

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

KHALED A.F. AL ODAH,

Petitioner,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 02-828 (CKK)

AHCENE ZEMIRI,

Petitioner,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 04-2046 (CKK)

ABDUL LATIF MOHAMMED NASSER,

Petitioner,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 05-764 (CKK)

ALI HUSSIAN MOHAMMAD MUETY  
SHAABAN,

Petitioner,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 05-892 (CKK)

TARIQ MAHMOUD ALSAWAM,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,  
Respondents.

Civil Action No. 05-1244 (CKK)

MOHAMMED RAJEB ABU GHANEM,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,  
Respondents.

Civil Action No. 05-1638 (CKK)

ZAKARIA AL-BAIDANY,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,  
Respondents.

Civil Action No. 05-2380 (CKK)

**ORDER**  
(December 22, 2008)

The Court adopts all of the procedures and schedules set forth in the Case Management Order issued by Judge Hogan in *In re Guantanamo Bay Detainee Litigation*, Misc. No. 08-442 (Nov. 6, 2008), Docket No. [940], as amended on December 16, 2008, No. 08-442, Docket No. [1315] (the “Case Management Order”), unless stated otherwise.

On November 14, 2008, the Court ordered the parties in the above-captioned cases to file Joint Status Reports identifying any matters that were *not* decided in the Case Management Order. Having reviewed these initial reports and Judge Hogan’s amendments to the Case

Management order, the Court shall now require the parties in the above-captioned cases to file additional Joint Status Reports, divided into five sections that include the following information:

- (1) a summary of the parties' compliance with the Case Management Order;
- (2) the schedule (*i.e.*, specific dates) for all motions, filings, or other disclosures contemplated in the Case Management Order assuming no alterations of the deadlines set forth therein;
- (3) a description of any anticipated problems that may arise during compliance with the schedule set forth in the Case Management Order;
- (4) proposals to change the Case Management Order as to matters that are *specific* to the facts of an individual case, other than scheduling (*e.g.*, motions for specific discovery that falls outside the scope of the Case Management Order).<sup>1</sup> These proposals should be identified but not briefed. Pursuant to section 5, below, the parties should include proposed dates for briefing these proposals as omnibus cross-motions; and
- (5) a final proposed schedule for the submission of all motions, filings, or other disclosures. For purposes of this section, unlike section 2, the parties may propose a schedule that deviates from the dates set forth in the Case Management Order.

If the parties cannot agree on a final proposed schedule, the Court shall impose one.

Once a schedule has been set, motions for extensions of time shall not be granted absent demonstrable extraordinary circumstances.

The parties shall file their Joint Status Reports in each of the above-captioned cases "jointly." Thus, to comply with this Order, the parties must discuss all of the items set forth above and attempt to eliminate or narrow any disputes, ideally by meeting with each other.

Going forward, the Court expects the parties to comply fully with Local Civil Rule 7(m).

---

<sup>1</sup> Matters that are *not* specific to the facts of an individual case include, but are not limited to, the items in Section II of the Case Management Order (Burden and Standard of Proof, Presumption in Favor of the Government's Evidence, and Hearsay). The Court shall not consider proposals to modify these items as this time.

