UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT ORIGINAL

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable JEFFREY S. WHITE, Judge

DEFENSE FOR CHILDREN ) Motion for Preliminary

INTERNATIONAL - PALESTINE; ) Injunction

AL-HAQ; AHMED ABU ARTEMA; )
MOHAMMED AHMED ABU ROKBEH; ) Motion to Dismiss

MOHAMMAD HERZALLAH; A.N.; )
LAILA ELHADDAD; WAEIL )

ELBHASSI; BASIM ELKARRA; and)
DR. OMAR EL-NAJJAR, )

Plaintiffs,

vs. ) No. C 23-05829 JSW

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., )
President of the United ) Pages 1 - 167
States, ANTONY R. BLINKEN, )

States, ANTONY R. BLINKEN, )
Secretary of State, LLOYD )
JAMES AUSTIN III, Secretary )
of Defense, in their )
official capacities, )

Defendants. ) O

Oakland, California Friday, January 26, 2024

## REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

**APPEARANCES:** 

For Plaintiff Van Der Hout, LLP

180 Sutter Street, Suite 500

San Francisco, California 94104

BY: JOHNNY SINODIS,

MARC VAN DER HOUT, ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Reported By: Raynee H. Mercado, CSR No. 8258

Proceedings reported by electronic/mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1							
2	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)						
3							
4	For PlaintiffS: Center for Constitutional Rights 666 Broadway, 7th Floor						
5	New York, New Yourk 10012						
6	BY: BAHER A. AZMY, KATHERINE GALLAGHER, MARIA C. LAHOOD,						
7	ASTHA SHARMA POKHAREL, DIALA SHAMAS,						
8	PAMELA C.SPEES, Attorneys at Law						
9							
10	For Defendants: United States Department of Justice						
11	Civil Division  1100 L Street, NW						
12	Washington, D.C. 20530 BY: JEAN LIN, SPECIAL COUNSEL,						
13	FEDERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH						
14	United States Department of Justice Civil Division						
15	175 N Street NE						
16	Washington, D.C. 20002 BY: JONATHAN D. KOSSAK, TRIAL ATTORNEY FEDERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH						
17	FEDERAL FROGRAMS BRANCH						
18							
19							
20	000						
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

1	INDEX			
2				
3	PLAINTIFFS' WITNESSES	PAGE	VOL.	
4	AL-NAJJAR, OMAR			
5	(SWORN)	59	1	
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SHAMAS	60	1	
7				
8	ABOFOUL, AHMED			
9	(SWORN)	69	1	
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SHAMAS	70	1	
11				
12	ELHADDAD, LAILA			
13	(SWORN)	81	1	
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. POKHAREL	81	1	
15				
16	ELBHASSI, WAEIL			
17	(SWORN)	92	1	
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. VAN DER HOUT	92	1	
19				
20	HERZALLAH, MOHAMMAD MONADEL			
21	(SWORN)	102	1	
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SINODIS	103	1	
23				
24				
25				

RAYNEE H. MERCADO, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR (510) 565-7228

1		INDEX			
2					
3	PLAINTIFFS' WITNESSES			PAGE	VOL.
4	ELKARRA, BASIM				
5	(SWORN)			115	1
6	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS	. POKHAREL		115	1
7					
8	QUZMAR, KHALED				
9	(SWORN)			126	1
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS	. LAHOOD		127	1
11					
12	TRACHTENBERG, BARRY				
13	(SWORN)			139	1
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS	. SPEES		139	1
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KOSSAK			154	1
16					
17					
18	<u> </u>	EXHIBIT	s		
19	PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBITS	W/DRAWN	IDEN	EVID	VOL.
20	PHAINTIPP S EMILBITS	W/DRAWN	IDEN	EVID	<u>VOII.</u>
21	1		143	143	1
22					
23					
24		000			
25					

RAYNEE H. MERCADO, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR (510) 565-7228

```
Friday, January 26, 2024
 1
                                                          8:57 a.m.
 2
                           PROCEEDINGS
 3
                                  --000--
 4
 5
                THE CLERK: Good morning, everyone. My name is Ki'i.
 6
      We're going to get started here in just a bit.
 7
           Just to go over a few housekeeping matters before we get
       started, please turn off or silence your cell phones. They
 8
 9
       should not be present during court appearances or during this
10
      hearing.
11
          Also, we will be appearing via Zoom today. And this --
12
      excuse me -- the motion hearing will also be video-recorded.
13
          Prior to starting, I'd like to review General Order
      Number 58.
14
15
          Persons granted access to court proceedings held by
16
      telephone or video conference are reminded that photographing,
17
      recording and rebroadcasting of court proceedings, including
18
      screenshots or other visual copying of a hearing is absolutely
19
      prohibited.
20
          Thank you.
21
                        (Pause in the proceedings.)
22
                THE COURT: Please call the case.
23
                THE CLERK: Calling civil case 23-CV-5829 JSW,
      Defense for Children International - Palestine, et al. versus
24
25
       Biden, et al.
```

```
1
           Counsel, please step forward to the podium and state your
 2
      appearance for the record starting with plaintiff counsel.
 3
               MS. SHAMAS: Good morning. My names is Diala Shamas,
      counsel for the plaintiffs.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: Good morning.
 6
               MS. SHAMAS: In the courtroom, we have several of our
 7
      plaintiffs with us today.
 8
                THE COURT: All right.
 9
                MS. SHAMAS: Mr. Ahmed Abofoul on behalf of Al-Hag,
      Ms. Laila Elhaddad, Waeil Elbhassi, Mohammad Herzallah, Basim
10
11
      Elkarra, and our pseudonymous plaintiff, AN, is also here in
12
      person.
13
          Over Zoom, we are joined by Dr. Omar Al-Najjar from Gaza,
      and Mr. Khaled Quzmar from Defense for Children
14
15
       International - Palestine.
16
                THE COURT: Would you mind, Counsel, introducing the
      other folks at your table.
17
18
          You may have already mentioned their names, but it would
19
      be very helpful if you could just have them introduce
20
      themselves or you introduce them, please.
21
                MS. SHAMAS: Okay. So at our counsel's table, we
22
      have Katie Gallagher.
23
                THE COURT: Welcome.
24
               MS. SHAMAS: Pamela Spees.
25
                THE COURT: Welcome.
```

```
1
                MS. SHAMAS:
                             Astha Sharma Pokharel.
 2
                THE COURT: Welcome.
 3
                MS. SHAMAS: Mr. Marc Van Der Hout.
 4
                THE COURT: Welcome.
 5
                MR. VAN DER HOUT: Good morning, Your Honor.
 6
                THE COURT: Good morning.
 7
               MS. SHAMAS: Mr. Johnny Sinodis.
 8
                THE COURT: Good morning.
 9
               MS. SHAMAS: Mr. Baher Azmy.
10
                THE COURT: Good morning.
11
               MS. SHAMAS: And Ms. Maria LaHood.
12
                THE COURT: Good morning. Thank you very much.
13
          And for the defendants, please?
14
               MS. LIN: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Jean
15
            I'm here on behalf of the United States and the federal
16
      defendants.
17
          And with me at the counsel table is Jonathan Kossak, also
      from the Department of Justice.
18
19
                THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, everybody.
20
          So before we get to the hearing -- before we start the
21
      hearing and arguments and then testimony in this case, I
22
      wanted to state some remarks to kind of set up the hearing
23
      today and tell you based upon the briefs in the case and my
24
      initial thoughts about the case where I think the issues are
25
       this morning.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In response to the brutal attack by Hamas on October 7, 2023, Israel's defensive military campaign has been similarly brutal. Hamas murdered approximately 1200 citizens and soldiers and took 240 civilian hostages and military captives. Since that time, Israel has killed tens of thousands of Palestinian civilians, a substantial portion of them children, and nearly 2 million Palestinian people have been displaced from their homes. The destruction is widespread. The current living conditions for occupants of the Gaza Strip are worsening and becoming more and more dangerous each day. The Israeli attacks have destroyed critical civilian infrastructure, leveled hospitals, schools, refugee camps, and safe havens, and destroyed nearly 45 percent of all housing units in the area. The Palestinian people are living in fear and without food, medical care, clean water or sufficient humanitarian aid. The defendants, the President of the United States and his Secretaries of State and Defense, have provided substantial military, financial, and diplomatic support to Israel. Defendants have repeatedly visited the region to reinforce the United States' support there.

During the whole -- during the whole course of the military campaign, defendants continue to fund and proffer weapons to Israel.

Plaintiffs and the amicus parties are human rights organizations, doctors, Palestinian residents of Gaza, and Palestinians in the United States with family remaining in Gaza.

They seek an injunction ordering the United States to cease supporting Israel's continued attacks in Gaza through provision of financial support and military aid.

Plaintiffs invoked the Genocide Convention, which was unanimously adopted by the United Nations in 1948.

Article III of the Convention forbids genocide, defined as acts, quote, committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group as such, unquote.

The treaty also forbids, quote, complicity in genocide, unquote, which plaintiffs claim is implicated by the United States' support of Israel's ongoing military campaign.

The facts of war and the brutality of the killings in the region are horrible. However, the primary concern for this Court is the limitation of its own jurisdictional reach.

By this lawsuit, plaintiffs seek an injunction to stop the United States government from providing military or financial assistance to Israel.

However, the foreign policy decisions whether to provide military or financial support to a foreign nation is, quote, a quintessential political question, unquote, and likely, quote,

inappropriate for judicial resolution, unquote.

And for that quote, I'm citing Abusharar,

A-b-u-s-h-a-r-a-r, vs. Hagel, 77 Fed. Supp. 3d. 1005 and 1006,

and which is cited in the Central District of California in

2014; and Corrie, C-o-r-r-i-e, vs. Caterpillar, 503 F.3d 974

at 983 decided by the Ninth Circuit in 2007.

The Court faces the issue of whether allowing this action to proceed would necessarily require the judiciary to question the decisions of the political branches of our government to grant extensive military aid to Israel.

Foreign policy is constitutionally committed to the political branches of government, and disputes over foreign policy are considered non-justiciable political questions.

And for this position, see *Haig*, H-a-i-g, *vs. Agee*,

A-g-e-e, 453 U.S. 280 at 292, and decided in 1981. Quote, If
the Court is being called upon to serve as a forum for
considering the wisdom of discretionary decisions made by the
political branches in the realm of foreign policy or national
security, then the political question doctrine is implicated,
and the Court cannot proceed, unquote. Citing *Mobarez*,

M-o-b-a-r-e-z, *vs. Kerry*, 187 Fed. Supp. 3d. 85 at 92 decided
by the DC District Court. This is an opinion by now Justice
Ketanji Brown Jackson.

At the heart of the political question doctrine is the separation of powers among the three branches of government, a

fundamental and guiding concept enshrined in the United States Constitution.

I understand what is at stake here and the importance of plaintiffs' lawsuit. I also understand the limitations placed on my office by the separation of powers and binding legal precedent.

The Court has permitted the hearing to be available contemporaneously to the public by Zoom and the Zoom recording which will be available immediately after this hearing on the Court's website for the public.

So I will first address the questions posted to the parties, and then I would welcome the witnesses to testify.

What I want to say for those of you who have not appeared in my court for a law and motion, when I -- I review the pleadings, I review the authorities, including the ones recently submitted by the parties, and all of the arguments of counsel, and the entire record.

And then when I am left with questions to help guide me to a fair and just decision, I issue questions to the lawyers, which, when I was a lawyer, I wished judges would do all the time. For example, when I argued before the Ninth Circuit, it would be great if I knew what their questions were before I went in there and made a fool of myself.

So I issue those questions to help counsel to help the Court and also to set the metes and bounds of this hearing.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If I have not asked a question on a particular subject, it's because I don't need any additional information. So this is not an opportunity to simply regurgitate what's in either side's briefs but to help the Court come to a fair decision by answering its questions. So the way I typically handle this is I will address the question to one side or the other and then ask the opposing side to respond and continue the discussion until I feel like I've had sufficient information. When I'm done, when the responses to the questions are completed, I'll take a short recess, and then we will hear from the witnesses whose testimony I am anxious to hear. So if counsel will come up and we can begin with the questions, I would really much appreciate it. And by the way, if you want to split up -- I should have said this -- who answers what questions, as long as we have one lawyer answering -- on each side answering the questions rather than more than one because it's hard to follow, I appreciate that very much. So we'll start immediately with question 1. And why don't counsel come up. Yeah, please come to the podium. We'll give you plenty of time. And may I ask you to kindly identify yourself again.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

1 MR. VAN DER HOUT: Marc Van der Hout on behalf of 2 plaintiffs, Your Honor. 3 And what I thought -- and do you want counsel to --THE COURT: No, not until we ask --4 5 (Simultaneous colloguy.) 6 MR. VAN DER HOUT: Okay. Thank you. 7 Just before we get into answering your questions, 8 et cetera, which other of my co-counsel will be doing, I just 9 wanted to address and -- and ask the Court if possible, we received the Court's -- communication through the Court the 10 11 last couple of days in terms of the courtroom availability, 12 that there would be capacity of 30 people inside the courtroom 13 and then there'd be an overflow courtroom available to whatever members of the public could -- could fit in there. 14 15 And so we anticipated besides the Zoom, which is going on now, we anticipated, you know, around 50 people from the 16 17 public would be able to come in. 18 When we approached the courthouse today, we were informed 19 that there was an order from the Court to not allow any 20 members of the public in except the press and obviously 21 plaintiffs and their -- the attorneys and plaintiffs and their 22 witnesses. 23 So we asked this -- if there was a court order, and we've been quite honestly unclear because we've been not given any 24 25 court order, yet that was what the marshals were informed.

1 And we -- there's a huge public interest of course in this. 2 So we do want to know is there an overflow courtroom 3 available like we were told there would be? And can we at 4 least have those members of the public who are waiting in line 5 right now and have been for hours this morning at least enter 6 to fill that overflow courtroom and -- and whatever is 7 available here. 8 THE COURT: All right. The answer to your question 9 and the issue you raised is that the Court has determined in 10 the interest of public safety to take the steps that you outlined. So that's the answer to your question. 11 12 Now, let's move on to the questions. And I'll start with 13 plaintiffs' counsel for question --14 (Simultaneous colloquy.) 15 MR. VAN DER HOUT: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 17 Question number 1. 18 MS. GALLAGER: Good morning, Your Honor. Katherine 19 Gallagher for the plaintiffs. 20 And thank you for the recitation of the facts in this case at the start of this hearing and your appreciation of the very 21 22 serious nature of the claims before the Court today. 23 This case does not present the Court with a political question. Rather, it raises two purely legal questions 24

arising out of the unfolding genocide against 2.2 million

25

Palestinians in Gaza; namely, whether U.S. officials have violated international and U.S. law in failing to take all measures to prevent genocide when put on notice of the serious risk of genocide against the Palestinian population in Gaza; and, two, whether U.S. officials violated international law when they knowingly provide and continue to provide practical assistance that has had a substantial effect on the commission of genocide, contrary to the prohibition of complicity in genocide.

This Court has authority to exercise its judgment over these questions regarding the lawfulness of defendants' conduct and not the wisdom of discretionary policies. These are not questions of policy. These are questions of law.

In accordance with the power vested to the judiciary in the Constitution since the founding of this country, there has been a role for the courts in determining what the law is and applying it to the facts.

Ever since Marbury vs. Madison, the court has enforced a fundamental distinction between discretionary policy decisions, which may be committed to the executive judgment, and binding legal obligations which must be subjected to judicial review.

A proper application of the separation of powers maintains the court's power to serve as a check on political branches.

The executive does not get to make a political determination

when the law is enforced.

And more fundamentally, the executive branch has no discretion to violate the law, including legal, binding obligations arising out of international law.

Here, the erga omnes prohibitions relate to the most serious of crimes, genocide. And it is the duty, respectfully, of this Court to apply these laws intended to forestall further death, destruction, displacement, and starvation of the Palestinian people in Gaza, half of whom are children.

This power of judicial review is not foreclosed when U.S. foreign policy decisions are implicated. As the Supreme Court made clear in *Baker v. Carr*, it is error to suppose that every case or controversy which touches on foreign relations lies beyond judicial cognizance.

Indeed, the Supreme Court, in an eight-to-one decision in Zivotofsky v. Clinton, emphasized the very narrow nature of the political question doctrine and affirmed that when there are concrete legal questions, there is a role for courts.

The court stressed federal courts are not being asked to supplant a foreign policy decision of the political branches with the court's own unmoored determination. In a politically fraught case like some may perceive this one to be, in that case regarding the status of Jerusalem, it continued that where there is a specific statutory right, the court has a

role to determine whether or not that statute is constitutional. Quote, this is a familiar judicial exercise.

In this case, there is that same familiar judicial exercise to be carried out by this Court, and that is to provide a factual analysis against a clearly defined and clearly established legal obligations to prevent and not further genocide.

In Al Shimari v. CACI, a case out of the Fourth Circuit, the court made clear that when there is an international obligation, in that case regarding the prohibition of torture, it is the court's duty to enforce the prohibition. And that case arising out of torture at Abu Ghraib, the military context was of no moment to the court when the -- when legality was at issue.

The court noted that there is, quote, settled international law and binding criminal law to make the claims justiciable. That is the same case here.

The United States has a clear and unambiguous duty, which it itself has acknowledged, to prevent and punish genocide.

The United States led the drafting of the Genocide Convention and included the obligations to prevent, suppress, and punish all forms of genocide. The United States ratified the Genocide Convention.

The United States enacted domestic criminal prohibitions to punish all acts of genocide. And President Biden declared

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

upon taking office that the prevention and punishment of mass atrocities including genocide are cases of national -- of national interest and a matter of national policy. Here, the United States is choosing to disregard its binding legal obligations. It is making policy determinations that are contrary to law. This case is distinguishable from those cases which Your Honor mentioned, Corrie, Haig, and -- and other cases where there was a discretionary matter before the -- the Court. Here, there can be and must be no discretion to provide the means by which a genocide is committed. This is not a wholesale challenge to U.S. military aid to This is not a question of applying the Leahy law as Israel. was the case in -- in Haig. This is also distinct from Corrie v. Caterpillar where the Court was being asked to review a discretionary decision to reimburse the sale of bulldozers in a direct -- a direct sale between a private company and a foreign state. In that case, the court would have had to review the entire foreign military financing program and the ways that it is carried out. No such assessment is required here. simply applying the facts to the law. I will stop here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

I'll now hear from government counsel.

