

The Honorable Richard A. Jones

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, *et al.*, on behalf of  
*himself and other similarly situated,*

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, President of the United  
States, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:17-cv-00094-RAJ

**DECLARATION OF JESSE L.  
BUSEN IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
EXCLUDE TESTIMONY AND  
REPORTS OF PLAINTIFFS'  
EXPERTS ARASTU, GAIRSON  
AND RAGLAND**

I, Jesse L. Busen, do declare and say:

1. I am a duly appointed Counsel for National Security for the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division, Office of Immigration Litigation in Washington, D.C., and I am one of the attorneys assigned to represent Defendants in this action.

2. Marked as "Exhibit A," and filed separately under seal, is a true and correct copy of the July 1, 2020 Expert Declaration of Dr. Nermeen Arastu;

3. Marked as "Exhibit B," and filed separately under seal, is a true and correct copy of the July 1, 2020 Expert Report of Jay Gairson;

1 4. Marked as “Exhibit C,” and filed separately under seal, is a true and correct copy of the  
2 July 1, 2020 Expert Report of Thomas K. Ragland;

3 5. Attached hereto and marked as “Exhibit D” is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the  
4 September 9, 2020 Deposition Testimony of Dr. Narmeen Arastu;

5 6. Attached hereto and marked as “Exhibit E” is a true and correct copy of excerpts from the  
6 September 25, 2020 Deposition Testimony of Jay Gairson;

7 7. Attached hereto and marked as “Exhibit F” is a redacted copy of excerpts from the  
8 September 18, 2020 Deposition Testimony of Thomas K. Ragland. A true and correct copy of the  
9 unredacted excerpts is marked as “Exhibit F – Filed Under Seal” and is filed separately under seal.

10 8. Marked as “Exhibit G,” and filed separately under seal, is a true and correct copy of the  
11 October 13, 2020 Expert Report of Dr. Bernard R. Siskin;

12 9. Marked as “Exhibit H,” and filed separately under seal, is a redacted copy of the July 17,  
13 2020 Amended Expert Report of Dr. Bernard Siskin.

14  
15 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

16 Executed on this 25th day of March 2021, at Washington, D.C.

17  
18 /s/ Jesse L. Busen  
19 JESSE L. BUSEN

Exhibit A  
– Filed Under Seal –

Exhibit B  
– Filed Under Seal –

Exhibit C  
– Filed Under Seal –

# Exhibit D

CONFIDENTIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

- - - - -x  
ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, ET AL., On behalf of himself  
and others similarly situated,  
Plaintiffs,

Index No.:  
2:17-CV-00094-RAJ

-against-

DONALD TRUMP, President of the United States,  
et al.,

Defendants.

- - - - -x  
VIDEO-CONFERENCED VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION  
Conducted Via Webex

DATE: September 9th, 2020

- - - - -x

AMBRIA IANAZZI, RPR

JOB#: 630464

- - - - -x

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

CONFIDENTIAL

-----x

CONFIDENTIAL Videotaped

video-conferenced deposition of NERMEEN ARASTU,  
taken pursuant to Notice, was held via Webex,  
commencing September 9th, 2020, at 9:13 a.m.,  
before AMBRIA IANAZZI, a Registered  
Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and  
for the State of New York.

-----x



1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 Objection, calls for speculation. 15:08

3 A. I can't recall off the 15:08

4 top of my head. I do believe that 15:08

5 some of those names, party names, of 15:09

6 course, I can't confirm it's the 15:09

7 exact two people when they share the 15:09

8 same name, I believe that maybe some 15:09

9 of those cases, those individuals 15:09

10 have maybe done, like later -- like 15:09

11 I've read an Article, and there 15:09

12 seems there's a similar name for 15:09

13 someone who's done CARRP -- like 15:09

14 related advocacy maybe appeared in a 15:09

15 Report about CARRP. 15:09

16 But, no, I don't know for 15:09

17 certain that in any of the cases 15:09

18 that appear in that data set are -- 15:09

19 were individuals who were placed 15:09

20 into CARRP. 15:09

21 Q. Now, I just have a few 15:09

22 questions before -- or do you want 15:09

23 to break now? 15:09

24 THE COURT REPORTER: Yeah. 15:10

25 Can we take a break? 15:10

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

CONFIDENTIAL

MS. SLACK: Okay. Fifteen 15:10  
minutes? Come back 25 after 3:00. 15:10  
THE COURT REPORTER: Sure. 15:10  
MR. AHMED: That works for 15:10  
me. Nermeen, does that work for 15:10  
you? 15:10  
MS. SLACK: Okay. 15:10  
THE WITNESS: Sure. 15:10  
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're 15:10  
going off the record. The time is 15:10  
3:10 p.m. 15:10  
(Whereupon, a short 15:28  
recess was taken at 3:10 15:28  
p.m. and ended at 3:28 15:28  
p.m.) 15:28  
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Please 15:28  
standby. We're back on the 15:28  
record. The time is 3:28 p.m. 15:28

1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 BY MS. SLACK 15:28

3 Q. Professor Arastu, while 15:29

4 we're still on the subject of the 15:29

5 cases in your study, I had a 15:29

6 question about how you decided which 15:29

7 category to put a particular case 15:29

8 in. 15:29

9 What date were you going 15:29

10 by in putting the cases into the 15:29

11 different -- four different 15:29

12 categories? 15:29

13 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:29

14 vague. Objection, compound. 15:29

15 A. In term -- in terms of, 15:29

16 like when the case was filed versus 15:29

17 when decided; that type of thing? 15:29

18 Q. Versus any other date 15:29

19 that might be associated with -- 15:29

20 A. Oh. 15:29

21 Q. -- the matter? 15:29

22 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:30

23 vague. 15:30

24 A. I cannot recall off the 15:30

25 top of my head which measure we 15:30

1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 used. There was, like something was 15:30

