Department of Justice's Office of Immigration Litigation's 1. Appellate Section. I am one of the attorneys of record for Defendants in the above-captioned lawsuit.
- In general, regular telephonic conferences between attorneys for the parties as a 2. means to informally resolve a variety of issues relating to discovery and other matters as they have arisen has been an ongoing feature of this litigation since at least the Summer of 2018.
- With respect to the dispute between the parties concerning Plaintiffs' Request For 3. Production (RFP) No. 53, requesting the production of "[t]he Alien Files ("A files") of 100 members of the Naturalization and Adjustment Classes statistically chosen at random," the parties had numerous discussions with the purpose of attempting to avert the need to bring this dispute to the Court. RFP No. 53 was one of the topics discussed during formal meet and confer sessions between the parties on the October 19, 2018 and October 24, 2018, November 8, 2018. Although some of these sessions involved full teams of lawyers from both sides, other sessions involved smaller breakout groups of attorneys.
- In a telephonic meeting on November 20, 2018, the parties agreed that they had 4. exhausted all avenues of compromise on RFP No. 53 and had reached an impasse on the matter.
- An impasse between the parties with respect to their request for so-called "why 5. information" as to the five named Plaintiffs has persisted for a longer period of time, though Defendants have never acknowledged on the public docket that any of the named Plaintiffs were ever placed in the CARRP program. Defendants have consistently taken the position that, because such information is, by its very nature, law enforcement privileged, classified, or both, it cannot be disclosed to Plaintiffs, even under an Attorney's Eyes only order. Prior to the filing of this motion, and Plaintiffs motion to compel, the parties discussed this issue during the November 20, 2018 meet and confer and agreed that an impasse on this issue had occurred.

	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
İ	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6

6. Di	aring the November 20, 2018, meet and confer, Plaintiffs' counsel also informed
Defendants' coun	sel of their intention to ask the Court for permission to communicate with Wagafe
class members th	rough a public notice. Plaintiffs' public notice proposal was discussed by the
parties over the co	ourse of several prior meetings but, as Defendants' counsel informed Plaintiffs'
counsel, Defenda	nts opposed the idea because of the increased risk of a disclosure of sensitive
information subje	ect to the AEO protective order to unnamed class members who are targets of
investigations. D	uring the November 20, 2018 meet and confer, the parties agreed that an impasse
had been reached	on that issue as well.

Finally, during a meeting and confer between the parties on December 20, 2018, 7. Defendants informed Plaintiffs of their intention to file a limited number of declarations, and possibly some portions of their memorandum of law in support of the protective order in camera and ex parte. Plaintiffs stated that they would consult internally before taking a position on this issue. On February 28, 2019, in anticipation of filing their motion for a protective order, Ethan Kanter, counsel for Defendants, again informed Plaintiffs' counsel by e-mail of Defendants intention to file a limited number of declarations, and potentially some portions of their memorandum of law in support of the protective order in camera and ex parte. On March 6, 2019, Plaintiffs, through attorney Sameer Ahmed, informed Defendants by e-mail of their decision to oppose Defendants' motion to seek leave to submit declarations and briefing in camera and ex parte. Plaintiffs also communicated their expectation that Defendants provide Plaintiffs a summary of the materials Defendants intend to submit in camera and ex parte in as much detail as possible without revealing the information claimed to be classified and law enforcement privileged information.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on this 7th day of March 2019, at Washington D.C.

Swass Nere

28