```
1
                MS. LIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
           I think Your Honor had --
 3
                THE COURT: Would you reidentify yourself, counsel,
 4
      please.
 5
                         Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor.
                MS. LIN:
                THE COURT: That's okay.
 6
 7
                MS. LIN: My name is Jean Lin from the Department of
 8
       Justice --
 9
                THE COURT: All right. Proceed.
               MS. LIN: -- on behalf of defendants.
10
11
           So the Court has recognized that the -- the Corrie vs.
12
       Caterpillar case of the Court of Appeals decision is directly
13
       relevant here. And, in fact, we submit that it forecloses the
      plaintiffs' claims here because this political question
14
15
       doctrine is -- renders this case non-justiciable.
16
           Just three very quick responses to the plaintiffs'
17
      position.
18
           So the political question doctrine bars the Court's review
19
       regardless of how they're styled as long as they call into
20
       questions that are inexecrable from the issues -- from the
21
       questions identified in Baker. And we submit that that
22
      clearly is the case here.
23
          And I don't want to belabor the Corrie case, but just to
      highlight a couple points that the Court of Appeals mentioned
24
```

in the Corrie case where the court said it is not the role of

25

the Court to indirectly indict Israel for violating international law with military equipment that the United States provided in that case. Any politic -- any policy condemning the Israeli government must first emanate from the political branches.

And the court in that case could not find in favor of the plaintiffs without implicitly questioning and even condemning United States foreign policy toward Israel, especially about policy decision the political branches had already made in that case.

And if the court were to condemn United States foreign policy toward Israel, it could cause international embarrassment and undermine foreign policy decision of the sensitive -- in the sensitive context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

And finally, there, as here, entering a declaration that the Israeli military has systemically committed grave violation of international law was to verve [phonetic] United States foreign policy. So all of those consideration [sic] apply equally here.

And, in fact, it wouldn't make sense for a case such as Caterpillar where the -- the challenge is indirectly challenging the United States foreign policy to be precluded by the political questions doctrine and here when the plaintiffs are directly challenging the United States policy

towards Israel.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. Counsel mentioned the Abu Ghraib case. There's another case that I think counsel cited in its additional authorities involving the Iraq war -- another aspect of the Iraq war and was brought by Congress against then President George W. Bush. And the court there -- it was a District Court, obviously not in this district, but still -- not in this Circuit, but still a pretty well-reasoned opinion. Although he -- that judge ruled against the plaintiffs, he held that the ability for the court to look at what the government was doing, the executive branch, in connection with its then impending war with Iraq was not a political question.

So counsel is -- has submitted a -- those authorities and others as instances where the court has recognized its power to intervene.

So how would you distinguish from those -- that line of questions -- that line of cases? Excuse me.

MS. LIN: So to take the Court's questions in turn, the first one was the case of the Al-Tamimi case where the court asked about why there was not political question doctrine applicable there.

And I think we -- we submit that that case actually underlines why the political question doctrine applies here.

Because in that case, yes, it was true that it was involving a

claim of genocide, but the court was quite clear that it didn't implicate U.S. foreign policy. It was about whether the Israeli settlers were committing genocide.

And the court specifically analyzed that it would have been a different case if the Israeli military's conduct were called into question. And in that case, the United States has submitted a statement of interest indicating that if the Israeli military's conduct were in -- were called into question, that could create an interbranch conflict.

But in that case, the plaintiffs dropped the claims against Israeli military. So there was no U.S. foreign policy at issue in that case at all. Which highlights why in this case, where directly -- where there's a direct challenge to U.S. foreign policy, that the political question doctrine applies with full force here.

And I'll just address quickly on the *Dellums* case that the Court noted that the plaintiffs submitted yesterday. So we think that case, first of all, we think is -- is an outlier because since that time the DC circuit en banc has adopted a framework that we think will call into doubt the -- the decision in that case. The DC circuit en banc case we had cited in our brief is the *El-Shifa Pharmaceutical Company* case. And that case is cited with favor by the Ninth Circuit in the *Republic of Marshall Islands* case.

So but even if Dellums were still good law, it's more in

line with the kind of conflict that was at issue in Zivotofsky. So in both cases, there was a question of whether one political branch is intruding on the authority of another branch. So in Zivotofsky, Congress enacted a statute which potentially could intrude into the President's authority to recognize a foreign government.

So the Congress was -- sorry -- the Supreme Court was saying that a familiar judicial exercise was determined whether that statute was constitutional, and it determined that it wasn't because it's intruding into the President's exclusive power invested by the Constitution to recognize foreign countries.

Similarly, in *Dellums vs. Bush*, the Court was considering a question about whether the President's use of military force intruded into Congress's war powers clause, and whether the President's activities as the commander in chief was constitutional. So there, too, is a similar kind of separation of powers question.

But here we don't have any of that where there's not a familiar judicial exercise to determine whether a statute is constitutional, whether one branch is intruding on another branch's Constitutionally vested authority. What we have here is a challenge to the foreign policy decisions of the political branches.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.

MS. GALLAGER: Just a few responses, Your Honor, if I may.

First on *Corrie v. Caterpillar*, I would note that that decision predates the *Zivotofsky* decision. And so to suggest that any discussion of foreign policy that may be contrary to the views of even an ally is not a reason to find that there is a political question.

I do not believe that the *Corrie v. Caterpillar* decision can stand following the Supreme Court's decision in *Zivotofsky* to the extent that the government is arguing that there is some background concern about discord with a foreign government.

THE COURT: Let me ask you one question because, counsel, and I apologize for interrupting, but I'm afraid I'll lose the thought if I don't bring this up.

So I'm very familiar the Marshall Islands case because that was my case, went up to the Ninth Circuit. So there was a case where the Marshall Islands was alleging that the U.S. acted inappropriately by failing to engage in nuclear disarmament talks, and I ruled in that case and I was affirmed by the Ninth Circuit -- not that my ruling is of any weight or anything like that -- but the Ninth Circuit, that that was a quintessential political issue.

So how is that case distinguishable?

MS. GALLAGER: I think that case is distinguishable,

Your Honor, because of the nature of the obligations in place in the treaty at issue.

Here in the Genocide Convention, there are specifically defined obligations to prevent, to suppress, and to punish the crime. There are judicially manageable standards of conduct that is required of all states' parties because there is a definition of genocide and a definition of the duties on states.

Respectfully, in the -- in the Republic of Marshall Islands case, what the plaintiffs were seeking was something that related to negotiations, and that is more squarely within the powers of the executive branch and the foreign policy considerations of the executive than it is for the courts.

Here, the question is a legal one, whether the actions undertaken by the United States fail to uphold the obligation to prevent genocide. And that is an active obligation that requires that the United States not provide the means by which a genocide is being furthered.

It also requires the United States not to provide support in the form of aiding and abetting a genocide. Those are fundamentally different than asking the Court to weigh into what the outcome of negotiation should be. The United States already negotiated the Genocide Convention. It already ratified it, implemented it, and stated that compliance with the Genocide Convention is part of U.S. policy.

The United States also affirmed the International Court of Justice just two years ago in the *Ukraine v. Russia* case that it views these obligations as *erga omnes partes*, meaning binding on all states.

So to the extent that there may be conduct by a third state at issue in this case, a state that is not a party to the proceedings -- this case is, again, against U.S. defendants -- that obligation to prevent, suppress, and punish genocide also applies to the State of Israel. And we had a judgment this morning out of the International Court of Justice that made that quite clear.

So there is no discretion for any state to evade its obligations, its legal obligations. These are not policy decisions.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Anything further you want to say briefly?

MS. LIN: No. Other than I did misspeak. You know, I think friends on the other side was actually talking about different case as opposed to Al-Tamimi. They talked about the Al Shimari case, which I just want to mention that that case is not at all relevant here because it had to do with how to assess whether military contractor has any -- you know, the actions of a military contractor is imputed to the military so that it becomes a military decision. So that's entirely outside of the realm.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                           All right.
 2
               MS. LIN: But there are a couple points that counsel
 3
      mentioned that I think is probably reserved for the next
 4
      questions --
 5
                THE COURT: All right.
               MS. LIN: -- about the duties.
 6
 7
                THE COURT: Do you want to respond briefly to what
 8
      your opponent just said?
 9
                MS. GALLAGER: I think just on Al Shimari, the
      political question doctrine was litigated over a decade back
10
11
      and forth in that case. It was a live issue in the case. And
12
      it was the Fourth Circuit, upon review, that said even when
13
      military affairs are implicated, binding law applies. And
14
      it's a role of the court to determine what the law is.
15
      even when there are questions that may implicate U.S. foreign
16
      policy, U.S. military operations, the law must be applied and
17
      that no one, including the President of the United States, is
18
      above the law.
19
                THE COURT: We've heard that before many times in
20
      the --
21
               MS. LIN: Your Honor, if I may just say that we
22
      dispute the characterization of that case because that
23
      ultimately --
24
                THE COURT: Let me stop you. I can read the case.
25
               MS. LIN:
                          Sure.
```

THE COURT: And I'm not trying to be rude, but whenever there's a case at issue and -- I can interpret it hopefully as well as counsel.

What I'm going to do, move on to question 2. And I think given the importance and public interest in the case, I'll read the question in case those people who are observing these proceedings, or will, understand what we're asking because they may not have access to the docket.

So question 2 that the Court prepublished is as follows:

If the Court determines that plaintiffs' claims present

non-justiciable political questions best left to the executive

branch, must the Court adjudicate whether plaintiffs have

stated cognizable causes of action for injunctive relief under

the Alien Tort Statute and whether the claim is barred by the

Federal Tort Claims statute or whether the government has

waived sovereign immunity?

So I know when I ask these hypotheticals, the lawyer who thinks -- the side who thinks that it's against their position gets nervous. But that's just the way we engage in dialogue.

So I'll let you answer.

MS. GALLAGER: Sure, Your Honor.

And hearing that I don't have to repeat that we do not believe the political question doctrine applies in these -- in this case.

But for purposes of your question, I think the answer

turns on how the political question is defined. We have two claims in this case, one for duty to prevent genocide and one for complicity in genocide.

And we also have two forms of relief that we're requesting. One is a declaratory judgment and one is injunctive relief. And with regard to declaratory judgment, declaratory relief, the government has been silent on that.

And we find that there is really no way that the -- that a judicial pronouncement that the executive officers are violating the law and, in so doing, the Court advising what the law is, is a political question.

The Court unambiguously could enter declaratory relief in this case which the defendants would be obligated to take measures to comply with.

So we think that even if there are some aspects of the case that might be determined to be a political question, which was part of the analysis that the DC Circuit did in the Al-Tamimi case where it carved out some questions as political questions under the doctrine and determined that the adjudication of whether genocide was being committed was a legal question proper for adjudication, a similar exercise could happen here.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, counsel. If you were -- when I start looking at a case -- a request for injunction or declaratory relief, I start with the notion --

and when I was, you know, in your position, the first thing I would start with is drafting the proposed order and the remedy.

So tell me precisely what the plaintiffs envision as the remedy if they were to prevail in terms of what would the injunction look like in a way that would actually be enforceable, and where the President and his cabinet would understand what they're ordered to do or not do, and then do it so that you could seek further relief if they don't comply.

MS. GALLAGER: Right.

Your Honor, I think that that order would start with defining that there could not be further military support for use in the ongoing genocide in Gaza.

What we know from public reporting and from announcements of U.S. officials at press conferences and elsewhere is that the United States has provided tens of thousands of munitions worth billions of dollars for operations in Gaza.

THE COURT: So let me stop you there, right there, okay.

So let's assume for purposes of argument -- and by the way, I will let you complete your answer and give a full answer. But I'm interested in this because -- so let's say the Court orders the government to do what you said. Would that mean that the government -- the executive branch could, for example, continue to give some arms to Israel to protect

itself from other -- from Iran or -- and I'm just saying, I'm not making any judgments about that, but other actors in the area?

MS. GALLAGER: Your Honor, we are not seeking through this case a cessation of all military support or assistance to Israel. To the extent that there may be programs such as the Iron Dome, that is not something that is necessarily implicated in this case.

What we are seeking is to stop the flow of munitions, whether it's tanks, Hellfire missiles, bunker-busting bombs, there is a -- a list which plaintiffs can come up with. But, frankly, the government is in a far better position than we are to know what is in the pipeline for delivery to Israel.

So we could see, if Your Honor were to move towards an injunction, that we could have a hearing and do some discovery even, if necessary, to more define what are the parameters of the weapons that would need to be foreclosed.

But any -- I think there could be a high-level order that any weapons that are going to support military operations against the Palestinian population in Gaza at this moment and to enforce the total siege on Gaza must be stopped.

THE COURT: All right. You may -- I interrupted your response to question 2, if --

MS. GALLAGER: Your Honor, just to say that we do think that the Court could go on and do an analysis of the

Alien Tort Statute claims if it were to find that there were a path forward on any -- either of our claims or either of our forms of relief.

And this is in fact the framework that the *Sosa v. Alvarez* Supreme Court decision sets out, a two-step process, to first assess whether the claim is specific, obligatory, and universal under international law, and then after making that determination, determine whether there is any reason for the Court to exercise judicial caution.

THE COURT: Continue. Sorry.

MS. GALLAGER: And I can stop here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't want to cut you off.

MS. GALLAGER: I can stop here.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Counsel.

MS. LIN: Your Honor, I think just trying to answer the question about whether declaratory relief would be appropriate and also the predicate question of if the Court would find political question, whether the Court could proceed.

So we submit that if the Court finds that this case presents political questions that go to both of the claims here, one is to prevent genocide, the other one is to stop being purportedly complicit in genocide. If the Court finds that those questions -- those present political questions,

then there is no need for the Court to proceed further.

And that's essentially what Corrie vs. Caterpillar did because there was also the declaratory judgment request in that case.

So that if -- responding to the Court's pure question about whether the Court could proceed to address those other issues, it's only if the Court finds one of the two or one of the other -- one -- there is one possibility that something is not precluded by political question, then -- then the Court would need to address the other defenses that the United States has raised.