3 chosen, and we used it one way, but 15:30

4 I can't recall right now. 15:30

5 MS. SLACK: Tyler, can you 15:31

6 pull up Document N? And we're 15:31

7 going to mark that Exhibit 29. 15:31

8 -o0o- 15:31

9 (Whereupon, Exhibit 29 15:31

10 was marked for 15:31

11 identification, as of 15:31

12 September 9th, 2020.) 15:31

13 -o0o- 15:31

14 MS. SLACK: Is that where 15:31

15 we were Tyler, 29? 15:31

16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 15:31

17 Twenty-nine is correct; yes. 15:31

18 MS. SLACK: Is there any 15:31

19 way to blow this up a little bit? 15:31

20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Is there 15:31

21 a specific portion that you'd like 15:31

22 to have blown up? It's going to 15:31

23 be challenging. 15:31

24 MS. SLACK: Maybe to be 15:31

25 able to see what's encompassed in 15:31

1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 it. 15:31

3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I can 15:31

4 try. 15:31

5 MS. SLACK: Maybe, like be 15:31

6 able to see better the whole page? 15:31

7 Is there a way to do that? 15:32

8 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: That's 15:32

9 just about as good as it's going 15:32

10 to get, unless there's a specific 15:32

11 portion of it that you want to 15:32

12 focus on. 15:32

13 BY MS. SLACK 15:32

14 Q. Is there some place in 15:32

15 your Article, or in your Expert 15:32

16 Report, Professor, that you could 15:32

17 review to help you remember how you 15:32

18 decided what date to use to sort 15:32

19 these 158 cases between the four 15:32

20 categories? 15:32

21 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:32

22 vague. Objection, compound. 15:32

23 Also, I just wanted to object that 15:32

24 you had asked him to blow it up to 15:32

25 see the full exhibit, and the way 15:33

1

CONFIDENTIAL

2

it's currently blown up, I can

15:33

3

only see about half of it, and

15:33

4

when the full thing is on one

15:33

5

screen -- the words are so tiny

15:33

6

that I cannot see any of it.

15:33

7

Q. And it's three pages like

15:33

8

this.

15:33

9

A. I can't recall a single

15:33

10

place I could look to get you that

15:33

11

information.

15:33

12

Q. I mean, do you have some

15:33

13

document that actually broke these

15:33

14

cases up by the dates in your four

15:33

15

categories?

15:33

16

MR. AHMED: Objection,

15:33

17

vague.

15:33

18

A. (No verbal response.)

15:34

19

Q. I mean, looking at this

15:34

20

Exhibit on your own, perhaps during

15:34

21

the next break, do you think that

15:34

22

would help you refresh your memory?

15:34

23

Is there anything you can

15:34

24

think of that you could look at that

15:34

25

would help refresh your memory?

15:34

1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:34

3 compound. 15:34

4 A. So, you're asking me 15:34

5 where I got the filed date column 15:34

6 from; is that the question? 15:34

7 Q. No, my question is -- was 15:34

8 you said, "I can't recall what date 15:34

9 we chose," in order to create the 15:34

10 categories, whether it was the 15:34

11 filing date, whether it was the 15:34

12 publication date, or some other date 15:34

13 that related; is that a correct 15:34

14 characterization of what you just 15:35

15 said a few minutes ago? 15:35

16 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:35

17 misstates testimony. Objection, 15:35

18 compound. 15:35

19 A. Right. Okay. Yeah. I 15:35

20 can't recall exactly -- yeah. I 15:35

21 cannot recall off the top of my 15:35

22 head, which -- like how that measure 15:35

23 was determined specifically. 15:35

24 Q. And I'm asking -- I'll 15:35

25 start by saying, when you say you 15:35

1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 can't recall, you mean you can't 15:35

3 remember? 15:35

4 A. Yes. I can't remember. 15:35

5 Q. But at one time, you knew 15:35

6 how you were doing setting this 15:35

7 characterization? 15:35

8 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:35

9 vague. 15:35

10 A. Yes. 15:35

11 Q. Now, my question is, is 15:35

12 there anything that would refresh 15:35

13 your memory about how -- what date 15:35

14 you were using to sort these cases? 15:35

15 A. There -- there may be, 15:36

16 but I don't have those that -- those 15:36

17 documents like readily available 15:36

18 that, you know. You mentioned could 15:36

19 you look at them on the next break. 15:36

20 It's not something I could probably 15:36

21 pull out in the next break easily. 15:36

22 Q. Other than -- scratch 15:36

23 what I just said. 15:36

24 When you say in the -- 15:36

25 during the next break, is there 15:36



1 CONFIDENTIAL

2 anything that you could access today 15:36

3 that you would be able to look at to 15:36

4 refresh your memory about what date 15:36

5 you were relying on when you sorted 15:36

6 these cases? 15:36

7 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:36

8 vague. 15:36

9 A. I'm not sure -- yeah. I 15:36

10 couldn't tell you without looking, 15:36

11 if it's possible to access today or 15:36

12 not. I don't think so, but I'm that 15:37

13 I'm going to be able to get it 15:37

14 easily today. 15:37

15 Q. I'm going to move on, but 15:37

16 we'll probably come back to this 15:37

17 later. 15:37

18 MS. SLACK: Thank you, 15:37

19 Tyler. 15:37

20 Q. When did you submit this 15:37

21 Article for publication? 15:37

22 MR. AHMED: Objection, 15:38

23 vague. 15:38

24 A. Submit to who like -- 15:38

25 submit to UCLA. 15:38

# Exhibit E



1 samples and notes that I've taken over the year on the  
2 topic -- years on the -- sorry -- over the years on  
3 the topic.

4 Q. Okay. Thank you.

5 You mentioned your existing library of  
6 information. What does that embody?

7 A. It embodies the entire history of cases  
8 I've done, it embodies the many law review articles  
9 and other articles I've, you know, made copies of and  
10 kept for myself over the years, the various books I've  
11 read on the topic, the notes I've taken when at CLEs  
12 and other programs for -- as well as whatever else is  
13 in my head.

14 Q. You mentioned law review articles you've  
15 read. Are there any that stand out to you?

16 A. In general or for this case?

17 Q. Well, let's start in general. Are there  
18 any law review articles that stand out to you that you  
19 would see as part of this library of information that  
20 you access in rendering your expert services?

21 A. I -- the one thing you're going to learn  
22 about me today is I'm bad with names and titles, and  
23 so without me flipping through the various -- you  
24 know, my library and going, Yeah, this is the one I  
25 have marked as a favorite, there -- it just really

1 Q. Okay. So thank you.

2 We're going to come back to much of what  
3 you've said and talk more about it individually later.  
4 I want to turn to -- you've made some estimates of the  
5 clients that you've worked with over the years, and  
6 I'd like to turn to that.

7 You estimate that you've had  
8 approximately a thousand clients; is that correct?

9 A. That is a conservative estimate, yes.

10 Q. And what would that estimate include?  
11 Would it include the time you spent as a paralegal or  
12 just since you've become a practicing attorney?

