

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SAIFULLAH PARACHA,

Petitioner,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH,  
President of the United States,  
*et al.*,

Respondents.

Civil Action No. 04-CV-2022 (PLF) (AK)


**JOINT STATUS REPORT REGARDING PETITIONER'S MOTIONS TO  
COMPEL RELEASE OF ATTORNEY-DETAINEE CORRESPONDENCE**

On March 14, 2007, Magistrate Judge Alan Kay held a hearing to address two pending motions in the above-captioned case: (1) Petitioner's Motion For Release Of Attorney-Detainee Correspondence (dkt. no. 88); and (2) Petitioner's Motion To Review And Release Confidential Attorney-Detainee Correspondence (dkt. no. 95). Following the hearing, counsel for petitioner and counsel for respondents engaged in discussions to resolve the two motions and, as explained below, the parties are in agreement that the motions have become moot.


1. With respect to Petitioner's Motion For Release Of Attorney-Detainee Correspondence (dkt. no. 88), petitioner's counsel has agreed to return the disputed communications and letters to Guantanamo Bay for review and processing in accordance with the standard operating procedures for detainee non-legal mail. See Amended Protective Order and Procedures for Counsel Access to Detainees at Guantanamo (dkt. no. 13). Accordingly, the parties agree that this motion is moot.

2. With respect to Petitioner's Motion To Review And Release Confidential Attorney-Detainee Correspondence (dkt. no. 95), at the motion hearing, petitioner's counsel brought to respondents' counsel's attention the fact that the disputed communications at issue had previously been filed on the public record as part of petitioner's motion. Respondents' counsel has investigated the matter and determined that the motion was approved for public filing in its entirety on July 20, 2006. Such approval was inadvertent to the extent it covered the disputed communications reprinted therein and attached thereto that were the subject of the motion; nonetheless, the approval occurred, and the motion was publicly filed. Thus, the motion has been available on the Court's public docket since that time. As a consequence of public filing, petitioner's counsel has shared the contents of the motion (including the disputed communications) with the intended recipients of the communications. In light of these events, the parties agree that the motion is moot.

Dated: March 27, 2007

By:   
Gaillard T. Hunt (D.C. Bar No. 83975)  
1409 Gleason Street  
Silver Spring, MD 20902  
Tel: (301) 530-2807

Attorney for Petitioner

  
Andrew I. Warden (IN Bar No. 23840-49)  
United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Rm. 6120  
Washington, DC 20530  
Tel: (202) 616-5084

Attorney for Respondents