But just to be very clear about the idea that there is a universal standard on prevention of genocide as opposed to complicity, we certainly don't submit that that is something that is identified in the Genocide Convention Act under Article III --

THE COURT: So wait. So are you saying therefore that the political question issue or doctrine would supersede the Alien Tort Statute and so that the Court could not find that the plaintiffs have stated a case and maybe even are entitled to an injunction for a -- if there is -- if there is current alleged tortious acts being committed or aiding -- aided and abetted by our government, that the Court could not -- does the -- does the doctrine of political question supersede the Alien Tort Statute?

MS. LIN: Yes, Your Honor. Because the Alien Tort Statute is really a cause of action. So if the Court has no jurisdiction to proceed at all because it goes -- the justiciability, meaning the political question doctrine application, goes to the very question of whether the Court has subject matter jurisdiction to proceed.

So if the Court doesn't have that, then there's no need to address cause of action, sovereign immunity defenses, all the other issues that the parties have briefed.

And that, again, is what the *Corrie vs. Caterpillar* case did, you know, even though, again, the case did raise declaratory judgment.

But in general, all of the political question doctrine cases, when they -- when the court finds a political -- that the political question doctrine applies, then as to that claim nothing else needs to be addressed because that goes to the court's jurisdiction.

And we think that here is a very easy question as to both of these claims. There is a textual commitment to -- by the Constitution to the political branches to make those decisions.

Some of the remedies that plaintiffs' counsel is outlining kind of underscores precisely why that is not appropriate for this Court to do, to line draw some military aid might be appropriate, some may not be appropriate, plaintiffs can help

with defining what the U.S. foreign policy should be as to what military aid is appropriate.

So that kind of really underscore that these are the kind of questions that constitutionally are committed to the political branches.

THE COURT: So let me ask you this. So why don't you kind of humor me for a moment, and I'll go to the same series of questions, hypotheticals I asked plaintiffs' counsel.

Let's say the Court gave the plaintiffs substantially what they wanted after further hearings, discovery, and the remedies said to the President and his Cabinet, stop supplying -- stop aiding and abetting -- I won't use the term genocide -- but the damage being inflicted on the Palestinian people. Figure out what it is you're -- for example, we read about these bunker-busting bombs that plaintiff mentioned, and clearly those are -- there's no dispute and the President and Secretary Austin have affirmed that those come from the United States.

What would the President do, putting aside they go to the Ninth Circuit or the Supreme Court, they grade my papers, and, you know, they would -- if they disagree, they disagree. But let's assume that's not the case or that the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court agrees. What would the President then do?

MS. LIN: Your Honor, I hate to suggest that, you know, the executive branch would not be complying with a

judicial court order. But, you know, it's a longstanding doctrine the court has jurisdiction to enjoin the President in his exercise of official duties. Franklin vs. Massachusetts is a well-established principle. And precisely because of the separation of powers.

Imagine any District Court in the country try to stop the President, as the commander in chief and as the nation's organ in the realm of foreign policy, to try to manipulate how the President should make those very sensitive foreign policy decisions.

THE COURT: Well, the courts had no problem doing that when Trump and all the Muslims coming into this country. That case went all the way to the Supreme Court, right? And that was against the President and his policy.

MS. LIN: Your Honor, if the question is going to the -- whether -- I'm not very familiar with the travel ban issues. But certainly the political question doctrine was not directly implicated. At least, you know, that was not how those cases were decided. So I don't think that they would be directly applicable here.

But here we're really getting at the quintessential separation of powers doctrine and what the political questions doctrine stands for. The *Baker vs. Carr* factors apply in all of its elements to this case here.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Would you like to reply?

MS. GALLAGER: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

First to -- to go to the duty to prevent. The United

States again ratified the Geneva -- the Genocide Convention.

And Article I of the Genocide Convention, at the urging of the United States during drafting, includes the legal duty to prevent.

And in its submission to the International Court of Justice, in the *Ukraine v. Russia* case, the United States submission says that the object and purpose is, quote, safeguarding the very existence of certain human groups, end quote, endorsing the most elementary principles of morality. This duty to prevent is to forestall the destruction of a group.

And it has been adjudicated now a number of times by the International Court of Justice which has put forward the elements that the Court could apply. The ICJ has noted that this is not a passive obligation but it is an active obligation similar to preventing aiding and abetting as a mode of liability.

THE COURT: Well, let me -- since you've already kind of moved into that -- and I'm not criticizing you -- to the third question, let's put that on the table because I think you were beginning to respond to that question. And let's get that on the table.

So the question 3 reads: United States Constitution

Article VI clause 2 provides as follows: "This Constitution,
and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in

Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be
made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the
supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall
be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any
state to the Contrary notwithstanding."

So the question is, which is what we've begun discussing, which I appreciate, if the Genocide Convention is explicitly binding on this Court and the Supreme Court of the land, can the Court find support for exercising jurisdiction here?

And I'll let you continue now since you started answering that anyway.

MS. GALLAGER: Yes, Your Honor. The Court can certainly find support for jurisdiction in the Genocide Convention as a binding treaty on the United States as well as an expression of customary international law.

The purpose and framework of the Genocide Convention envisions and in fact mandates judicial enforcement. These obligations are not merely aspirational.

Sections 1331 and 1350, which is the Alien Tort Statute, vests this Court with the jurisdiction over violations of customary international law as part of federal common law, which the Supreme Court and the Ninth Circuit have both

1 repeatedly found. 2 So, yes, Your Honor, operating through 1331 and 1350, this 3 Court can apply the prohibitions and requirements in the Genocide Convention including against the United States. 4 5 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. MS. LIN: Your Honor, the -- we submit that the Court 6 7 has no jurisdiction to assess these claims even though we agree that the Genocide Convention is the supreme law of land. 8 9 And this --THE COURT: So it's the supreme law of the land 10 11 within the meaning of the Constitutional provision I read; you agree to that? 12 13 MS. LIN: Yes, it is. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MS. LIN: Under the supremacy clause, it is supreme 16 law of land. But as the Ninth Circuit explained very clearly 17 in the Marshall Islands case, that elevated status does not 18 mean that it may be enforced by the courts. 19 And as the Ninth Circuit explained in the Marshall Islands 20 case, the key is to recognize that the question whether a 21 treaty is supreme law of land is separate from the question 22 whether its provisions create a rule of decision. 23 So the fundamental and threshold inquiry of whether a

treaty is self-executing must proceed before the Court

attempts to enforce it. So at its core, the question of

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

self-execution addresses whether a treaty provision is directly enforceable in domestic courts. And so when courts are asked to enforce a treaty provision, they must first make that determination, and only -- only if the treaty is a directive to domestic courts, then may the court enforce it. So by contrast, a treaty that is not self-executing is not enforceable at the behest of anyone because non-self-executing treaties are not judicially enforceable claims, seeking to enforce them therefore non-justiciable. Sorry, I'm getting a little bit confused here. But the point is that the Court must first determine whether the Genocide Convention is self-executing for it to apply with full force here. And we have cited authority in our briefs establishing that the Genocide Convention is not self-executing. THE COURT: And you're saying because it's not self-executing, it does not -- it does not yield a basis for asserting jurisdiction or any mechanism for parties to seek intervention of a U.S. court; is that what you're arguing? MS. LIN: Yes. Yes, that's our position, that if -when there's a non-self-executing treaty, it's not enforceable in the domestic courts. And, you know --

THE COURT: And what's your principal authority for that, the Marshall Islands case?

MS. LIN: The Marshall Islands case. But the principal distinction between execution and self-execution of course is well established. The Supreme Court in the Dean vs. Texas, which is also quoted in the Marshall Islands case, identify why certain treaties are self-executing and can be enforced and then why some others are not self-executing. And there's a whole framework to determine whether a treaty is non-self-executing.

So all that body of jurisprudence will be pointless if you connect -- seek to enforce a treaty regardless of its self-executing nature and just try to enforce it in District Court or in -- in the federal courts.

And so one other point about this is that when -- when the -- when Congress ratified the Genocide Convention, which it did in the 1980s, it explicitly conditioned, and this is the Senate that provided the advising consent, explicitly conditioned that ratification of the Genocide Convention on the enactment of the Implementation Act, and we cited authority discussing this legislative history.

And so the Implementation Act is what Congress has permitted how the Genocide Convention is going to be enforced domestically. And in implementing that -- that act, which is section 1092, Congress specifically said that nothing in the act shall be construed as creating any substantive or procedural right enforceable by law by any party in any

proceeding.

And that's how Congress envisioned the Genocide Convention will be enforced domestically, which is through a criminal proceeding through the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in -- in courts in that manner.

THE COURT: So does that mean that somebody could be charged with a crime in this country in this Court, for example, for violating the convention against genocide?

MS. LIN: Your Honor, yes, there is a criminal process for doing that. And just to note that even in adopting or enacting the Implementation Act, Congress did not include complicity as part of the punishable act even though in Article III of the Genocide Convention, there's a list of acts and complicity is one of them.

And by the way, there's no prevention of genocide in that section. And Congress did not include all of the provisions even from the Article III of the convention.

THE COURT: So I'm a little confused. Are you saying the government -- the Court can enforce the statute -- or actually the executive branch can. They could bring a criminal prosecution and the Court could enforce the statute in that manner, but the Court cannot enforce the statute in equity as the plaintiffs are -- are requesting here?

MS. LIN: That's right, Your Honor. There is -- Your Honor simply has no jurisdiction because this is not a

self-executing treaty.

And of course, you know, there is some very minor exception in the civil context if someone were to bring a lawsuit under the ATS, the Alien Tort Statute. And then in that context, there's very limited determination, as explained by the Supreme Court in Sosa, for the two-step analysis.

And so there is a possibility in very small category cases a civil action is appropriate. But is not appropriate against the United States in that context.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Counsel?

MS. GALLAGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

A few -- a few comments.

First on section 1092. Opposing counsel is correct that the provision says that the United States is, quote, create -- not creating any new substantive rights. But it certainly did not say it is taking away preexisting rights.

And as the Second Circuit found in *Kadic v. Karadžic* and, as the Ninth Circuit found in *Sarei*, the right to a remedy under 1331 through the enforcement of federal common law, and under 1350 through the recognition of a cause of action under international law that is specific, obligatory and universal, remains.

So it is -- section 1092 is in no way diminishing the jurisdiction that already exists.

And a treaty, while the discussion around self-executing or not self-executing, a treaty is also evidence of customary international law. And when it comes to the prohibitions around genocide, there is no question that genocide, unlike some other treaty obligations, rises to the level of customary international law and satisfies the *Sosa* standards.

Also on aiding and abetting, aiding and abetting exists in the federal code and can be used as a mode of liability. It has also been recognized most recently in the Ninth Circuit in the Cisco case as a mode of liability available for ATS claims.

So I don't think there is any discussion or debate including again the United States confirming that complicity in genocide is part of customary international law. There's no debate that aiding and abetting genocide is available under the Alien Tort Statute in 1331 as federal common law.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's move on to the next question. And as inevitably happens in my proceedings, we kind of mush into the next question which is perfectly fine. It's kind of the way the Court's mind works in a linear fashion, and counsel -- esteemed counsel here do the same thing. But let's put the question on the table.

Question 4. Assuming for the sake of argument that the actions taken by the Israeli government constitute genocide under international law, and the actions taken by the

United States government constitutes complicity, what

mechanism -- and this is going to go to the government in the

first instance -- what mechanism do defendants contend would

be the appropriate forum to enforce binding international law

forbidding complicity with genocide? And, added to that, what

is the proper procedural mechanism for enforcement of

international law as embedded in the -- embodied in the

Genocide Convention?

So my concern is, counsel, we've -- we've established that, you know, that the Genocide Convention is part of the supreme law of the land. And -- and arguably, based on the allegations in the complaint and the submissions, and I'm sure the testimony, and the finding today by the International Tribunal concerning potential genocide, how -- how does the Court -- how does this Court, any court, how does the Court enforce that? What is the enforcement mechanism for the Genocide Convention? There's got to be some.

MS. LIN: Your Honor, the Genocide Convention itself sets forth the enforcement mechanism. There are three key features.

The first one is Article V of the Convention where it says that the contracting parties agree to undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the convention.

1 That is one mechanism. And as I noted earlier, the United 2 States did ratify the Convention undertaking the legislation 3 that is required under Article V. THE COURT: And what is that legislation --4 5 MS. LIN: That is the --THE COURT: -- that the government -- the necessary 6 7 legislation to give effect to the provisions of the 8 Convention, what is that legislation? 9 MS. LIN: The legislation is the Genocide Convention Act section 1092 which is what I mentioned earlier. 10 11 So Congress, again not to -- not to repeat the point here 12 but just to be clear, Article V of the Genocide Convention 13 addresses how the individual signatory state should try to 14 enforce the Convention in their domestic courts. 15 So that's why section -- and that's why the Genocide 16 Convention is not self-executing for that reason because 17 additional acts taken by the political branches of the 18 signatory states must take place. 19 THE COURT: And you're saying those haven't taken 20 place yet? 21 MS. LIN: They have taken place in this case because 22 Congress -- the Senate that ratified the Convention or 23 provided the advice and consent conditioned the ratification 24 of the Convention on the implementation of the Genocide

Convention Implementation Act.

THE COURT: But I'm still confused. You keep saying that, and that's what the authorities state. But what is the implementation? We're kind of going round and round.

There's the Genocide Convention supreme law of the land.

There's implementation, ratification by the senate, implementation, okay.

So where does that leave us with plaintiffs who are claiming under that Convention that they're entitled to relief?

MS. LIN: So they're not under the -- the scheme that Congress created. The Implementation Act is the criminal statute. So the way the United States has committed to implement the Genocide Convention is through criminal prosecutions of individuals whose committed acts identified in the Implementation Act, which as I noted earlier, is narrower set of punishable acts compared to the Convention Article III. And that --

THE COURT: So are you saying therefore that the President and the Secretaries are subject to criminal prosecution? They're not above the law, as you properly conceded. But they could be prosecuted if it's found -- if they're charged with complicity in what a court would find is genocide going on in the Middle East?

MS. LIN: Your Honor, I'm not criminal law experts.

And depending how the prosecutors can exercise the discretion

under the prosecutorial discretion to charge an individual under, you know, where they're acting official capacity, there are, I think, limitations about this kind of prosecution.

But this is not the only feature, though, in the Convention that provides enforcement. Again the Genocide Convention has two other very important features.

The one is through Article VIII of the Convention which says that the contracting parties may call upon the competent organs of the United States -- the United Nations to take such actions under the charter of the United Nation as -- as they consider appropriate for the prevention and suppression of acts of genocide.

And so you know, some of the competent organs, as mentioned, are the General Assembly, the -- the Security Council. And there've been votes taken in those forums -- fora to address whether -- as to any claim of genocidal acts.

So that's another key feature that is -- that the Convention itself envisions to enforce itself.

The third feature is in Article IX of the Genocide

Convention, which says that disputes between the contracting

parties relating to the interpretation, application or

fulfillment of the Convention may be broad and shall be

submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request

of any of the parties to that dispute.

So as Your Honor is aware, South Africa did submit an

application with the court -- the International Court of Justice under the Genocide Convention against Israel.

And so these two international features, in terms of addressing enforcement of a convention, are consistent with the Supreme Court's jurisprudence about how a treaty is enforced.

So this concept is discussed again in the *Marshall Islands* case, which is that a treaty --

THE COURT: So you're saying -- you're saying that it would not be appropriate, for example, for South Africa to come in under, you know, some sort of collateral estoppel argument or otherwise using the finding that was recently made in the -- in the court -- in the International Tribunal and bring a claim here in the United States to enforce the ruling of that body under the -- under the Genocide Convention or otherwise?

MS. LIN: Your Honor, under the Genocide Convention, the mechanism is very clearly spelled out either through Article VIII or Article IX, or the individual states could enact laws under Article V. Right.

So these concepts, especially the use of international fora to address violations of a convention is -- these are consistent with Supreme Court jurisprudence.

And again, the *Marshall Islands* case identified that and repeated it, which is well established, which is that a treaty

will often depend on -- for the enforcement of its provisions on the interest and honor of the governments which are parties to it. If a state breaches a non-self-executing treaty, its infraction becomes the subject of international negotiations and reclamation, and the judicial courts have nothing to do and can give no redress.

And here we have even more than just simply reclamation

And here we have even more than just simply reclamation and negotiation. We have the individual international bodies addressing this precise question. So domestically, beyond the criminal provision that I mentioned and the international fora that the -- that a party can go to address, we also have colloquial [sic] accountability. So in fact, there is very active discussion in Congress right now about the United States' support for Israel. And any relief therefore is not appropriate from this Court.