13 A. That is since I became an attorney.

14 Q. And how did you come up with this  
15 estimate?

16 A. I went through my list of client files  
17 and I had the number totaled up, and that was looking  
18 at things like family cases and whatnot as a single  
19 client instead of breaking out individuals who had  
20 subcases within that.

21 Q. What kinds of cases does this include,  
22 then?

23 A. Absolutely everything I've done. So this  
24 includes everything from representing individuals who  
25 the Secret Service or the FBI had questions for or

1 some other agency within the U.S. Government had  
2 questions for, to representing individuals within  
3 their immigration cases, whether for family-based  
4 benefits, defensive benefits, or employment-based  
5 benefits. Also includes consulate processing as well  
6 as cases before USCIS and immigration courts, and CBP,  
7 and --

8 I can keep going.

9 Q. Does it include more than just  
10 immigration cases?

11 A. I believe I took the time to make sure  
12 that cases that did not have a relationship to  
13 immigration were not counted in that list.

14 Q. And in your report you mention that part  
15 of this client file review was to look at your  
16 electronic records; is that correct?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q. And what kinds of electronic records do  
19 you maintain?

20 A. I maintain a complete copy of all of my  
21 client files electronically. I do expire them  
22 eventually and move them off into storage, but I do  
23 keep all client files as much as electronic as I can  
24 because the amount of paperwork involved with  
25 immigration quickly fills my filing cabinets

1 familiar.

2                   Yeah, my recollection is there's two  
3 primary classes. There was one involving individuals  
4 who are delayed as related to their applications for  
5 naturalization and then there's one for individuals  
6 whose cases are delayed as related to their adjustment  
7 of status.

8           Q.       Okay.

9                   So I'm particularly interested in what  
10 portion of your clients have these types of  
11 applications.

12                   Let's start with naturalization. Can you  
13 give me an estimate, of your thousand or so cases, how  
14 many naturalization applications you've assisted with?

15           A.       Oh, boy. A lot. I don't know an exact  
16 number of naturalization cases that I've done over the  
17 years.

18                   If I count just cases where I did  
19 naturalization interviews, which is not all the  
20 naturalization cases I've done, because sometimes  
21 clients decide not to have an attorney at their  
22 interview, I would say at least -- probably at least  
23 15 to 20 percent, and probably more.

24           Q.       So roughly 150 to 200 of your thousand  
25 clients is your estimate of how many of them involve

1 naturalization applications. Did I have that correct?

2 A. That would be a reasonable estimate.

3 Q. And how many would you say involve  
4 adjustment of status, and that being any type of  
5 adjustment of status?

6 A. Any type of adjustment. So any type of  
7 acquisition of a lawful permanent resident status?

8 Q. No, I mean, there's adjustment for  
9 refugees, asylees, for nonimmigrant visas of different  
10 sorts. So in that whole nutshell, about how many  
11 would you say involved adjustment of status?

12 A. Well over half the cases I've done. I  
13 would say that for individuals where the purpose was  
14 for them to have a lawful permanent resident status at  
15 the end of it, whether through adjustment of status or  
16 some other related means, that's going to be at  
17 least -- at least two-thirds of my cases.

18 Q. So 6- to 700 of your thousand clients  
19 involve adjustment of status?

20 A. They have --

21 MR. ADAMS: Object to form.

22 THE WITNESS: If we're -- that's why I  
23 keep coming back to are you asking specifically as to  
24 the adjustment of status application form itself, the  
25 I-485?



1                   Because that's a number that I don't have  
2 a specific direct way to say, well, this X percent.

3                   I mean, I know how many of my cases  
4 roughly that involve getting to having a green card,  
5 which is generally through adjustment of status or  
6 acquisition of an immigrant visa. And so those types  
7 of cases combined are at least two-thirds. I don't  
8 know exactly how many of those would be adjustments.

9                   Q.       BY MS. SLACK: Of the ones that involve  
10 acquisition of lawful permanent residence, do you know  
11 about how many -- what percentage of those you would  
12 say are straight getting immigrant visas?

13                  A.       Oh, for immigrant visas?

14                   I mean -- it's probably about half of  
15 that. Probably a little bit more, but about half.

16                  Q.       Do you think it's fair, then, to say that  
17 roughly 300 or 400 of your thousand clients involve  
18 adjustment of status?

19                  A.       At minimum, yes.

20                  Q.       So between the two, we're talking about  
21 450 to 600 of your thousand clients are involving  
22 naturalization or adjustment of status?

23                  A.       At a minimum, yes.

24                  Q.       You mentioned the use of FOIA with your  
25 clients. Do you ever work on FOIA review matters for

1 based upon the pattern of the case, the types of  
2 request for evidence or decisions I received, as well  
3 as the styling of the interviews.

4 Q. Just to make sure I have this correct,  
5 you did this based largely on FOIA responses that you  
6 received, where sometimes you'd actually see the word  
7 CARRP within the FOIA response?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. That sometimes you would see text codes  
10 that you associate with CARRP?

11 A. Text codes, other similar codes. You  
12 know, headers that then were followed by large  
13 redacted portions that were usually placed in the file  
14 where a letterhead memorandum would be at or similar.

15 Q. In addition that you see patterns within  
16 the case, what are those patterns?

17 A. So generally speaking -- if we take away  
18 the FOIA requests -- let's say I'm looking at a case  
19 and I've got no FOIA requests to look at, because FOIA  
20 requests need a lot of information to understand  
21 what's going on in the case.

22 If I'm looking at patterns aside from  
23 that, what I am generally looking for are extensive  
24 delays in the case, repeated schedulings of interviews  
25 and canceling, repeated interviews. I've had clients

1 who have been interviewed half a dozen or more times  
2 with the same benefit over and over and over again,  
3 and asked the same questions. Cases where you go into  
4 the interview and you've got two different officers or  
5 more. In some of the cases I've had three or four  
6 officers in the room asking questions. In a few cases  
7 I've had one of those officers identify themselves as  
8 being an FBI agent or similar. Recognized a few of  
9 them as FBI agents.

10 And then the patterns of -- the types of  
11 notices of intent to deny, revoke, request for  
12 evidence and decisions. A lot of the cases have  
13 involved searches and requests for information that  
14 is -- seems -- you know, that is either very  
15 pretextual in nature, often has very little to do with  
16 the basis of the case, and as well as looking at the  
17 individual's background and history and reviewing, you  
18 know, what's happened in their case beforehand.

19 A lot of these individuals I've worked  
20 with are coming -- most of my clients were coming from  
21 countries with significant Muslim populations, a lot  
22 of them are coming from countries and regions that  
23 have war and other types of major issues and violence  
24 that have been ongoing, and so when looking at those  
25 cases and looking at those patterns, I'm able to say,

1 Okay, these particular populations are more likely to  
2 have a case that's going to fall within one or  
3 two -- you know, a couple of different potential  
4 buckets for the causes in delays, and then my job is  
5 to look at it and say, Okay, is this a case that's  
6 principally to do with CARRP, TRIG, fraud, something  
7 else, and identify where or what the cause of it is.

8 Usually cases that are involved with  
9 fraud are fairly clear. It's like, Okay, this is what  
10 you did, this is what you lied about. The vast  
11 majority of those clients will come out and admit it  
12 to me, and then we're, you know, looking at it whether  
13 or not it was material or not.

14 But for the CARRP and the TRIG cases,  
15 oftentimes the clients are just completely confused;  
16 they don't understand why. Especially when they've  
17 obtained refugee or asylee status previously, based  
18 upon their membership in the organization that they're  
19 now being reviewed for for CARRP.

20 I know that was a lot of answer. Sorry.

21 Q. What types of applications are you  
22 including in your estimate of 300 CARRP cases?

23 A. Those are adjustment and asylum and  
24 naturalization cases, primarily. There's a small  
25 handful of those that also had either H-1B typically

1 cases do you think are either adjustment of status or  
2 naturalization?

3 A. I don't know an exact number.  
4 Probably -- if I had to give an estimate, it would be  
5 about the same.

6 Q. Okay.

7 And you said at one point earlier that a  
8 lot of your TRIG cases are asylum cases. Can you  
9 explain that?

10 A. Yes. So TRIG very often comes up in  
11 either the refugee or the asylum context when an  
12 individual -- especially for individuals in the United  
13 States seeking asylum benefits.

14 Q. And why is that?

15 A. This comes up because when an individual  
16 is fleeing from another country to the United States,  
17 it is often due to either their membership and  
18 association with a particular group or social group or  
19 their fear of a particular group or social group. And  
20 those groups that tend to make people scared enough to  
21 run away from the life that they've always known are  
22 often groups that fall within the definition of a  
23 terrorist organization under the INA.

24 Q. When we discussed the methodology that  
25 you used in order to come up with these figures for

1 which proportion of your cases are CARRP, you didn't  
2 mention the tabular data that is among the list of  
3 things you reviewed for this case. It would be listed  
4 as the confidential data. It's a set of -- it's  
5 datasets in an Excel spreadsheet. Does that ring a  
6 bell to you?

7 MR. ADAMS: Object to form.

8 THE WITNESS: I -- yes, there is an Excel  
9 spreadsheet I did review.

10 Q. BY MS. SLACK: But you didn't reference  
11 that in your methodology in coming up with your 300  
12 cases. Did you use it at all?

13 A. I did not use it for coming up with the  
14 number of cases that I am involved in, no.

15 Q. Why not?

16 A. Because my practice involves more CARRP  
17 and TRIG cases than most immigration attorneys, since  
18 that's the area I happen to do most of my work in.

19 Q. Did you observe the information in that  
20 dataset about the proportion of naturalization and  
21 adjustment of status cases that are processed in  
22 CARRP?

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. And how would you characterize the  
25 proportions in that tabular data?

1 reaching their discretionary decisions for an  
2 adjustment of status.

3 Q. BY MS. SLACK: So just -- we're going to  
4 walk through what your understanding is, and I  
5 under -- and I'll start by saying I understand you  
6 don't have this information in front of you, and I'm  
7 just trying to get your baseline understanding of how  
8 a case is processed routinely from start to finish for  
9 these two applications. And it may vary, depending on  
10 the basis of adjustment of status, how that routine  
11 processing takes place, and so with that  
12 understanding, I want to ask you some questions about  
13 that.

14 For naturalization, if you're handling  
15 somebody's case from the beginning to the end, where  
16 do you file a naturalization application?

17 A. Depending on the individual's location, I  
18 file it based upon the -- where to file an N-400 for  
19 an individual. I look up the address. File it USCIS  
20 usually to one of the two lockboxes that are relevant  
21 for naturalization applications.

22 Q. And what is your understanding of what  
23 happens at the lockbox stage?

24 A. It is -- the file is taken in by the  
25 mailroom, where it gets an initial review for

1 completeness, whether or not there's any missing  
2 pages, whether or not the appropriate fees have been  
3 included or not, and whether or not it appears to be  
4 meeting the basic form that is -- format of the entire  
5 packet that is appropriate for that petitioner  
6 application type, and then is either rejected if it  
7 isn't basically prima facie eligible or then  
8 redirected to the appropriate department to further  
9 review the case, adjudicate it.

10 Q. And if it's moving on in the process and  
11 not being rejected or sent back, what is your  
12 understanding of where it goes next?

13 A. My understanding is that generally it is  
14 sent to the service center, where the first-level  
15 review of the case is done, and they identify -- if  
16 there are any particular issues of concern, they go  
17 over their check sheets for it, and identify any part  
18 of the application that needs to go out for additional  
19 review or analysis or request for initial evidence as  
20 may be appropriate. And once it's finished that basic  
21 level review, it's typically scheduled for a  
22 biographic appointment, although the biographic  
23 appointment can come simultaneously or in parallel.

24 Q. And when you say the service center --  
25 and I apologize because I think I forgot to put this



1 in the key terms. Are you talking about the National  
2 Benefits Center or are you talking about SCOPs, which  
3 is the -- the offices that handle the service center  
4 operations?

5 A. I am not specifically familiar with the  
6 interior distinctions of those various units, so when  
7 I'm saying service center, I could very well be  
8 meaning the overlap between the two of them, because  
9 it's not always clear to those of us who have not  
10 worked with the agency where one ends and the other  
11 one necessarily begins.

12 Q. Do you have an understanding of why a  
13 particular application would go to SCOPs or it would  
14 go to the NBC?

15 MR. ADAMS: Object to form. It's a basic  
16 lack of foundation on the question.

17 Q. BY MS. SLACK: Do you know if there's a  
18 distinction between the two?

19 A. Not off -- not that I can recall off the  
20 top of my head. I would have to look through my past  
21 notes and materials to do that, because I didn't  
22 prepare for that line of questioning today.