THE COURT: All right.

Counsel?

MS. GALLAGER: Your Honor, I'm going to change positions with my co-counsel, Pam Spees.

THE COURT: Okay. But just to give me kind of a -- is she going to address the next question?

MS. GALLAGER: She's going to address this question and the next question.

THE COURT: Oh, very well. Okay.

MS. GALLAGER: Thank you.

```
1
                THE COURT: Please come up and. If you wouldn't
 2
      mind, counsel, reintroducing yourself for the court reporter
 3
       and the Court. Thank you.
               MS. SPEES: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
 5
          Pam Spees for the plaintiffs.
 6
                THE COURT: And just so, you know, we're still on
 7
      question number 4. And you're going to speak in opposition to
 8
      what the government just stated; is that correct?
 9
               MS. SPEES: That's correct, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
10
11
               MS. SPEES: The government is correct that Article V
12
       of the convention anticipates that countries that ratify the
13
      convention will incorporate the ability within their national
14
       systems to -- to deal with and implement the obligations set
15
      out in the convention.
16
          And just to step back a moment, this was -- this is the
17
      Genocide Convention which was drafted and adopted in the wake
18
      of the Holocaust and was an effort to make sure that this
19
      could never happen again. So the crime -- one of the
20
      crimes -- the crime of most serious concern to the
21
       international community as a whole.
22
          Article VIII -- well, let me go to Article IX.
23
          When the U.S. ratified the Genocide Convention, it
       specifically entered a reservation to Article IX that the
24
```

International Court of Justice jurisdiction would not apply to

the U.S. unless the U.S. government consented to it.

So pointing to the ICJ as a procedural device or mechanism or court that could handle claims dealing with the U.S. is not -- does not satisfy that concern because the U.S. has specifically said it has to consent in an ongoing way.

And we know from -- from the case brought by Nicaragua against the U.S. after the -- after the affairs of the 1980s that the U.S. actually withdrew from that case and -- and renounced the court's jurisdiction.

So pointing to the ICJ is not an answer for these concerns.

The upshot of the government's position is --

THE COURT: Is that dispositive on -- just kind of thinking out loud. Okay, let's assume I agree that, okay, and it kind of -- it will kind of, you know, kind of segue in a few minutes into the last -- into the fifth question.

Does that fail -- or that -- I'm sorry, that omission and that declination by the U.S. to be -- to consent or consent as you've just laid out, somehow -- how does that aid the Court in determining whether it has jurisdiction?

I understand your point that you just rebutted what the government said about there being an enforcement mechanism in the International Tribunal. Okay. So how does that move the ball along in this specific case?

MS. SPEES: It means that courts in the United States

have an even more critical role to play in enforcing the Genocide Convention and the mandates of that convention and customary international law.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SPEES: And the upshot of the government's argument is that, yes, we have a criminal statute that implements the Convention which -- which suggests that after the fact of a genocide someone can be prosecuted for it, but that while it's being committed or carried out or aided and abetted, that the courts in this country can do nothing to stop it. That is the upshot of their position, and that cannot be the case.

THE COURT: All right. I'll give you the last chance of that question if you wish.

MS. LIN: Your Honor, I think that the idea that there are enforcement mechanisms provided by the Convention itself in the United States is part of that Convention should be answer enough because there are processes in place. Just because in a very precise situation there may or may not be actual remedy is not a way to then give the Court jurisdiction.

Again, the Court's jurisdiction is very limited by the political question doctrine and the arguments that we've raised.

THE COURT: All right. Let's move -- go ahead. I'm

1 sorry. 2 MS. LIN: Just one other thing is that, you know, 3 even just in the situation in Nicaragua, for example, the 4 United States provision of aid to Nicaragua had been found 5 again a political question. 6 So all of these things come back to the fundamental 7 question of whether this Court is sitting in judgment of 8 political decisions made by the political branches about 9 things that are committed to them by the Constitution. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 I'll -- if you wish to reply, I'll give you an 12 opportunity. But let's put question 5 on the table, and then 13 I won't limit you from not responding to what the government -- if you wish. 14 15 So the question 5 is: Can plaintiffs join the current 16 suit before the International Court of Justice, or ICJ, 17 regarding the participation or support offered by the United 18 States government? 19 I now know the status of the proceeding. Thank you for 20 that. We all found out together. 21 And can plaintiffs file on their own to proceed before the 22 ICJ? 23 Counsel. 24 MS. GALLAGER: Your Honor, just to quickly respond to

one other thing that counsel for the government stated around

```
1
      Article VIII and the mechanisms in the UN system.
 2
           I would just note that the -- the U.S. is a permanent
 3
      member of the Security Council and we wield to veto. So
      nothing is going to happen against the U.S. interest in terms
 4
 5
      of accountability in those forums.
 6
                THE COURT: Indeed they have exercised their veto in
 7
      that regard, correct?
 8
               MS. SPEES: Many times --
 9
                THE COURT: Yes.
10
               MS. SPEES: -- Your Honor. And more than once in the
11
       instant assault --
12
                THE COURT: Yes.
13
               MS. SPEES: -- if you will.
14
          And to the question as to whether plaintiffs can join the
15
       suit in the ICJ, the answer is no. Article XXXIV of the
16
       statute of the court mandates that only states' parties can
17
      bring cases before that court, and international public bodies
18
      can participate, but individuals cannot.
19
                THE COURT: Do you agree with that?
20
               MS. LIN: We agree, Your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Yay, we have an agreement on something.
22
      Okay.
23
               MS. LIN: Yes, but if I may --
24
                THE COURT: Yes.
25
                MS. LIN: -- Your Honor, just to highlight the idea
```

1 that the International Court of Justice will be determined in 2 the first instance whether Israel has committed genocide. 3 For this case to proceed in this Court, the Court would 4 necessarily have to address that first question, and we submit 5 that the Court is not necessarily competent when it's 6 intertwined with sensitive foreign policy decisions of the 7 United States. 8 THE COURT: All right. Let's do this now. 9 Let's take a deep breath and take a break, and then I want 10 to hear the testimony. 11 What I'm going to do at the end is I'm going to give each 12 side a chance to wrap up and maybe make a brief closing 13 argument, which I would normally do now and say -- where I 14 have the question where I ask, "Is there anything else?" 15 So I want to give counsel the chance to wrap it up after 16 we hear the testimony, and then I will take it under 17 submission. All right? MS. LIN: Your Honor. Sorry, with Your Honor's 18 19 permission, we do have a few points that we'd like to address 20 either now or later that were raised in the plaintiffs' 21 surreply that we didn't have a chance to respond. 22 I promise I'll be very brief --23 THE COURT: Well, let's do that in the final remarks.

That would be the time to do that. I'll give you a chance to

wrap up. If there's anything I missed in the legal

24

```
1
       discussion, I'd be happy to hear that.
 2
          And if any -- if you want to argue about the implications
 3
      to this case arising out of the evidence adduced by the
      witnesses, I'll allow both sides to do that.
 4
 5
           So you'll have the opportunity. If I forget, please
      remind me.
 6
 7
               MS. LIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. So let's take about 20 minutes.
 9
          Yes, counsel.
10
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Can I just approach briefly just
11
       about the next session?
12
               THE COURT: Yes, sir.
13
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Just so we're clear, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Reidentify yourself.
15
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: I'm sorry. Marc Van Der Hout on
16
      behalf of plaintiffs, Your Honor.
17
                THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you.
18
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: And since we're going to take a
19
      break and then reconvene, we have done everything we can to,
20
       you know, we -- to comply with the Court's order about
21
       allowing two hours, and we appreciate that, for testimony.
22
          We've restricted a number of plaintiffs testifying and a
23
      number of witnesses, et cetera. And we do have one expert.
24
      We believe that it's possible. It may go over somewhat, and
25
      we just wanted to, you know, ask the Court's indulgence in
```

```
1
       that. Or if that's --
 2
               THE COURT: You've got it.
 3
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Thank you very much.
 4
               THE COURT: But the indulgence is not unlimited just
 5
      because we have other matters. But, no, this is a really
 6
       serious matter, and I'm not going to peremptorily cut you off.
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Thank you.
 7
 8
               THE COURT: So I know you -- both parties have
 9
      behaved in good faith. So, yes, you'll have as much time as
10
      you need, within reason.
11
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Thank you, Your Honor. Appreciate
12
      that.
13
                THE COURT: Thank you very much.
14
           (Recess taken at 10:13 A.M.; proceedings resumed at
15
      10:35 A.M.)
16
                THE CLERK: This case is being recorded. Per General
      Order 58, persons granted access to court proceedings are
17
18
      reminded that photographing, recording, rebroadcasting of
19
      court proceedings, including screenshots or other visual
20
      copying of a hearing, is absolutely prohibited.
21
           I previously asked that you silence your cell phones. If
22
      you could please go ahead and turn them off.
23
           Please be reminded that during our court proceedings in
      person, no cameras are allowed to video-record or screenshot
24
25
       any portion of this proceeding. Anyone found doing so will be
```

```
1
       escorted from the property. Thank you.
 2
                        (Pause in the proceedings.)
 3
                THE CLERK: Please remain seated and come to order.
 4
       Court is back in session.
 5
                THE COURT: All right. Would you please call your
 6
       first witness.
 7
                MS. SHAMAS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
          My name is Diala Shamas.
 9
          And I would like to call Dr. Omar Al-Najjar, who's on
10
       Zoom, to the stand.
11
                THE COURT: Madam Clerk, would you please swear the
12
       doctor in.
13
                THE CLERK: Good morning, sir. Can you hear me?
14
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
                THE CLERK: If you could please raise your right
15
16
      hand.
17
18
                              OMAR AL-NAJJAR,
19
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
20
       testified as follows:
21
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
22
                THE CLERK: Thank you.
23
           Please state your full name and spell your last name for
       the record.
24
25
                THE WITNESS: Omar Al-Najjar.
```

```
1
                THE CLERK:
                            If you could spell your last name for the
 2
       record.
 3
                THE WITNESS: Al-Najjar.
 4
                MS. SHAMAS: Can I spell it, Your Honor?
 5
                THE CLERK: Yes, go ahead.
 6
                THE COURT:
                            Yes, please. Thank you.
 7
                MS. SHAMAS: A-L, N-A-J-J-A-R.
 8
                THE WITNESS: J-J.
 9
                THE COURT: Very well. You may proceed, counsel.
10
                MS. SHAMAS:
                            Thank you.
11
                            DIRECT EXAMINATION
12
      BY MS. SHAMAS:
13
          Good evening, Dr. Al-Najjar. Can you let us know where
14
       you are calling in from today?
15
                        (Off-the-record discussion.)
16
                THE COURT: Ask him to please speak as slowly as
17
      possible.
                  Thank you.
18
      BY MS. SHAMAS:
19
          Dr. Al-Najjar, do you mind slowing down in your answers so
20
       that the clerk of the court [sic] can hear you and take notes?
21
      Α.
          Okay.
22
          So can you let us know again where you're calling in from?
       Q.
23
      Α.
          Okay.
24
           I'm communicating with you from hospital in Rafah, in
25
       Rafah City near southern part of Gaza Strip.
```

AL-NAJJAR - DIRECT / SHAMAS Can you spell Rafah? 1 Q. 2 Rafah, yes, R-A-F-A-H. Α. 3 Thank you. Q. 4 And what is your profession? 5 Α. What? 6 What is your profession? Q. 7 Okay. I'm internship director --Α. 8 THE COURT: Is there -- Counsel, is there any way --9 I understand where he is, he's in a war zone. But is there 10 any way he can move away to kind of a quieter -- or close the 11 door or something? If it's not possible, it's not possible. 12 But you understand why it's a little bit distracting. 13 MS. SHAMAS: Yeah. 14 Dr. Al-Najjar, there's a lot of sound around you. Can you 15 describe where exactly you are? And is there any way you can 16 move to a quieter zone? 17 A. Okay. As I said, I'm communicating with you, the 18 administration Internet. I'm sitting in the hallway of the 19 board of the administration here in the hospital. And it is 20 the oldest [sic] point I can get a good Internet. 21 THE COURT: Fair enough. Thank you. 22 THE WITNESS: Is that clear? 23 BY MS. SHAMAS: 24

I think we were able to hear you. Thank you. And can you -- can you -- tell us where you're from before

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AL-NAJJAR - DIRECT / SHAMAS you were in Rafah, where did you live? Okay. I'm -- I'm from Khuza'a village in the eastern part Α. of Khan Younis city. I'm originally from Salama Village from So before I came here to Rafah, I was in Khuza'a. Jaffa. And when you say you were originally from Jaffa, can you explain more? A. Yes. My grandparents are from Jaffa, and they were forcely [sic] displaced in 1948 by the Zionists in that time to leave Jaffa, and they settled in Gaza, in Khuza'a. Thank you. Q. And you said you're from Khuza'a and now you're in Rafah. Can you explain how or why you got from Khuza'a to Rafah and when? A. Okay. Actually, it's a long story. I left Khuza'a, my village, since the second day the war. That mean before 112 days ago. It was the last time I slept in my bed there, because the occupation -- Israel occupation forces threats and the random shelling of the village in that time. So we had to leave so to preserve our lives. Khuza'a in the eastern border of Khan Younis, it's about -- my home about 400 meter away from the Israel occupation since. So we had to leave Khuza'a to preserve our lives to -- more to center to the city.

It is more to center than Khan Younis, away from the

So firstly, my family went to relatives in Bani Suheila

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

border. And personally I went to Nassar Medical Complex. We lived difficult days with scarce water and food. And then we have go through multiple displacement throughout these This, when I came here to Rafah, this the fourth last davs. displacement for me and my family. Thank you. Q. And -- and you -- just to make sure -- I'm not sure the clerk [sic] caught it. You said you were in Nassar Medical Complex before coming --Yes. Α. Q. Okay. Yes. I left Nassar Medical Complex in the 5th of December. And do you still have friends at the Nassar Medical Okay. Complex or former -- or colleagues? And are you still in touch with them? Okay. I have a friend called Hammad. He was in Nassar Medical Complex until the beginning of this week when the ground invasion widened in Khan Younis City. I lost contact with him until yesterday when I hear that he managed to evacuate the hospital due to heavy shelling and random gunfire, with some family to Al-Mawasi area, which is

area that Israel occupation forces claims it's safe.

Once they arrive to Al-Mawasi area, the IRF targeted them,
and they killed his uncle and cousin. Up until now, I have

not heard any new information about him.

I have also other colleagues I know there, and some of them are still there. According to those who managed to -- to get out, the Nassar Medical Complex, the situation there is catastrophic with very few numbers of doctors, and their conditions are difficult.

It seems to be like the scenario of the bombing and the siege in al-Shifa hospital is repeating again.

- Q. And do you know what's happened to your home in Khuza'a?
- A. Unfortunately, I -- me and my family, so I report from a broad channels, this 12 channels, that document like a report where the soldiers who bomb all the area. So I saw my home, my uncle homes, my grandparents' homes, all this area was bombed, totally bombed.

And it is now like a very -- a very space area without any building. So we -- we can't go there until now, but we saw that -- that in the reports of Israeli channels.

Q. And I'd like to ask you a little bit about the hospital you're in now and what you're seeing and what you're experiencing.

Can you describe the situation at the hospital in Rafah?

A. Okay. As you know, there are approximately 2 million people in Rafah and overwhelming for the population originally not exceeding 300,000. Rafah lacks a well-equipped large hospital like Nassar Medical Complex or al-Shifa Medical

Complex. The hospital I work lacks, for example, intensive care units and even essential medications for urgent cases.

The original capacity of this hospital is like three emergency beds only. And daily we receive over 2,000 patients in addition to numerous injuries, cases from various locations.

The health situation here is -- is catastrophic with imminent outbreaks of infectious diseases. Hepatitis A cases are observed daily. And severe dehydration cases, respiratory distress, cyanosis, convulsions, all of these things we are seeing every minutes.

Also cases of a childbirth in the street are widespread in this time due to the absence of communication and preventing the families from calling for an ambulances.

Also there is a problem with the chronic patients, the chronic diseases patients with diabetes, hypertensions, cancers, kidney failure. There is no medication for them.

They are facing complication without proper care to them.

Q. Thank you.

Can you describe just any recent patient that you've seen perhaps in the last couple of days or weeks?

A. There is -- there is a lot -- there is a lot of cases and a lot of scenes. But I can recall and mention from Nassar Medical Complex and from -- from other hospital. Where I'm right now, there is a story of my sister, my sister

mother-in-law, which is my -- my sister in a tent in the refugee area here in Al Mawasi area in Rafah.

A few days ago, my sister-in-law, brother-in-law had suffered from a stroke in the middle of the night in their tent. So they couldn't inform anyone due to the lack of communications and transportation. So they feared moving on foot at night under the sounds of air strikes and shelling. So the woman passed away that night in the tent among their children and grandchildren.

And until the morning, her lifeless body remained among -- among them. Until the morning they -- they are -- they were able to bring a guard and a proper -- here to the hospital where I saw her -- her body. So these are recent events.

And also there is many events, for example, before around four days when I was on a night shift. Around 3:00 a.m., there's a father came to the hospital, to the ER. He was running, and he say to us that his -- his wife gave a child in the street around 300 meter from the hospital gate.

We go there. We -- we rushed to there. And unfortunately we saw the child was -- and he started to have a convulsion. We send him to the hospital. And later on, I -- I know that -- I have some information from the doctor from that hospital that he has hypoxic systemic brain injury.

Q. Thank you for those examples.

You said your family is on their fourth displacement. Are

Case 4:23-cv-05829-JSW Document 100 Filed 02/27/24 Page 67 of 167 67 AL-NAJJAR - DIRECT / SHAMAS 1 you in touch with them now --2 A. Yes. 3 -- while you're at the hospital? 4 I'm working on the hospital around -- around the Α. Yeah. 5 clock, 24 hours, there is no rest. But in every week, I try 6 to go to there to the place where they are, about two hours or 7 three hours to check in with a checkpoint with them. 8 have no direct contact with them. 9 For example, a short while ago, as I was trying to listen to the discussions here in this -- in this station, someone 10 11 informed me that there was an air strike on the tents of 12 displaced people west of Rafah, the place where my sister and 13 relatives are. 14 So I left my phone here in this place and went down to 15 help -- to help and also check on the wounded who come from 16 there to make sure that my sister and other relatives are not 17

with them.

So this is the only way I can know about their safety right now in this absence of communication.

- Have you heard from your sister since the air strike that just -- that you just described?
- Sorry. Again? Α.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Have you heard any news from your sister since the air strike that you just described?
  - I didn't. But I did not receive her --No. No, no, no.

or any of her daughters in our emergency room.

Q. Okay.

Dr. Al-Najjar, is there anything else you would like to share with the Court today while we have you in a pretty -- I know it's been very hard to get the connection so I'm grateful you were able to make it work.

Is there anything else you would like to share?

A. I would like to share that I have a lot to talk and a lot to mention and sharing this a glimpse of a heavy burden on my heart. I have lost everything with this war, my home, my garden, my mother home, my family houses, my mosque, my neighborhood, playground, all complete destroyed. My university is gone.

Friends I haven't seen a while and many of them lost, professors and teachers. And also other teachers were killed.

My dreams and the plans for acceptance to UK universities and the nights spent on those plans, all of this are lost.

I have nothing left but my breath, a lifeless body walking on this earth, seeing the life in shades of gray devoid of passion and energy.

This is what Israel and its supporters have done to us before and during the war. They weakened us for years and continue to unleash bullets and missiles on our lifeless body, so that's the situation.

Q. Thank you, Dr. Al-Najjar.

```
1
                MS. SHAMAS:
                             I have no further questions.
 2
                THE COURT: Any questions from the government?
 3
                MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.
 4
 5
                MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
 6
                THE COURT: Thank you very much.
 7
           Thank you, Dr. Omar Al-Najjar. I hope you stay safe.
 8
      Thank you very much for helping the Court. Appreciate it.
 9
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you.
10
                THE COURT: Next witness, please.
                MS. SHAMAS: Your Honor, I would like to call
11
12
      Mr. Ahmed Abofoul to the stand.
13
                THE COURT: Is he live or --
14
               MS. SHAMAS: He's live. Making his way.
15
                THE COURT: Thank you.
16
           Good morning, sir.
17
                THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
18
19
                              AHMED ABOFOUL,
20
       called as a witness by the PLAINTIFFS, having been duly sworn,
21
      testified as follows:
22
                THE WITNESS:
                              I do.
23
                THE CLERK: Please be seated. I'm going to ask that
24
       you speak clearly into the microphone.
25
           Please state your full name and spell your last name for
```

1 the record. 2 THE WITNESS: My name Ahmed Abofoul. And my last 3 name is spelled A-B-O-F-O-U-L. 4 THE COURT: Welcome, sir. 5 Thank you, Your Honor. THE WITNESS: THE COURT: 6 Proceed. 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MS. SHAMAS: 9 Mr. Abofoul, can you please state your place of residence. 10 I reside in The Hague, the Netherlands, at the moment. 11 But I'm originally from Gaza, born and raised as a 12 third-generation refugee, spent my whole life in Gaza. 13 And I'm -- I was born and raised --14 THE COURT: Excuse me, sir. Would you mind pulling 15 the microphone a little closer. You have a very soft voice 16 and I want to make sure we hear you. 17 Thank you, sir. 18 THE WITNESS: So I was saying I reside in the 19 Netherlands, in The Haque, but I was born and raised in Gaza 20 as a third-generation refugee, as over 75 percent of the Gaza 21 population who were ethnically cleansed from their homes and 22 villages, including my family, in 1948. 23 BY MS. SHAMAS: 24 And where do you work? 25 I work with Al-Haq Palestinian human rights organization

ABOFOUL - DIRECT / SHAMAS 1 based in Ramallah. 2 Could you spell Al-Haq. Q. 3 A-L, H-A-Q. Α. 4 Thank you. 0. 5 And what's your specific role within Al-Haq and what's 6 your area of expertise? 7 I'm an international lawyer by profession. My position with Al-Haq is a legal researcher and advocacy officer. And 8 9 my area of expertise is public international law, 10 international humanitarian law, and international criminal 11 law. 12 Q. And can you tell us about what Al-Haq does and its 13 mission? 14 Al-Hag was established in 1979 as the first human rights 15 organization in Palestine and in the region as a whole. And 16 we have a very specific mandate to protect and promote the 17 individual and collective rights of the Palestinian people as 18 a whole, but in particular in the occupied Palestinian 19 territory. 20 And we do that by documenting the human rights violations 21 that are being committed regardless of the nationality of the 22 perpetrator or the victim as long as these crimes are within 23 our mandate.

And Al-Haq was established in 1979 because a group of

Palestinian lawyers realized that the systematic violations of

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the Israeli occupation go unnoticed and undocumented, and it
has been ever since our mission to make sure that we document
these violations and ensure that at some point these victims
will see justice.
  And why did your organization, Al-Haq, decide to file this
case in U.S. court?
  We decided to file this case in U.S. court primarily
because of our firm belief in the recourse to the rule of law,
because of our confidence in the judiciary and this court.
And the current situation in Gaza is like nothing we've seen
before and even for people like us who spend their lives
working in this field but also in this particular situation.
    I, for one, I worked in different armed conflicts around
the world, especially in our region. I have never seen any
like -- anything like this. I was born and raised in Gaza.
lived through, I would even say, rather, survived three wars.
And these wars were the reason that I decided to study law.
    But I've never seen anything like this, and we've never
imagined to witness something like this. We've always heard
the stories of Nakba. And our grandparents would tell us that
perhaps the world didn't know back then because we weren't as
connected as today. But I've never imagined that we would
live it and witness it, though, ourselves.
   Thank you.
0.
```

And I'd like to ask you more about that in a moment, but

for now, I'd just like to ask you a bit more about Al-Haq and Al-Haq's experience over the last 16 weeks.

Can you share how Israel's assault on Gaza over the last 16 weeks has impacted the organization?

A. It has impacted our ability to do our work gravely. For the first time since our establishment in 1979, we had to announce that we are unable to cover Gaza properly. At some point, we lost contact with our colleagues Tariq and Mohamad who lost family members and their homes were also destroyed.

And I remember this very well that we had also made this decision collectively. Everyone in the organization participated in this decision. At that point, our thinking was that we have to choose between documenting human rights violations but also the survival of our staff.

And our collective conclusion was that they need to look after themselves and make sure that they are and their families are safe. Unfortunately, some of them lost family members. And they're -- they're both displaced now. But they continue to try to do their work and document to the best they can.

- Q. Can you share some other ways that Al-Haq's work has been impacted?
- A. Of course. Our core work, most of it has been suspended at the moment because of the level of violations that we're facing at the moment. And our work has shifted completely on

the situation on Gaza.

I can give examples from my work personally. For example, part of my function with Al-Haq is to build partnerships to represent Al-Haq with coalitions and federations, and build these partnerships, including here in the U.S., but also around the world. All of this work has stopped.

Part of my work is also to represent Al-Haq before international mechanisms. I still manage to do this work, but only in relation to Gaza. The core part of our work with these institutions has stopped.

And big part of our projects have been suspended. And we're in a way unable to meet our obligations because we're in what I would describe on auto pilot mode responding to the current situation but not doing other projects and not meeting other deadlines.

Q. Thank you.

And you mentioned some of the Al-Haq staff who have been impacted directly who are in Gaza.

Can you share more about what has been the experience of your Gaza-based Al-Haq staff?

A. Well, both our staff had to evacuate. Both of them, their houses have been destroyed. They lost family members. One of our staff, his sister was critically injured. Her three children were killed. And they struggle to -- to survive, let alone do their -- their work.

My own family was -- was also affected by -- by this. From my father's side of the family, we lost over 60 members, sixty, six zero. Fifty in one strike in the north. We -- we are still unable to -- to retrieve the bodies of many of them who remain under the rubble.

My cousin, Ahmed Abofoul, who is a paramedic, tried to reach that house that is his house, and he still -- he's still unable to retrieve the bodies of his five children. And every time they try, the Civil Defence, to enter that area, the Israeli Army and snipers shoot at them.

My family has been displaced, all of them. We are originally from -- or we used to reside in the northern part of Gaza, in Gaza City. But now most of the family is in Rafah. The one uncle that is still in the north, we -- we don't have contact, and we don't know if they're alive or not. Last we heard that they're still alive but struggling to find food and water, like most of the people in the Gaza Strip.

From my mother's side, we've lost over 22 members of the family. Her -- my mother's uncle was also taken by the Israelis when he was evacuating from the north to the south. He was taken by the Israeli Army, and we don't know where he is. And the family is gravely concerned because of the numerous reports of torture that those people that were taken have been experiencing.

My mother's Aunt Aziza, she's 90 years old, and she's

missing. We -- we don't know where -- where she is. Until this very moment we don't know if she's alive.

And from my immediate family, I lost my eldest uncle one day before the so-called humanitarian pause.

My sister was pregnant. She couldn't have access to -- to deliver, and this is her third child. She had to have a C-section and it was not possible. She went to the hospital one day before the humanitarian pause, and she was scared. And they didn't have full anesthesia to conduct the operation and she was scared to do it without it, and they send her back.

Next day we learned that my uncle was killed. Also next day when the humanitarian pause entered, she went back to the hospital and managed to -- to deliver. But at the moment of them are at serious risk because neither she or the baby are having enough food. She can't breast feed because she's not having enough food.

And this is the situation in all Gaza, not only my family. One of the hardest things I have to deal with is to hear my family trying to manage one liter of water and how they going to drink it because they don't know if they going to have water next day. Same goes for food. People are -- are struggling to have anything to survive on.

It's no secret to the Court and to everyone that 80 percent of the people who are facing starvation around the

world are in Gaza. The vast majority of the population are facing famine. And those who survive the bombings most likely will not survive staying in this condition.

- Q. When did you leave Gaza? How old were you when you left Gaza?
- A. I left Gaza in 2016 to do my internship at the International Criminal Courts Office of Public Counsel for Victims, and I was 24 years.
- Q. And so what do you know about the current state of the places that you knew for the majority of your life?
- A. The -- the Gaza that we know no longer exists. Everything I know has been destroyed. And I'm not exaggerating when I'm telling you that.

From my kindergarten to any elementary school. To my university, I had to watch it being blown up for no reason. The Israeli Army was there, entered the university but then blew it up. Every place I have memories with has been destroyed.

One of the hardest I had to deal with, seeing my neighborhood completely destroyed and -- and seeing part of the wall that survived and the writing on it which brings so many memories. It was a wedding. Palestinians have a habit of writing on the wall to congratulate each others on such occasions. And I was there when that writing happened. And I remember that we were celebrating someone. And everything

there has been destroyed except for that part of the wall that was there to -- to remind me of it.

Everything I know, every place I made memories, and including, for example, the -- the three historic churches, one of which is the -- the oldest -- the third oldest in the world, which I attended so many weddings there for my friends, have been destroyed. The Al Omari Mosque, which is a historic place, has also been destroyed for no obvious reason.

The Gaza Archive, the history of Gaza. Gaza is one of the oldest cities in the world. The Archive has been destroyed. So that's why when I say the Gaza we know no longer exists, it does not longer exist, has been completely destroyed.

- Q. And briefly, you described displacement and you've said the word Nakba. Can you elaborate, just share more about what that means for your family and for you to sort of watch this displacement?
- A. You know, I grew up hearing about this from my grandparents who lived it. And my grandfather who's still alive, he was seven when the Nakba happened, and he remembered very well.

I remember at some point when I encouraged my family to leave the -- the northern part of Gaza and came from me, the one who's outside because people underground didn't understand what's going to happen. But as a lawyer who worked in different situations and hearing Israeli officials' genocidal

statements, I was scared for my family and I told them.

But my -- my grandfather refused. His exact words were -because we told him we leave for a few days until it's safe
and then we come back. And his exact words were, "That's
exactly what they told me in 1948 and I haven't been able to
go back ever since."

And he didn't want to go -- to leave Gaza City. So my uncles told me that they had to carry him and force him in a car and take him to the south.

- Q. And do you have any idea if his house is still -- what happened to his house?
- A. It has been destroyed.
- Q. Thank you.

So how has everything that you just described impacted you and your ability to work and your work at Al-Haq?

A. It did not only affect my ability to work, it affected my ability to live. It affects my -- my -- every second of my life to the extent I feel guilty when I drink water.

Add that to the survival -- survivor's guilt that why am I safe, why am I here and not there. I feel guilty when I eat, when I have shelter. I spend so many nights not able to sleep because I'm worried about a name I saw on the news that is the exact name of one of my cousins or my family, and there's no way for me to verify this until I manage to -- to get hold of my family in Gaza, which is extremely difficult because the

```
1
      Israeli occupation imposes a telecommunication blackout so
 2
      we're unable to reach them to verify who -- who's still alive.
 3
          And to the extent that I'm scared every time that I pick
 4
      up the phone and I try to -- to call them. Although I want to
 5
      reach them and know that they're safe, but it has been the
      case that with every phone call, they're not the same, we've
 6
 7
      lost more. And I'm -- I'm always concerned that some more
 8
      have been killed.
 9
         Thank you. Thank you for sharing your personal story as
10
      well as your -- the background about your organization Al-Hag.
11
               MS. SHAMAS: I have no further questions, Your Honor.
12
               THE COURT: Any questions from the government?
13
               MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. We really --
14
15
               THE WITNESS: Thank you.
16
                THE COURT: -- appreciate your testimony. Thank you.
17
          Next witness, please.
18
               MS. POKHAREL: Good morning, Your Honor.
19
          My name is Astha Sharma Pokharel. And I'd like to call
20
      Ms. Laila Elhaddad to the stand.
21
                THE COURT: Please do. Is this a live person?
22
               MS. POKHAREL:
                              Yes.
23
                THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you.
24
          It's hard for me to tell where people are, so thank you
25
       for that.
```