23 Q. And if I understand correctly, it's your  
24 understanding that pretty much the same thing happens  
25 at the NBC or a SCOPs office?

1           The other thing is that, generally  
2 speaking, refugees and asylees weren't interviewed,  
3 although they increasingly are these days.

4           You know, some of the internal processing  
5 differs from there. I don't have the specifics in  
6 front of me right now.

7           Q.       Do you have any knowledge of why  
8 increasingly refugees and asylees are subject to  
9 interview? When they apply for adjustment of status.

10          A.       A lot of that comes down to executive  
11 orders and proclamations seeking to enhance the -- or  
12 allegedly enhance the security of the immigration  
13 process.

14          Q.       Now we're going to shift to when you  
15 suspect a case is in CARRP.

16                 What is the first stage of this process  
17 from filing to decision where you start to see  
18 something different in the way a case is being  
19 processed when you believe it's subject to CARRP?

20          A.       The majority of the time when a case --  
21 well, there's a couple different things that may  
22 happen that would alert to it potentially being a  
23 CARRP case early on. Generally the scheduling of the  
24 interview for the case is delayed far beyond the  
25 normal processing dates for that type of case. The

1 timelines tend to be substantially extended in these  
2 cases.

3 The -- if and when an interview is  
4 scheduled, oftentimes more than one officer will be  
5 present for the review and adjudication of the case.  
6 Sometimes the individual will be visited by one or  
7 more law enforcement agencies and asked questions  
8 related to the country of origin, their immigration  
9 history, their religion, themselves, the people they  
10 know, that type of stuff, and many other types of  
11 conversations within that.

12 Q. I have just one follow-up question to  
13 that point, and I'm sorry to interrupt you.

14 When you say "visited by law  
15 enforcement," you mean not somebody from USCIS?

16 A. Generally not someone identifying as  
17 being from USCIS. Most often someone from the FBI,  
18 sometimes someone from HSI or another agency.

19 Q. Do you ever have clients that are visited  
20 by law enforcement who have not applied for  
21 immigration benefits?

22 A. Assuming aside from clients who have  
23 committed -- or allegedly committed a crime, for which  
24 they're being investigated at that time, I have had  
25 immigrant clients who have been visited -- immigrant

1 Q. BY MS. SLACK: And I'm just trying to  
2 clarify. And you -- when you said at times once or  
3 twice a week and then at other times once or twice a  
4 month, all being pre-COVID because things are slower  
5 now, was that estimate for the -- for all of your  
6 clients or the one for those that have no pending  
7 immigration benefit application?

8 A. That's all of my clients whom have had  
9 some form of law enforcement or national  
10 security-related investigation.

11 It would be difficult for me to  
12 specifically break out what percentage or amount of  
13 those were -- had a pending immigration benefit or  
14 not. I know some did not, you know, but I know many  
15 of them did.

16 Q. So you were -- you were giving me  
17 examples of ways that cases are different in this  
18 process from routine cases when you suspect that  
19 they're in CARRP. Did you have any others?

20 A. I have a lot of others. Those were, you  
21 know --

22 So let's see.

23 The top one's extension of time, visits  
24 from law enforcement, pretextual requests for  
25 evidence, requests -- notices of intent to deny,

1 notices of intent to revoke, and decisions where  
2 oftentimes they have very little bearing on the  
3 benefits sought. At least very little obvious bearing  
4 on it.

5           When there are interviews -- extensively  
6 long interviews, interviews where you show up only to  
7 have the interview get canceled, for you -- another  
8 one to get scheduled, for you to show up and have it  
9 get canceled or to get a call the day ahead of time to  
10 be told it's canceled. And I have clients who have  
11 showed up nearly a dozen different times of interviews  
12 scheduled, only to have it canceled every time with  
13 excuses or -- Well, we can't pull your file from the  
14 database to, you know, It looks like another user is  
15 using the file at the same time. I'm not allowed to  
16 open it right now, or, Well, your file wasn't sent  
17 here, which that excuse gets a little bit long in the  
18 tooth when it's the same person over and over and over  
19 again, to individuals whom simply just never get an  
20 interview scheduled no matter how much they ask for  
21 it.

22           Q.       Do you ever have occasions where  
23 interviews get canceled that you don't suspect CARRP?

24           A.       Sure. When there's a snowstorm, when  
25 there's -- you know, there are reasons that I have

1 seen where cases are canceled for reasons I don't  
2 suspect to be CARRP. I've had cases that were  
3 scheduled within a normal processing time and had an  
4 officer say, you know, We just haven't received the  
5 file yet. Those usually get quickly rescheduled, and  
6 the next interview goes right on through within a  
7 matter of weeks.

8           You know, but the CARRP-related cases  
9 have a much more ongoing rhythm and pattern of  
10 lengthier timelines and repeated instances of cases  
11 being rescheduled or canceled. I've had clients show  
12 up and have their biometrics canceled.

13           But, you know, in general -- scheduling  
14 snafus happen once in a while, but not near the  
15 frequency that they occur with CARRP cases.

16           Q.       Do you ever have an instance in which  
17 there's more than one officer in the interview that  
18 you don't suspect to be subject to CARRP?

19           A.       Fraud cases, generally.

20           Q.       Any others?

21           A.       Once in a while criminal investigations  
22 that may not necessarily be CARRP related.

23           Q.       Any instances in which you suspect it's  
24 just routine processing that there's more than one  
25 officer in an interview?

1           A.           Very rarely. Once in a while there will  
2 be a new officer who is claiming to be there for  
3 purposes of training, but the majority of the time  
4 it's -- when there's more than one officer, it's  
5 because the other officer is there for a purpose  
6 associated with some type of additional investigation.

7           Q.           Is there anything different after the  
8 interview that makes you suspect the case is subject  
9 to CARRP?

10          A.           Decision or request for evidence isn't  
11 issued within a timely manner.

12          Q.           And what's a timely manner?

13          A.           Depends on what the current processing  
14 times are for that case. The majority of them, after  
15 the interview the case -- by the time it got to the  
16 interview the case was ready for adjudication. So for  
17 the majority of them, you know, you -- your decision  
18 is made within a matter of weeks, on the long end  
19 within the statutorily provided timelines, like the  
20 naturalization case within 120 days, versus CARRP  
21 cases tend to go far longer than that.