```
1
                THE CLERK:
                            Good morning.
                                            Please raise your right
 2
      hand.
 3
 4
                              LAILA ELHADDAD,
 5
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
 6
       testified as follows:
 7
                              I do.
                THE WITNESS:
 8
                THE CLERK: Please be seated.
 9
           Please speak clearly into the microphone, state your full
10
              And if you don't mind, please spell your first and last
11
       name.
12
                THE WITNESS: Laila Elhaddad, L-A-I-L-A,
13
      E-L-H-A-D-D-A-D.
14
                            Welcome, Ms. Elhaddad.
                THE COURT:
15
                              Thank you.
                THE WITNESS:
16
                THE COURT: Counsel.
17
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MS. POKHAREL:
18
19
           Good morning, Ms. Elhaddad.
20
           Where do you live?
21
      Α.
           I live in Clarksville, Maryland.
22
           And what do you do for a living?
23
           I'm a mother of four. I'm an author. I'm a writer who
24
       focuses largely on documenting Gaza's culinary heritage as a
25
       way to further exploring the human impact of Israel's blockade
```

on Gaza.

- Q. And how are you connected to this case?
- A. I'm a plaintiff with family in Gaza.
  - Q. And why did you decide to bring this case?
  - A. Israeli forces have killed, massacred numerous members of my family on my father and my mother's side, with active U.S. support, arms, political support. And I felt it was my duty as an American whose taxes and government have been directly responsible for the deaths of my family. And as a Palestinian with family in Gaza, to do everything I can to put an end to this ongoing genocide. And to ask this Court to hold the government accountable as they have failed to uphold their duty. And to prevent the further arms from being sent and from the U.S. government supporting any further Israel's genociding of my family.
  - Q. Thank you.
  - I'd like to ask you about your -- your family in Gaza. So what -- what family do you have there?
  - A. My entire extended family is in Gaza. My father's side of the family are from Gaza City. My mother's side are from Khan Younis in the south of Gaza.
- Q. You said your paternal side of the family is from Gaza City. Where are they now?
  - A. Israel has displaced the surviving family members. So I have a younger uncle whose house was destroyed by Israeli

ELHADDAD - DIRECT 1 forces in Gaza who is currently sheltering with neighbors. 2 I have my eldest uncle, who is now in central Gaza in the 3 village of Zawayda. He's almost 90 and he's blind and he's 4 deaf. 5 And my middle uncle is now, after being displaced four times, in the southern Gaza town of Rafah, along with my 6 7 cousins and their family members. 8 And I have my mother's side of the family who are from 9 Khan Younis, who Israeli forces displaced, and are now in the Mawasi enclave west of Khan Younis. 10 Are you in touch with your family who's now in Rafah? 11 12 Yes, I am. Α. 13 Are you in touch with your family who's still in Gaza 14 City? 15 I only have intermittent communication with them because 16 of the communication blackouts. So we mainly rely on our 17 family members in Rafah to convey any updates or information about members of our family who have either been killed or 18 19 injured or displaced. 20 And you said you had family from Khan Younis who are now 21 in Mawasi. What do you know about what's currently happening 22 in that area? 23 I know that the town of Khan Younis itself has been

surrounded by Israeli forces. And that despite Israel proclaiming that Mawasi was supposed to be a safe area, they

24

actually attacked it several times, attacked hospitals as well within Mawasi, and targeted and killed dozens of Palestinians who were sheltering and trying to receive some humanitarian aid as well.

And the conditions within Mawasi for those family members who are surviving that I have been able to hear from are horrifying as well.

One of them messaged me telling me that after her home was destroyed, she had to go to Mawasi and that she's now living with her four children and her husband who has cancer under a nylon tarp because she couldn't even find a tent, and had a minimal amount of food to feed her family members with and children, and no winter clothes at all.

- Q. Have any of your family members in Gaza been injured or killed over the past 16 weeks?
- A. Yes. Early November, on November 2nd, we received word that my aunt -- that Israeli forces had dropped a bomb in the Sheykh Ridwan neighborhood where my aunt was residing, and killed my aunt and my three adult cousins, Hanni and Houdah and Wafah, and my cousin's wife Vera.

And the injured -- critically injured the surviving cousin who I was finally able to get in touch with and communicated to me the horror scene that unfolded before him as he had to attempt to retrieve whatever bodies he could find.

Two of their bodies he was unable to retrieve and are

still under -- under the rubble. And he had to collect the body parts of his sister and half of his mother's body. And his brother bled to death in his arms. And he buried them in a mass grave because they didn't have access to anywhere where they could bury them.

Q. I'm really sorry, Ms. Elhaddad.

What was your relationship like with your aunt who you've just described?

- A. We were close. She was the first person to always visit us when we would return to Gaza, both as children and as adults. She -- she lived with my paternal grandmother for a long time, and was a kind of repository of memories and recipes and information. And my father, I know, was very fond of her as well. And the last time I had a chance to see her was in 2019.
- Q. You described your aunt and your cousins, her -- her children who have been skilled over the past 16 weeks.

Do you have any other family members who've been killed or injured over the past 16 weeks?

A. My father's eldest cousin was also killed in Gaza City, and I had cousins as well in central Gaza in the town of Deir el-Balah -- in the town of Deir el-Balah who were -- who were killed.

And as I said, the surviving family members, Israel has either displaced or is starving or depriving them of clean

```
1
       water, and they're just having trouble trying to survive at
 2
      this point.
 3
         Do you have an estimate of the numbers of relatives
 4
      that -- that have been killed over the past 16 weeks?
 5
          I know on my father's side, as I mentioned, it was five.
 6
      And on my mother's side of the family, the latest count is
 7
       84 with several dozen that are unaccounted for. And they are
 8
      from the Al-Fara [phonetic] family in southern Gaza in Khan
 9
      Younis.
          So you've described your family's displacement. You've
10
11
       described families that -- your family members that have been
12
      killed. How has this affected you?
13
          I mean it's consumed every aspect of my life. It's been a
14
      living nightmare figuratively and literally. I, you know,
15
       sometimes wake up from nightmares where I've returned to Gaza,
16
       and as the previous plaintiff pointed out, it's
17
      unrecognizable, and I'm just walking around in the rubble of
18
      my neighborhood which was destroyed on the second day of
19
       Israel's aggression on Gaza, and looking for pictures or
20
       something to remember it by.
21
           I spend my days just -- it all revolves round this.
22
       I'm not trying to help family members meet their basic needs
23
       in Gaza, I am trying to do what I can, you know, and use my
24
      privilege here to put an end to their suffering by lobbying my
```

representatives or speaking to the media or writing or even

```
1
       looking over my own back and my daughter's back, both of us
 2
      being visible Muslim women, or trying to defend and protect my
 3
       daughter's First Amendment rights in her high school, or
 4
      helping, you know, coach them and help them cope through this
 5
      tragedy.
 6
           So it has been completely layers upon layers of trauma, I
 7
      would say, is the best way to describe it.
 8
          Has it impacted your relationship with your family members
 9
      here?
          I -- you know, I wish I could say I had the luxury to be
10
11
       able to grieve, but there's this urgency that I and others, I
12
      think, as Palestinians with family members, Palestinian
13
      Americans with family members feel about doing something about
14
      this, and I just haven't really had a moment to process.
15
          And my -- my eldest two children approached me last week,
16
      my 19-year-old and my 16-year-old. And they said we need to
17
      talk to you because you've been irritable and emotionally
18
      distant and we need you and you're not there for us.
19
           So, you know, it's -- yeah, it takes a toll. It's very
20
       stressful. I mean, what do you say? Of course, I tell them,
21
      you know, my family's being killed on my dime. There's no
22
      time for feelings right now. So --
23
          So sorry, Ms. Elhaddad.
24
           I would like to ask you some questions --
```

Thank you.

```
1
           When you're ready, I'd like --
 2
                THE COURT: Would you like a glass of water or do you
 3
      need a break? Are you okay?
                THE WITNESS: I'm okay. Water would be great
 4
 5
      actually. Yeah. Thank you.
 6
                THE COURT: Okay. Madam Clerk or counsel, would you
 7
      please.
          Thank you very much.
 8
 9
           If at any time you need a break, just let me know.
10
                THE WITNESS: Oh, sure.
11
                THE COURT: Of course I'll give that to you.
12
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you.
13
                        (Pause in the proceedings.)
14
                THE COURT: Are you ready to proceed?
15
                THE WITNESS: Yeah.
16
                THE COURT: All right. Proceed, please.
      BY MS. POKHAREL:
17
18
           I would like to ask you some more questions about your
19
      connections to Gaza. So have you spent time in Gaza?
20
          Yes. Gaza is the place where my parents were born and
21
      raised and began practicing as physicians, and where I would
22
      visit, where I would return to every summer as a child and
23
      where I ultimately decided to return to as a -- as a new
24
      mother to raise my firstborn son for the first few years of
25
      his life and begin my career as a journalist at the time.
```

- Q. What are some places that you remember about your time there?
- A. As a child, I remember the Khan Younis, you know, town center and walking down the narrow alleyways. And being sent by my mother -- by my grandmother to -- with empty bowls to go and fill them up with hummus and ful for breakfast.

And as an adult, visiting Gaza City where my father's home is in the Ridwan neighborhood, as I mentioned. And as a young mother, taking my son down to the Jundi park, otherwise known as the Park of the Unknown Soldier, in front of which my father's house is. And that park extends all the way down the main street, Omar Al Mukhtar, in Gaza all the way to the parliament and the Rashad al Shawa Cultural Center.

And I would take him down for strolls. And my mother and I would buy peanuts and ice cream and walk all the way down to the promenade along Gaza City's beach to drink tea and watch the sunset and go watch musical performances in the Rashad al Shawa Center. That entire area was destroyed on the second day of Israel's aggression on Gaza. And it is now a large pile of sand.

Everything from the Rashad al Shawa Cultural Center to the swing sets to the park to the fountain that used to be there to the memorial of the unknown soldier is completely gone.

Q. So you've described the destruction of -- of this neighborhood and this park. How has that destruction affected

you?

A. I mean it's -- it's been devastating and overwhelming, and it has really left me with a profound feeling of not just sorrow and sadness but helplessness and injustice.

In Arabic, we have a word for this. It's called hadjes [phonetic] or hadjza [phonetic] in the feminine. And all of this is compounded by the knowledge that my taxpayer money and my government is complicit in this ongoing genocide against my family and the destruction of everything that I knew and I loved.

- Q. So I'd like to ask you some more about why you decided to sue these defendants. Why did you decide to sue President Biden, Secretary Blinken, and Secretary Austin?
- A. I -- I want to just -- I have a few more thoughts about the previous question. I just want to say also -- sorry --

Feel free to share.

A. -- that it's also made me feel, as a Palestinian-American Muslim, unseen and unheard and discriminated against and dehumanized, completely invisible to hear our President not only actively support this but cast doubt on the deaths of my family members and other Palestinians in Gaza.

In regards to why I decided to be a plaintiff in the case,
President Biden, Secretary of State Blinken, and Secretary of
State Austin -- Secretary of Defense Austin -- excuse me -have supported this ongoing genocide from day one despite now

```
the overwhelming majority of Americans supporting a ceasefire,
 1
 2
      despite President Biden himself acknowledging the
 3
       discriminatory nature of Israel's bombings, despite Israeli
       leaders themselves making clear their intent to commit
 4
 5
       genocide against Palestinians, to make Gaza unliveable, to
      maximize damage, to consider there are no innocents in Gaza.
 6
 7
           Despite this, they have continued to kill my family
 8
      members, to displace the surviving family members, to deprive
 9
       them of food and water and basic human needs, to starve them.
           Despite all this and despite the fact that President Biden
10
       could, with one phone call, put an end to this, he has on the
11
12
       contrary decided to aid and abet and actively encourage.
13
           And so I'm here today to do everything in my capacity to
14
       stop that and to ask the Court to do everything in its
15
       capacity to hold the U.S. government accountable and from
16
       furthering this genocide and from providing any more arms or
17
       support to Israel as this genocide continues to unfold.
18
           Thank you, Ms. Elhaddad.
                MS. SHAMAS: That's all I have for this witness.
19
20
                THE COURT: Any questions?
21
                MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
22
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you, Ms. Elhaddad, for your
23
      testimony.
24
           Next witness, please.
```

Good morning once again, Your

MR. VAN DER HOUT:

```
1
       Honor. Marc Van der Hout for plaintiffs.
 2
           And I'll call Mr. Waeil Elbhassi to the stand, please.
 3
                THE CLERK: Good morning, sir. If you could please
 4
       raise your right hand.
 5
 6
                              WAEIL ELBHASSI,
 7
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
 8
       testified as follows:
 9
                THE WITNESS: I do.
10
                THE CLERK: Please be seated.
11
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you.
12
                THE CLERK: If you could please speak clearly into
13
       the microphone, state your full name and spell your first name
14
       and last name, please.
15
                THE WITNESS: My name is Waeil Elbhassi. My last
16
       name is E-L-B-H-A-S-S-I.
17
                THE COURT: Welcome, sir.
18
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
19
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
20
      BY MR. VAN DER HOUT:
21
           Mr. Elbhassi, where do you currently reside?
       Q.
22
           I reside in San Ramon, California.
      Α.
23
           And what is -- excuse me.
24
           What is your role in this case?
25
           I am one of the plaintiffs. I'm a Palestinian-American
```

- with large extended family in the Gaza Strip, many of whom were killed by Israeli bombing since October 8th.
  - Q. And where were you born and where were you raised?
- A. I was born and raised in Kuwait.
- Q. And since when have you been living in the United States?
- A. I've been in the States since 1988.
- **Q.** Do you currently have family in Gaza?
  - A. Yes. I have large extended family from both sides of my parents. Primarily in Khan Younis and Deir el-Balah counting in the hundreds.
- Q. And I'm sorry?
- A. Hundreds.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

18

24

- 13 **Q.** In the hundreds.
- Have any of your family members been injured or killed since the Israeli attacks began on October 8th?
  - A. Yes. Over a hundred members of my family were killed and/or injured.
  - **Q.** And how have you become aware of that?
- A. From various family members living in the Gaza Strip or abroad. My mother's last name, Abu Shamala, was in the news multiple times where many members of Abu Shamala family were massacred in various bombings in Rafah, in Khan Younis, and El Bureij refugee camp, as well as in Deir el-Balah.
  - Q. Is anybody by that last name a member of your family; is that what you're saying?

A. Absolutely.

bomb.

- Q. Okay. And how did you become aware of this?
- A. Various family members, as I said, and some news feeds with family last name which was later affirmed.
  - Q. Okay. And do you have family members who you knew personally who have been killed or injured by Israeli attacks?

I do. My first cousin Mohammad, who was 65 years old at

the time. His son Hamdan who was 33-year-old at the time.

And Hamdan's daughter, Noord, was one-year-old at the time.

On October 12th, the three of them were killed in an Israeli

The three were standing or hanging out by their house, and the bomb hit the neighboring house directly killing 14 members of that family, completely wiping out that house.

- Q. And how did you become aware of this specific incident?
- A. My other cousin, Mazouza, who lives in Deir el-Balah, same town, had told me. I had been in touch with her over the years. And I had been in touch with her especially during these times. She had told me about that incident.
- Q. And given the ages, was it Mohammad that you knew personally?
- A. Yeah. Mohammad was a bit older than me, but he is the one that I knew personally. I knew him well. My family -- our parents in Kuwait, just like most Palestinians, would make -- would try to make that trip as much as possible to the Gaza

Strip, to make a long difficult road trip, and they would take us and they made sure that we made connections and knew family and knew about the homeland.

So I knew Mohammad and I knew all my cousins from that time, and I kept in touch with them.

(Simultaneous colloquy.)

## BY MR. VAN DER HOUT:

- Q. Kept in touch with them in the United States -- from the United States?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Were you shown any photos or videos or anything about that killing?
  - A. There was one disturbing photo that my uncle in Canada,
    Uncle Yousef, had shared with me of that instance. Apparently
    it was taken just a few seconds after the bombing. And you
    can see Hamdan's -- the son head, his body. I'm told that
    that's him kind of appearing from under the rubble.
  - Q. From the rubble, is that what you said?

And how did it make you feel not only that obviously that one, you know, photo, which, you know, was graphic, but not only that, but just the killing of -- of Mohammad and the people you knew there?

A. It's horrifying. It was devastating. We'd been witnessing this at the time for weeks. There had been various bombing campaigns in previous years. And it's always a fear

that next day you're going to hear about a loved one or someone you know.

This time we felt it was different. The -- the magnitude, intensity, the level of the destruction and the killing was just so enormous by comparison of previous times. And -- and just felt that it was going to be a matter of time before I hear about someone I know.

And sure enough. It's so -- so it's quite devastating and to know that this is going on and I've lost other family members as well since.

- Q. And that was going to be my next question. So what other family members have been killed that you knew personally?
- A. Tragically, obviously, but especially Mazouza, the -- my cousin who I had just mentioned who had told me about Mohammad and his family, her son Samer, a week later on October 19th, was killed. Samer was 26 years old. He was in the mosque praying and the bomb destroyed the mosque, killing him and other worshipers.

I've -- also know the disturbing fact that Samer's body remains under the rubble as we speak.

- Q. How are you aware of that?
- A. She told me, Mazouza, his mother. She is dealing with this added grief, horror that her son is still under the rubble.

She did mention the scene just as much as you could. I

```
mean, people dig when these things happened, and we see these images. People dig, people using their bare hands as much as they can. But there's only so much they can do.
```

And without ceasefire, she says, without heavy machinery, without fuel, Samer's body, as well as 7,000 people probably, at least that we know of, will remain under the rubble.

People are not even trying to dig them out. It's impossible.

- People are not even trying to dig them out. It's impossible.
- Q. What else have you become aware of, if anything, regarding other family members in Gaza who've been injured or killed?
- A. I do have large extended family in Khan Younis. My aunt's children, my cousins, Shadi and Ahmad were injured in a -- a bomb at Khan Younis a few weeks later -- I forget the date.

  And Shadi was so lucky. The shrapnel didn't penetrate his flesh and sustained injuries.

And Ahmad was -- also sustained burns. It was a bomb that directly hit also the house right next to them killing two members of that family.

- Q. Those two who you just mentioned were shot or burned -- or injured, sorry -- they've managed to survive though; is that correct?
- A. Sorry.

- Q. They're alive though?
- **A.** Yes. Yes.
  - Q. Okay. And the aunt you just spoke of, is that the aunt that you referred to in your declaration who may have been

thinking of going to Dubai?

A. Yes. This is my aunt. And they had since been able to exit, but at the time and as had mentioned the declaration it was a very difficult decision to make. People who can make — who can exit — well, it's very difficult to exit with situation in the border.

But also leaving and leaving loved ones behind in what is a killing field essentially is an extremely difficult decision to make with a lot of extended family and grandchildren and so on.

At that time of my declaration, I believe there was about 60 -- over 60 people living in their house, half of whom were family, friends who had been evicted or fled the north seeking shelter and eventually trying to make their way to the south to Rafah. People try to sort things out like that.

And in addition, obviously her husband, her children, her grandchildren, and some in-laws.

- Q. In your declaration, you mention that your family survived the Nakba in 19 -- experienced the Nakba in 1948. And what is occurring in Gaza now has brought up feelings for you about that. Can you talk about that a little bit?
- A. Yeah. And actually when my aunt that I was just talking about, a big part of not wanting to leave is also knowing that they understand what this is. They -- they fully understand what's going on. They know that once they leave, it's very

unlikely they would be allowed to come back. Israel is ethnically cleansing the Gaza Strip. It is making it unliveable. It is executing a massive campaign of destruction so that people cannot -- have nothing to come back to.

My aunt as well as my mom and my father, they're all -well, my -- my parents, but my aunt is one of the majority of
people on Gaza who know all too well what the Nakba is, the
catastrophe of 1948.

The majority of people in Gaza are refugees that were forcibly removed in 1948. Two of whom are my parents who actually lived it firsthand and told us also stories about it. So people know. People don't want to leave. People feel that -- it's difficult. They might -- if they stay, they might die or starve. And if they leave, it's not likely that there's going to -- that they'll be allowed to come back.

You know, if I may.

Q. Please do.

A. One of the really powerful images that's very disturbing images early on, first few weeks of this, that struck me so powerfully was when I saw thousands of people in Gaza just fleeing, walking on foot, carrying all they can from their belongings, carrying children.

And my brain immediately recalled images from black and white that I know of from 1948 of Palestinians made the same exodus, made the same journey. This is so powerfully

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
ingrained in our consciousness and our memory as Palestinians.
   Can you describe -- I know this is difficult, but can you
describe how the events, you know, since October 8th have made
you feel?
   It's -- I think devastating really is befitting here.
mean it's -- it's -- I feel completely consumed by it. Every
Palestinian I know feels similarly. We wake up looking at our
news feeds, just watching the horror.
    In 1948, as I think Ahmed alluded to, people didn't know
what was going on. You know, we learned later that massacre
happened and destruction and so on. And the fact that we're
witnessing this in real time on television, we're watching the
Nakba as well as Israeli officials actually named it
Nakba 2.0. It's quite horrifying to be watching this.
    So it's -- it's devastating, but it's also enraging.
it makes me very fury -- furious and angry that my government
is complicit, that while this is happening, the Biden
administration is actually increasing and expediting arming
and vetoing ceasefire. Just something as basic as ceasefire,
like don't kill people, this is being vetoed by the U.S.
government, ensuring that this actually continues.
   Why did you decide to sue President Biden, Secretary of
State Blinken, and Secretary of Defense Austin in this
lawsuit?
```

Well, we are witnessing an unfolding genocide. There's no

```
1
       doubt in my mind.
                          We have demonstrated.
                                                 We have rallied.
                                                                   We
 2
      took to the streets. We spoke at city councils. We passed
 3
       local resolutions. We appealed to the world. And nothing is
      happening. I mean, the killing continues. And people in
 4
 5
      power who can make decision to stop it are complicit.
 6
          And that's why I'm here, and myself and the plaintiffs,
 7
      Your Honor, on behalf of 2 million Palestinians who are
 8
      trapped in a killing field, who are being destroyed. We're
 9
      here to appeal to you, to implore you to order the government
10
      to obey the law. That's it. Just obey the law. Stop the
11
      genocide.
12
          They can do a lot to stop this genocide. And we implore
13
       you to order them to do everything in their power to stop
14
      this.
15
          Thank you very much, Mr. Elbahassi, for sharing this with
16
      the Court and quite honestly with the public of this country.
17
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: We have no further questions, Your
18
      Honor.
                            Thank you, counsel.
19
               THE COURT:
20
          Any questions?
21
               MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
22
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you, sir. We really appreciate
23
      your testimony.
24
                          (Simultaneous colloguy.)
```

Thank you.

THE COURT:

```
1
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
 2
                       (Off-the-record discussion.)
 3
                THE COURT: You may call the next witness.
                MR. SINODIS: Morning, Your Honor. I'd like to call
 4
 5
      Mohammad Monadel Herzallah to the stand.
                THE COURT: And please reidentify yourself, sir.
 6
 7
                MR. SINODIS: Johnny Sinodis, Your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
 9
                        (Off-the-record discussion.)
10
                THE COURT: Okay. You need to speak right into the
11
      microphone because the court reporter needs -- she gets her
12
      information from the microphone, please.
13
           Say it again.
14
                MR. SINODIS: Johnny Sinodis, Your Honor.
15
           And I'd like to call Mohammad Monadel Herzallah to the
16
      stand.
17
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
18
                THE WITNESS: Good morning.
19
                THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
20
21
                       MOHAMMAD MONADEL HERZALLAH,
22
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
23
      testified as follows:
24
                THE WITNESS: I do.
25
                THE CLERK: Please be seated.
```

```
1
           Please speak clearly into the microphone. Please state
 2
       your full name and spell your first and last name for the
 3
       record.
                THE WITNESS: Mohammad Monadel Herzallah. Last name
 4
 5
       H-e-r-z-a-l-l-a-h.
 6
                THE COURT: Can you spell your first name, sir.
                                                                  I'm
 7
       sorry.
 8
                THE WITNESS: Mohammad.
 9
                        (Off-the-record discussion.)
10
                THE WITNESS: Monadel, M-O-N-A-D-E-L.
11
                THE COURT: Welcome, sir. Thank you.
12
           You may proceed, counsel.
13
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
14
      BY MR. SINODIS:
15
          Mr. Herzallah, what is the name that you typically go by?
16
       Α.
           I go by my middle name Monadel.
          Okay. And where are you currently residing?
17
       Q.
18
           I -- I am currently residing in the city of Fairfield,
19
       California.
20
          And can you explain to the Court and to the public what
21
       your role in this case is?
22
          My role in this case as a plaintiff with my brothers and
23
       sister bringing to the Court our plight for the fact that we
24
      have lost members -- well, I lost members of my family during
```

this destruction that has gone on, this unfolding genocide

that we're witnessing every day.

- Q. Can you elaborate on that? Why specifically did you sue these defendants?
  - A. I specifically suing these specific defendants for the fact that they have the authority, they have the power, they have the obligations to prevent -- first prevent this genocide from taking place and failing to stop it until this moment.
  - Q. I'd like to speak about your family in Gaza.
  - A. Yes.

- **Q.** How many family members do you have living there right now?
  - A. The remaining members of my family living in Gaza at this point is unknown for the fact that I am not -- my family originated in Gaza. My grandparents, my grandfather, my grandmother, my grandmother's brother, his sons, his daughters, we're all in big -- one big house in neighborhood of Shuja'iiya in Gaza City.

Years now, they are after 1948, some of them were, including my grandparents, were living in Vira Sivou [phonetic] which is south of Gaza. And after 1948, many of -- of the members of my family were scattered in the different Arab countries after the Nakba of 1948. But still, the majority of the members of the Herzallah family continue to -- to live in Gaza.

Q. And since the Israeli attacks began on October 8th, how

many family members have you lost?

- A. Since the beginning of October 8th, we have lost about seven members of my family, one of whom is a 40 years old girl by the name Warada. And Warada in Arabic means flower. And I was wondering how many more flowers should be cut before the whole world recognize that these are people that have been targeted for no reason.
- Q. How close were you to the members of your family who you lost?
- A. Members of my family that we lost are very close. As a matter of fact, regardless of where we are in the different Arab countries or we are here in the United States, I continue to have good relationship and communication with them just like any other family.

And, you know, during birthdays, holidays, Ramadan, el Eid, like, you know, making sure that we're always connected. Particularly my -- my cousin Mahar who is like a brother to me and who have lost two sons in this horrible....

- Q. Can you explain a little bit more about your relationship with Mahar and his losing his two sons?
- A. Mahar is my age. And we always -- as I mentioned, we always connect and communicate with each other. I have a son and -- and always joke to me, he said, you know, you're from Gaza, you only have one son. And I explain to him, Mahar, it's for medical reason, for health reason. And he said, no,

just consider my sons are your sons. And that really meant a lot to me. And that you know that your son has brothers in Gaza.

I learned in last week of October that Mahar lost his son 28 years old Majdadin, and left two daughters behind. It was devastating -- particularly devastating for me for the fact that Mahar have also have lost before a son, his oldest son, Mohammad, who was only 22 years old in the first aggression against Gaza during the blockade. His name is Mohammad, 22 years old. And this had been like the second thing.

So I called him right away and I expressed my condolences. It was hard for me to do that.

The hardest part is a few weeks later in first week of November, I learned that Mahar lost another son which means a third son he loses as we are -- as we are like witnessing this inhuman aggression against the population of -- of Gaza.

And Abdulah Haman was only -- that's the third son for Mahar. It was extremely horrible for me to hear. I was extremely saddened and I cannot find the words to express my condolences to Mahar for the fact that Abdulah Haman was only 20 years old, studying engineering in the university in Gaza. And he was killed by Israeli sniper is what I learned literally.

Until this moment, I did not have a chance to communicate with Mahar. As a matter of fact, I don't know how to find the

```
1
      words to explain or express my feeling towards him so I'm
 2
      sorry. I'm unable to do that.
 3
          You mentioned that Mahar lost his eldest son before in
 4
      another attack by Israel. When did that happen?
 5
           That happened in January of 2009.
      Α.
 6
          And can you explain to the Court why you haven't been able
 7
      to call Mahar after the killing of his third son?
           It's been extremely difficult, as my plaintiffs expressed
 8
 9
      earlier, for the fact -- I mean like the connection is very
      poor. And the Israeli government got the Internet and the
10
11
      power. And just to communicate with them or find -- or
12
       receive a text is very difficult for me to do that.
13
           So Mahar in specific, I haven't been talking to him.
       I had the chance to -- to communicate with his brother Amad
14
15
       [phonetic], and he's telling me that Mahar is -- is okay.
16
           So that's -- and it's really -- you know, I wanted to
17
       express with you that the fact -- to you, the fact that when I
18
      asked them and they -- and said how are you doing, and it's
19
      really -- we feel really helpless. I mean how you doing is --
20
       it's very dry. And when they respond to saying we still
21
       alive, that hurts more. That hurts more and more.
22
          And then it gives me more motivation to do whatever I can,
23
      whatever I can to stop this madness through all tools
      necessary here in the United States or elsewhere in the world.
24
```

For your family members in Gaza who have been fortunate to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Gaza.

survive this long, what has happened to them? Many of the families in Gaza, including mine, were -- had Α. to evacuate, had to be displaced from one place to another. At least last place they are in right now after Khan Younis, they are in Rafah. And as the doctor testified earlier, it's been extremely crowded and extremely difficult circumstances. Have any of them described the conditions to you? Yeah. Amad, who is brother of Mahar, I was able to Α. communicate with him, and he was telling me that there's no power, there is no clean water, there's piling garbage, there's hardly any food. And it's a very miserable situation. I have to tell you, Monadel, that living there, I mean animals cannot survive this kind of conditions. For you and your immediate family members inside the United States, what have the last 16 weeks been like? Well, I have to tell you, I am 63 years old man. And the last 16 months -- 16 weeks has been the hardest ever, the most devastating time I've ever lived in my entire life. And I --I lived through wars and before. And as the beginning of the war started in October 8th, as I said, my -- I have a small family, my wife and my son and myself. October 8th, my wife and I were protesting this vicious attack again for the fifth time against our people in

And we did that and came back home. Unfortunately, a week

later, Mona, my wife, was fighting a terminal illness and had to be admitted to the hospital in the ICU. I had to call my son who came from out of state and stayed with us. And -- and each and every moment as we are, we care about Mona and her situation, we were following up everything that is happening in Gaza.

As much as people, the staff and -- and people in the hospital were like, you know, talking about both at the same moment, about the health situation of my wife and the conditions of the people in Gaza with no separation of this. So my -- my it was really, really difficult time for me.

I'm proud and honored to have a partner in life for the last 33 years like Mona because she was always motivating to -- to do whatever we can, including filing this case and holding the people responsible.

And she was a force that is telling us, okay, you know, after she was discharged from the hospital, she was under care on the hospice. And then we were -- three of us were, you know, like, following the news, trying to communicate with the family in Gaza, and taking care of -- of Mona.

And until her last dying moment in December 18th, she was always encouraging us to move forward and, you know, raise your voice and we have to fight this injustice that's taking place.

And she was saying that you -- one of you and one of us

has to be in the action. So every weekend it was something going on in San Francisco, I would stay with Mona and then my son will go to the action, or vice versa, I'll go to the action, he stays with his mom.

And it's really very, very difficult moment that we went through in the last 16 weeks. And we're trying to, you know, confront each other and talking about the fact that although we're going through very difficult time as we are saying goodbye to close member of the family, and the fact that she was saying that one of us has to be there is really -- I want to make the wishes comes true and then continue to -- to this path.

I don't know what, you know -- and sometimes we try to -to comfort each other. We're saying that we're so lucky,
we're so fortunate for the fact that we are, you know,
communicating with each other. We have a roof over our head.
We have food. As a sister mentioned earlier, we feel guilty
about the fact.

But we also had the opportunity to be able to -- to -- to cherish the last moment of our loved ones before we learned that -- that's the end of her life.

These cherishable moment, the family moment, our people in Gaza don't have that. They die instantly. They die, they get killed. And -- and that's really make us, you know, our grief is not only private grief, but also a grief for our people in

Gaza and in Palestine as a whole.

- Q. When you wake up in the morning, what is the first thing that you do?
- A. First thing I do, I check my -- my phone on my messages to learn if I receive any update from the family in Gaza.

Second thing I do, I turn on my TV. That's if it was off because we always keep it on till we learn what's going on, what -- what is being done to stop this madness.

- Q. As you continually check in with your family, or try to, and watch the news, and as you see the statistics continue to rise, the death count continues to rise as Israel continues its bombing, how are you feeling today?
- A. I feel horrible. I feel dehumanized. I feel that we are witnessing numbers increased, and the world is numb about it, it's silence about it.