22          Q.           And earlier I asked if you ever had the  
23 experience where someone was approved in the interview  
24 and scheduled for an oath ceremony and got sworn in to  
25 become a citizen the same day as the interview, and

1 I'm trying to interpret that question.

2 Q. BY MS. SLACK: If you have 75 percent,  
3 that's more than a majority.

4 MR. ADAMS: That's still a majority.

5 MS. SLACK: Yeah. More -- more than a  
6 simple majority.

7 THE WITNESS: Of cases that require  
8 adjudication or interviews at a district or field  
9 office, I would say more than a simple majority occur  
10 within the Seattle region.

11 Q. BY MS. SLACK: You discussed earlier and  
12 you discuss in your report your experience as a  
13 paralegal, that you started in 2006. When you were  
14 working as a paralegal, did you encounter cases with  
15 longer-than-average processing times?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And how would you describe the work that  
18 you did as a paralegal with regard to longer  
19 processing time applications?

20 A. My role as a paralegal was to research  
21 and investigate the cause of the delays on behalf of  
22 the attorney and based upon that advice from the  
23 attorney, when told me to do so, draft complaints and  
24 FOIA requests and letters that the attorney then would  
25 review and approve of.



# Exhibit F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

----- x

ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, et al., :

Plaintiffs, :

vs. : No. 2:17-cv-00094-RAJ

DONALD TRUMP, President of the :

United States, et al., :

Defendants. :

----- x

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF THOMAS K. RAGLAND  
Conducted virtually via remote videoconference  
September 18, 2020

Reported by:  
Misty Klapper, RMR, CRR  
Job No.: 636397

1 academic setting, like in a university peer  
2 review?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. As opposed to -- I did have  
5 colleagues who I either coauthored with or may  
6 have reviewed the works, but that's more  
7 informal, I think, than what you're asking.

8 Q. Yes. I'm asking about more in the  
9 context of a university.

10 A. No.

11 Q. So let's move to your CARRP-related  
12 experience.

13 You indicate that -- in your report  
14 that you represented or you have represented 300  
15 or more cases involving adjustment of status and  
16 200 or more cases involving naturalization; is  
17 that correct?

18 A. Yes. That's probably on the low end.  
19 It's an estimate.

20 Q. And you state that this is over the  
21 course of your career. So how would you measure  
22 that?

1           A.        Estimating the number of cases each  
2           year I've been in private practice in those  
3           areas.

4           Q.        And how did you reach these  
5           estimates?

6           A.        Thinking of how many cases I have  
7           currently or how many cases I've had in recent  
8           years, active cases, either adjustment or  
9           naturalization, and then multiplying that by the  
10          number of years I've been in private practice.

11          Q.        Did you look back in any of your case  
12          files to try to reach this estimate?

13          A.        No.

14          Q.        Do these include cases that you  
15          handled personally?

16          A.        Yes.

17          Q.        Or do they include cases that were  
18          handled by other attorneys in your firm?

19          A.        No. This is cases that I would have  
20          handled personally.

21          Q.        And did you file a G-28 notice of  
22          entry of appearance as attorney or accredited

1 who is -- who is evaluating? Is that you? Is  
2 that your estimate?

3 A. Yeah, it would be my estimate.

4 Q. At paragraph 20 of your report you  
5 say that for naturalization cases not subject to  
6 CARRP the time between filing and interview is  
7 generally six to nine months, correct?

8 A. I -- I think that may have been  
9 correct. That was probably correct when I wrote  
10 the report. Certainly all processing times have  
11 been -- are much longer now, including for  
12 naturalization cases.

13 Q. Are you aware of the current filing  
14 time for the --

15 A. I think it depends on where it's  
16 being adjudicated. Depends on the field office.

17 Q. Do you generally work with the  
18 Washington, D.C. field office?

19 A. I'd say the majority of my cases are  
20 either in the Washington district office or the  
21 Baltimore district office, but I've handled cases  
22 in field offices around the country.

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. And what do you base this estimate  
3 on?

4 A. So at the time I based that estimate  
5 on, again, a -- an -- an estimate of  
6 naturalization cases that I was handling.

7 Q. Did you consider the processing times  
8 on the USCIS website?

9 A. I don't recall.

10 Q. Did you consider any other facts in  
11 reaching this estimate?

12 A. What -- I'm -- I don't know what you  
13 mean by what other facts.

14 Q. Well, did you consider any other  
15 data?

16 A. Not that I recall.

17 Q. Aside from -- okay.

18 What other reasons might an  
19 application be delayed?

20 A. Other than what?

21 Q. Other than being in CARRP.

22 A. An application --

1 MS. CHO: Objection, calls for  
2 speculation.

3 To the extent that you can answer it,  
4 please go ahead, Mr. Ragland.

5 THE WITNESS: I mean, there's a --  
6 there's a -- a lot of different cases  
7 why -- there's a lot of different reasons  
8 why a case could get -- could be delayed.  
9 I've had cases be misplaced by the agency,  
10 for example. I've also had cases be  
11 delayed because they're complicated.

12 I don't know, there's -- there are a  
13 lot of reasons other than CARRP that a case  
14 could be delayed.

15 BY MR. BUSEN:

16 Q. Based on your experience, would a  
17 fraud investigation cause a delay --

18 A. It certainly can, yes.

19 Q. -- between filing and interview?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And by a case being complicated, are  
22 you referring to the reasons that you mentioned

1 earlier?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. All right. Let's move on to the next  
4 telltale sign, an interview scheduled and then  
5 descheduled.

6 Are you familiar with the National  
7 Benefits Center?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. How do you know about it?

10 A. It's one of the -- it's one of the  
11 components of USCIS that adjudicates applications  
12 for immigration benefits.

13 Q. Do you know if the NBC, or the  
14 National Benefits Center, is involved in the  
15 CARRP process?

16 A. I don't know.

17 Q. Do you know if they refer cases to  
18 CARRP?

19 A. I don't know.

20 Q. Based on your understanding, what  
21 happens at the National Benefits Center when a  
22 naturalization application is filed there?



1           A.       My understanding is that the NBC  
2       prepares the -- prepares the application and the  
3       A-file and forwards, you know, the completed  
4       application and A-file to the field office to be  
5       placed in a queue and scheduled for interview.

6           Q.       What do you mean by prepares the  
7       application?

8           A.       You know, reviews the application,  
9       confirms that the necessary evidence is -- is  
10      included, that the -- the fee is paid, that the  
11      photos are included, that, you know, the right  
12      documents are -- are attached, et cetera. And  
13      then my understanding is -- although I don't  
14      think it always happens -- obtains the A-file  
15      and -- and any other files, T-files, you know,  
16      multiple other files related to the applicant and  
17      then forwards that to the field office for  
18      adjudication.

19          Q.       And is that a similar process to what  
20      happens when an adjustment of status application  
21      is filed at the National Benefits Center?

22          A.       I don't know.

1 Q. Based on your understanding, what  
2 happens when an adjustment of status application  
3 is filed with the National --

4 A. My understanding is that it's --

5 Q. -- Benefits Center?

6 A. -- that it's a similar process, that  
7 the -- the application is reviewed. If there are  
8 missing items, they might issue an RFE to the  
9 applicant to provide missing items and then, once  
10 everything is ready, forward it to the field  
11 office for scheduling.

12 Q. Did any of the materials you  
13 considered in preparing this report relate to the  
14 National Benefits Center?

15 A. I don't recall whether they related  
16 specifically to the National Benefits Center or  
17 not.

18 Q. Did any of the materials you  
19 considered relate to the National Benefits Center  
20 and any role that they may play in CARRP?

21 A. I don't --

22 MS. CHO: Objection, asked and

1 that a case may be scheduled and then  
2 descheduled?

3 A. Yes. If the field office for some  
4 reason doesn't have the file or all of the files,  
5 a case could be descheduled. I've been told  
6 that. That's one reason.

7 Q. Are there any others that you're  
8 aware of?

9 A. Those are the ones that come to mind  
10 that -- that I've been told -- when a case has  
11 been descheduled that I've been told, you know,  
12 that we don't have the file or where I -- or  
13 where there's an Adam Walsh Act issue or there's  
14 no reason given. And often those are CARRP  
15 cases.

16 Q. Now, you stated in your report that  
17 you have handled approximately 500 or more cases  
18 involving adjustment of status and  
19 naturalization, of which 50 of those you suspect  
20 were subject to CARRP, correct?

21 A. I suspect there are more, but  
22 because -- because CARRP doesn't advertise,

1 BY MR. BUSEN:

2 Q. Are you aware -- I -- I asked if  
3 you're aware of other bases for this SSSS code  
4 being on a boarding pass.

5 How often --

6 A. Okay. Go ahead.

7 Q. Are you aware of how often it is that  
8 this code will show up on a boarding pass because  
9 the applicant is on the terrorist screening  
10 database selectee list?

11 A. As opposed to for some other reason?

12 Q. Yes, as opposed to a reason not  
13 related to the terrorist screening database  
14 selectee list.

15 A. I don't know.

16 Q. Do you know if this code can show up  
17 on a boarding pass if a traveler changes their  
18 ticket at the last minute?

19 A. I don't know. I'd be speculating.

20 Q. Have you done any research into this  
21 SSSS code for purposes of this report?

22 A. No. Independent research? No, just

1 based on my experience of clients who've had this  
2 notation on boarding passes.

3 Q. I have some additional questions  
4 about your telltale signs in general. You've  
5 mentioned five main ones and then mentioned this  
6 SSSS code and a couple of others.

7 Would an applicant need all of these  
8 telltale signs for you to estimate that they --  
9 their application is subject to CARRP?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Would they need all but one of these  
12 signs for you to estimate that their application  
13 is subject to CARRP?

14 A. No. It's not a checklist.

15 Q. Would just one sign be sufficient  
16 to -- for you to estimate that an applicant is  
17 subject to CARRP?

18 A. Probably not, because, for example,  
19 if the only issue is a delay, I wouldn't take  
20 that to mean automatically that it's a CARRP  
21 delay. I would want to see that there are other  
22 indicators.

1           Q.       If an applicant was asked unusual  
2           questions, what you term unusual questions in an  
3           interview, would you suspect their application is  
4           subject to CARRP barring the presence of any of  
5           the other telltale signs you mention in the  
6           report?

7           A.       I think it depends on the questions  
8           that are being asked. For example, I -- I had a  
9           client who was asked a number of questions about  
10          a terrorist attack in a foreign country. On the  
11          basis of that questioning alone I might suspect  
12          that the case was subject to CARRP without any  
13          other indicators.

14                   MR. BUSEN: Noah, you can take the  
15                   exhibit down now. Thank you.

16                   BY MR. BUSEN:

17          Q.       Are there any of these signs that are  
18          more significant than others?

19          A.       Well, being on the selectee list,  
20          having the -- the four Ss on the boarding pass is  
21          more significant than being routinely referred to  
22          secondary inspection, for example, because you

1 can being referred to secondary inspection for  
2 lots of reasons, CARRP and non-CARRP related. So  
3 the four Ss are a significant basis.

4 The FBI interview is certainly a  
5 significant basis because, again, it's something  
6 that is documented. So some are more significant  
7 than others.

8 Q. You say you can be subject to  
9 secondary inspection for reasons both related  
10 to -- was it related to CARRP or the --

11 A. Well, not related to CARRP --  
12 (Crosstalk)

13 MS. REPORTER: I'm sorry. You both  
14 were on top of each other.

15 THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.

16 BY MR. BUSEN:

17 Q. Let me ask again.

18 So you say that you can be referred  
19 to secondary inspection for reasons having to do  
20 with national security and reasons not having to  
21 do with national security, correct?

22 A. Yes.

1 Q. Are you aware of whether you can get  
2 the SSSS code for reasons associated with  
3 national security or reasons not associated with  
4 national security?

5 A. I don't know. In my -- in my  
6 experience, SSSS has been -- SSSSs have been, to  
7 my understanding, being related to a national  
8 security concern.

9 Q. And why is that?

10 A. Because the SSSSs were in conjunction  
11 with other indicators of a national security  
12 concern, country of natonality, religion,  
13 association with organizations, those -- those  
14 other indicators.

15 I don't --

16 Q. Can you explain how you --

17 A. To answer your question, I don't --

18 Q. -- use these --

19 A. I guess to answer your question, I  
20 don't recall having a client with four Ss where  
21 it was a nonnational security -- I'm not saying  
22 it can't happen. I just haven't had the



1 experience.

2 Q. Can you explain how you use the  
3 telltale signs to determine whether an  
4 application is subject to CARRP?

5 A. I'm not sure I understand the  
6 question.

7 Q. Well, let's take -- you estimated you  
8 handled 50 or more cases that were subject to  
9 CARRP.

10 Can you estimate how many or what  
11 percentage of those had two of the telltale signs  
12 you mentioned?

13 A. I would think all of them had at  
14 least two.

15 Q. How many would have just one?

16 A. As I said before, I don't know that I  
17 would -- I don't know that I would conclude that  
18 a client is likely subject to CARRP based on a  
19 single indicator, with the exception of, for  
20 example, very specific questioning on a national  
21 security-related issue, whether at a USCIS  
22 interview --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

(Thereupon, Exhibit Number 32  
was marked for identification.)

MR. BUSEN: Could you please go to  
the tab receipt count on the bottom far  
left. And could you zoom in on the table  
on the left.

VIDEO OPERATOR: This table?

MR. BUSEN: Yes.

VIDEO OPERATOR: Stand by.

MR. BUSEN: It looks like there may  
be -- that grand total -- yeah, there it  
goes.

BY MR. BUSEN:

Q. Are you familiar with this document,  
Mr. Ragland?

A. I wouldn't say I'm familiar with it.  
I may have reviewed it if it was in the discovery  
materials.

Q. This is the tabular data that was  
provided by the defendants to the plaintiffs and  
it is on the list of documents that you reviewed

1 for your expert report on the first page of  
2 Exhibit B.

3 If you would like your recollection  
4 refreshed, we could look at that exhibit list  
5 again if you'd like.

6 A. I don't need to look at the exhibit  
7 list. If it's on the list, I would have reviewed  
8 it, but I wouldn't tell you that I've committed  
9 it to memory.

10 Q. Now, would you -- this -- would you  
11 agree that this table shows data from fiscal year  
12 2013 to 2019 from U -- USCIS?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Would you agree that the table shows  
15 how many I-485 and N-400 applications were  
16 received by USCIS from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal  
17 year 2019?

18 A. You're saying the grand total as the  
19 number received, 10 million cases.

20 Q. The grand -- the grand total in the  
21 bottom right corner is the total number of I-485  
22 and N-400 applications received between fiscal

1 MS. CHO: Objection, asked and  
2 answered.

3 THE WITNESS: Some -- some portion  
4 of the 50. Again, I believe the -- I  
5 believe the 50 number to be --

6 (Remote transmission interference)

7 MS. REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir. I  
8 can't hear you.

9 THE WITNESS: So I -- I -- I  
10 suspect the 50 number that I gave --  
11 which, again, is -- should not be carved  
12 in stone because it's an estimate for a  
13 program the agency does not disclose,  
14 so -- but I believe the 50 is on the low  
15 end. Probably the majority -- if the  
16 question you're asking of those 50 are the  
17 majority adjustment or naturalization  
18 applications, then I would say yes.

19 BY MR. BUSEN:

20 Q. So could you estimate more than 25 of  
21 those would have been adjustment of status and  
22 naturalization?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. So that would be 25 cases out of the  
3 500 naturalization and adjustment of status  
4 applications are cases that you've handled,  
5 correct?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So that would be approximately  
8 5 percent of the cases -- of the adjustment of  
9 status and naturalization cases you've handled  
10 you suspect were processed under CARRP?

11 A. Yes. Again, I feel like that's  
12 probably on the low end.

13 Q. How do you square that estimate with  
14 the data --

15 A. Well --

16 Q. -- provided by USCIS?

17 A. -- because I handle a lot more cases  
18 involving national security matters than most of  
19 the other immigration lawyers I know. I get  
20 referred cases because they have national  
21 security issues. Clients come to me for that  
22 reason. And so it's a -- the statistics of my

1 cases where there's a percentage of CARRP issues  
2 or TRIG issues or national security issues is  
3 going to be higher than -- I wouldn't say than  
4 any other lawyer in the country, but higher  
5 than -- than most.

6 Q. So are you choosing cases because  
7 they have national security problems or are  
8 people coming to you because they have cases that  
9 have national security problems?

10 A. The latter.

11 Q. So is your experience typical of an  
12 immigration attorney nationwide?

13 MS. CHO: Objection, asked and  
14 answered.

15 THE WITNESS: I'm not -- I'm not  
16 clear what the -- I'm not clear about the  
17 question.

18 BY MR. BUSEN:

19 Q. Do you think most immigration  
20 attorneys typically handle as many cases  
21 involving national security and TRIG issues as  
22 you?

1 BY MR. BUSEN:

2 Q. [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 A. [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 Q. [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]

19 A. [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]

22 Q. [REDACTED]

1 A. [REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED]

4 Q. [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED]

8 [REDACTED]

9 A. [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 Q. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12 [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 A. [REDACTED]

18 Q. [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 A. [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]

22 Q. [REDACTED]



1

[REDACTED]

2

A. [REDACTED]

3

Q. [REDACTED]

4

A. [REDACTED]

5

Q. [REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

A. [REDACTED]

8

Q. [REDACTED]

9

[REDACTED]

10

A. [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

11

[REDACTED]

12

Q. [REDACTED]

13

A. [REDACTED]

14

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

15

[REDACTED]

16

Q. [REDACTED]

17

[REDACTED]

18

[REDACTED]

19

A. [REDACTED]

20

MS. CHO: [REDACTED]

21

[REDACTED].

22

THE WITNESS: [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

BY MR. BUSEN:

5

Q. [REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

A. [REDACTED]

8

[REDACTED]

9

[REDACTED]

10

[REDACTED]

11

[REDACTED]

12

Q. [REDACTED]

13

[REDACTED]

14

[REDACTED]

15

[REDACTED]

16

[REDACTED]

17

[REDACTED]

18

[REDACTED]

19

[REDACTED]

20

A. [REDACTED]

21

[REDACTED]

22

Q. [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]

2 A. [REDACTED]

3 Q. [REDACTED]

4 A. [REDACTED].

5 [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]

7 [REDACTED] --

8 (Remote transmission interference)

9 THE WITNESS: [REDACTED]

10 [REDACTED]

11 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] --

12 MR. BUSEN: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]

14 THE WITNESS: [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]

17 [REDACTED]

18 [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED]

1

[REDACTED]

2

[REDACTED]

3

[REDACTED]

4

[REDACTED]

5

[REDACTED]

6

[REDACTED]

7

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

8

[REDACTED]

9

[REDACTED]

10

[REDACTED]

11

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

12

[REDACTED]

13

[REDACTED]

14

[REDACTED]

15

[REDACTED]

16

[REDACTED]

17

[REDACTED]

18

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

19

[REDACTED]

20

BY MR. BUSEN:

21

Q. [REDACTED]

22

[REDACTED]

Exhibit G  
– Filed Under Seal –

Exhibit H  
– Filed Under Seal –