As a matter of fact, two days ago I recall the fact that a number of -- of people killed was 200 in the last 24 hours which means that in every hour there's eight to nine people are being killed. Which means that in the last two hours we are sitting here in this court, there is eight, nine innocent people being killed, the majority of whom are children.

- Q. So what are you asking this Court to do?
- A. Well, as -- I'm asking this Court to do is continue to -to raise the voice of our people in Gaza, to hold people who
  are responsible and who has the authority and the duty, to --

to hold them responsible for the inability to stop this madness, to stop this genocide.

I heard earlier in the court that there's a separation of power. And I wanted to -- to say that we have learned that in the schools and the college. As a matter of fact, every U.S. citizen has to pass a -- an exam to make sure to know what -- what separation of power is.

My -- here I'm asking the Court to do whatever it takes to hold these people responsible, to abide by the Constitution.

We have Constitutional rights that abide these people in charge in -- in the government to do -- to do their job and to be -- and there is consequences to that.

And when we see that we are being invisible in the country and I see that this country is being -- is changing as much as the world is changing. And I see that the -- the fact that hardly anybody can criticize the actions of the state of Israel is because of the overwhelming and biased support by this government to the state of Israel.

And I believe that this thing will change because our people, the new generations will break this taboo. The new generation, not only immigrant Palestinians born and raised in the United States are in the streets asking for the same thing that we are asking here. End the genocide against the Palestinian people, against the people of Gaza, my family and those families over there. Today, before tomorrow, as soon as

```
1
      possible. This is an urgent thing. This is something that is
 2
      going on as we speak.
 3
      Q. Thank you, Mr. Herzallah.
 4
               MR. SINODIS: I have no further questions, Your
 5
      Honor.
 6
                THE COURT: Any questions?
 7
               MR. KOSSAK: No, Your Honor.
 8
          But would it be possible to have a brief restroom break?
 9
                THE COURT: I was just about to do that.
10
          So thank you, sir. I appreciate your testimony. Thank
11
      you, sir.
12
          Let me ask plaintiffs' counsel -- we're going to take
13
       about a 15-minute break, give everybody a rest -- how much
14
      more do you have in terms of witnesses and time? So I can
15
      plan.
16
               MR. VAN DER HOUT: Thank you, Your Honor. Marc Van
17
      Der Hout.
18
          So we have three more witnesses. We have one individual
19
      plaintiff, we have one organizational plaintiff, and then we
20
      have our expert, Dr. Trachtenberg. And we expect probably one
21
      hour total more or less as we -- we have to.
22
                THE COURT: This is very important and I want to hear
23
      it all, but hopefully a little bit toward the less than the
24
      more would be very much appreciated.
```

MR. VAN DER HOUT: We understand.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            I obviously -- it's very moving
 2
      testimony, I want to continue to hear it. But we need to be
 3
      mindful of the Court's and your and counsel's resources.
                MR. VAN DER HOUT: We appreciate that, Your Honor.
 4
 5
                THE COURT: All right. So I'll give you as much time
      as you want, but I'll just ask you to, you know, to take in
 6
 7
      mind what I'm saying.
 8
                MR. VAN DER HOUT: We definitely will and all my
 9
      co-counsel have that understanding, Your Honor.
10
                THE COURT: All right. So we'll take 15 minutes.
11
      Thank you.
12
                          (Simultaneous colloquy.)
13
           (Recess taken at 12:08 P.M.; proceedings resumed at
      12:24 P.M.)
14
15
                THE CLERK: Please remain seated and come to order.
16
      Court is back in session.
                THE COURT: Back on the record.
17
18
           Please call your next witness.
                MS. POKHAREL: Your Honor, Astha Sharma Pokharel.
19
      I'd like to call Mr. Basim Elkarra to the stand.
20
21
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
22
           Please come forward and be sworn.
23
                THE CLERK: Good afternoon.
24
           Please raise your right hand.
25
```

## 1 BASIM ELKARRA, 2 called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn, 3 testified as follows: 4 THE CLERK: Please be seated. Please speak clearly 5 into the microphone, state your name and spell your first and 6 last name. 7 THE WITNESS: Basim Elkarra, B-A-S --8 (Simultaneous colloquy.) 9 THE COURT: Can you just pull it really closer. 10 Thank you very much. That's better. 11 THE WITNESS: B-A-S-I-M, E-L-K-A-R-R-A. 12 THE COURT: Welcome, sir. 13 Proceed. 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MS. POKHAREL: 16 Mr. Elkarra, good afternoon. 17 Where do you live? 18 I live in Sacramento, California. Α. 19 And how are you connected to this case? 20 Both of my parents were born in the Gaza Strip. Both were 21 born in Bani Suheila. 22 And what is your role in this case? 23 I'm one of the plaintiffs. Α. 24 Why did you decide to file this case? 0. 25 Decided to file this case, it was the least that I can do

- to help stop the genocide of my family and my people.
- Q. So I'd like to ask you a little bit about your family in Gaza. What family do you have there?
  - A. Aunts, uncles, cousins, second cousins, third cousins.
- 5 But we -- in our culture, we don't, you know, distinguish
- 6 between first cousin, second cousin. They're all family,
- 7 they're all relatives.

4

- Q. What is your relationship like with your family there?
- 9 A. Very close to them. Spent childhoods, spent many summers,
- 10 with these family members. And beautiful fond memories with
- 11 them. And, you know, been able to stay in touch with many of
- 12 them over the years.
- 13 Q. Have any of your family members in Gaza been injured or
- 14 killed over the past 16 weeks?
- 15 **A.** Yes. Right after the ceasefire, according to the health
- ministry, the names that we were able to look up was a 65 at
- 17 that point for my mom and dad's side. Since then it was 73.
- 18 And right now during the break, I just received news that my
- mom's cousin's son was murdered and two of his siblings are
- 20 missing.
- 21 **Q.** In your declaration, you talk about your -- your other
- 22 cousin's son and grandson. Do you want to say more about
- 23 them?
- 24 **A.** Yeah. So Palestinian families are -- are splitting apart
- each night. This is in the beginning of -- of the genocide.

```
1
       Because a lot of -- entire families were being wiped out.
 2
      Sometimes three generations in one attack.
 3
           So what folks were doing was the mother would take some of
      the children and take them to one house. And then the father
 4
 5
      would take some children to another house.
           In this particular attack, my cousin, Fareda, her son
 6
 7
       and -- and his son were -- were in a house. And this is from
 8
      my mom's side. And then on my dad's side, one of his cousins
 9
      and his son happened to be in the same house, and that house
10
      was -- was bombed. They were all killed.
          Do you want to say more about your family members that you
11
12
      just got news about?
13
          This is, you know -- you know, his father was very dear to
14
           You know, I just -- when we were children, we'd always --
15
      you know, he'd always invite us over. And he was a very close
16
      cousin of my mother. And he was beloved to my grandmother.
17
      He was her nephew and she loved him. And -- and so this is
18
      just devastating news.
19
      Q. You described your family members who have been killed.
20
      Have any of your family members in Gaza faced any other action
21
      by Israeli authorities?
22
                 I mean, right now, the numbers that I mentioned, I
23
      think 74 and -- this is what we -- like I said, what we know
24
      of. There's dozens missing. Many family members are saying,
```

you know, expect once this is -- this is over, by the time

they count everyone, it to be over a hundred murdered.

Now, every few days, we're getting word that some of our elders are dying. And these are folks that are transmitters of our heritage and our history, some of them over 90 years old. And due to the -- you know, the famine-like conditions, no water, no food, we are losing many of our elders right now.

- Q. How else have the conditions in Gaza impacted your family members?
- A. No food, no water. Even in the beginning, you know, we were getting complaints from them that they had water in the southeast of Gaza and -- early on. But many of them were throwing up due to the tainted water.

And so -- and then the health -- the health conditions.

My 30-year-old cousin Noor just passed away just recently

from -- from thyroid cancer. And she died a horrible, painful
death. She left behind three children under the age of seven,
and -- you know, three orphans.

And -- and so this is impacting not just, you know, direct -- you know, direct military, you know, bombing and -- and murdering, but people -- so many others are dying due to the health conditions of Gaza.

We're talking about there's no menstruation pads. There's no diapers for children. Just imagine one of the most densely populated places on earth, people crowded in schools, and in these sanitary conditions.

Also the sites that, you know, we grew up seeing. You know, the school that many generations of my family went to, destroyed. Many cemeteries are said -- you know, according to a CNN report, over 16 cemeteries where our ancestors are buried. Imagine not knowing where your grandmother or great grandfather are buried. And just bulldozed, completely destroyed.

And so, you know, it's affecting our people in so many different ways.

- Q. You said you spent time with your -- with your family members in Gaza. Where did you go when you visited Gaza?
- A. We went all over, but we spent mostly in the southeast of Gaza, in Khuza'a, Abasan, New Abasan, Bani Suheila.

And we have family throughout this entire region. And we would spend -- you know, they'd all fight for -- for us to go and stay with them for -- for a few days here and there. And it was just the most warm, welcoming people, loving hearts, that....

And Khuza'a, which in 2014 was almost pretty much completely destroyed, now we're hearing is completely destroyed.

We're seeing footage of Israeli soldiers demolishing entire neighborhoods in -- in Khuza'a. And that's an area where we spend a lot of time, where our family there, they have farms and horses, and we would ride -- we would ride, you

```
1
       know, horses throughout the fields. And just beautiful
 2
      memories of Khuza'a, which, unfortunately, is no longer there.
 3
          Do you have any other memories of -- of Gaza that you
      would like to share?
 4
 5
          Yeah. You know, my grandfather's home, you know, it was
      over a hundred years old. And, you know, these homes get
 6
 7
      passed down generation. These are -- this was an -- an
 8
      Adobe-like home with a huge courtyard. And I remember the
 9
      bricks even had seashells in them.
10
           They were really -- a really old house that we always
       dreamt that we would turn into a cultural heritage site for
11
12
      people to come visit. That's -- that's been destroyed.
13
          And, you know, some of the memories of -- of going to
14
             I remember in -- in 2002, I just had fallen asleep, and
       an explosion -- just within a split second, I was from
15
16
       sleeping to standing up.
17
          And just -- and I rushed to my cousin's house to see, you
18
      know, what happened. And he had satellite, to see if there
19
      was any news.
20
          We found out that the next morning that a one-ton bomb was
21
       dropped on a three-story building. Seventeen people were
22
      killed, 150 were injured. From the 17 people who were killed,
23
       4 women and 11 children.
24
          And that shook me, because that's something that would
```

always play out in my head, that explosion. And that was just

one time. And that -- we were staying in Bani Suheila at the time. This bomb was in Gaza -- was in the north in Gaza.

And you could imagine. Gaza is, you know, 25 miles long, and it's from 3 to 7 miles wide in some areas. And so any bomb that gets dropped impacts everyone. Many people can feel it.

And so right now when we were talking to our relatives, they're saying they can -- there's no sleep. There's no sleep because due to the bombs.

And me going through that experience of just a one-ton bomb. Now two-ton bombs are being dropped. In December, CNN had produced a report that hundreds of two-ton bombs were being dropped. And these are bombs that were used in, you know, Vietnam and other wars, but they were used in open areas. They were never dropped in densely populated areas because they can kill up to a thousand feet. And this is -- and these bombs are being dropped on refugee camps. They're being dropped close to hospitals.

And so just, you know -- just thinking about that moment in 2002 and what young children are going through right now when some -- for some of them, this is their fifth war and these constant bombs being dropped.

And for me, these bombs are manufactured right here.

They're -- they're sent from -- from our government with our taxpayer dollars to -- to fund this genocide against our

people.

- Q. Have you found yourself thinking about the memory of that bomb over the past 16 weeks?
- A. Absolutely. Absolutely. And I just -- I can't, in my mind, fathom how these children, you know, or any human being for that matter, can -- can deal with a constant relentless bombing that shakes you to your core.

And -- and if this bomb was -- was -- you know, anyone that knows the geography of Gaza, this happened in the north. I can't even imagine when these 2,000-pound bombs -- and -- and more -- more tonnage of bombs has been dropped on Gaza than Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

And just -- for that to sit -- sit in, that's how much bombs, U.S. bombs, being dropped on my people. And it just -- it's very unsettling.

And you live with this guilt every day, the survivor's guilty, that knowing your taxpayer dollars -- and these bombs are being sent by an administration -- and I even feel more guilty because our community mobilized to help put Biden in power to defeat Trump who had the Muslim ban and all the rhetoric against our community, and it just -- it's -- it hurts. It hurts deeply.

Q. You've described your family members who have been killed and these -- these areas that you remember being destroyed.

How has this impacted your daily life?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know, you -- you know, at first it's like a dream. Like, you know, is this -- is this really happening? Because look, it's not our first rodeo. We've lost family members in many of the attacks over the years. But, you know, and this is what Israelis call mowing the lawn or putting the Gazans on a diet. So this has been happening, but not at this level. And the utter destruction of an entire -- you know, the majority of Gaza, and there's not a family that hasn't lost a loved one. And so for me to explain it to my children about why this is happening and, you know, who -- and we're asking -- and one of the saddest things, and I'm sure this happens to many families from Gaza, is that we're asking our parents for family trees. We're trying to piece the puzzles together because entire wings of the family have been wiped out. And it's, like, okay, whose son was this? And whose daughter was this? And so it just -- it makes you numb at times that, you know, every few days you're hearing more people killed. And it's just -- you become angry, you become numb. You know, we wake up every morning calling -- calling our family to see who's made it. But especially what's intense is

nights for us here. Because at night, it's morning time there.

So we're -- we split up, our -- my siblings and I. Wе

1 say, okay, I'll call these cousins, you call this branch of 2 the family, you call this branch, to see who survived. 3 And calling from America, you feel just -- you feel tremendous quilt because it's my government, and the bombs 4 5 that are being dropped on them are -- are being sent from 6 here. 7 Q. So, finally, I'd like to ask you some questions about why you decided to sue these defendants. So why did you decide to 8 9 sue the President and Secretaries Blinken and Austin? Because for them knowing that Israel has genocidal 10 intent -- because they've said it, they've said it publicly 11 on -- in Israeli media. Quoting biblical verses, calling for 12 13 a slaughter of men, women, children, and even animals. You 14 know, putting -- you know, saying that no food, no water, no 15 electricity will be -- you know, will be allowed into Gaza. 16 Calling the Gazans animals. 17 And these are things that reminiscent of previous 18 genocides that happened in the world. And we're seeing it play out before our eyes. They're saying it. Their intention 19 20 is clear. 21 And despite that, President Biden, his spokespeople, State 22 Department, their spokespeople, Defense -- and the Defense 23 Secretary and his spokespeople justifying, almost at every

press conference going out of the way to justify what's

happening in Gaza. And for me, just -- this is the least that

24

And just the utter dehumanization of our people. 1 we can do. 2 Just on the hundredth day of this conflict, 3 Secretary Blinken -- sorry -- the White House put out a statement, did not mention the over 20,000 Palestinians at the 4 5 time that were killed, mentioned only the hostages. So valuing certain lives more than other lives, it just --6 7 it's very dehumanizing. The way that they look at Palestinians, the way they look at Arabs, the way they look at 8 9 Palestinian Muslims, the way they look at Palestinian Christians, because if you look at what's happening there, you 10 11 know, some reports are saying over a thousand -- over a -- a 12 thousand out of 1200 mosques have been destroyed. Three 13 churches have been -- and these are ancient churches and 14 mosques. 15 And one memory I have was the Al Omari Mosque, which is 16 one of the oldest mosques in the Muslim world, and destroyed. 17 Our heritage sites, our antiquities, looted, not only 18 destroyed. 200 out of the 325 heritage sites have been 19 destroyed and looted. And some of this loot was -- the 20 antiquities were taken and displayed at the Knesset. 21 And so for our President to know all this? 22 And also the United States is flying drones over Gaza. 23 They made a -- they were flying drones. So they know what's happening on the ground. They know that what these 24 25 2,000-pound bombs being dropped on refugee camps are doing.

```
And despite that, they just keep sending more money, they keep
 1
 2
      sending more weaponry. And now there's a report of them
 3
       sending more fighter planes, more helicopter attacks.
          So they are failing -- not only failing to prevent a
 4
 5
      genocide, they are completely complicit.
               MS. POKHAREL: Thank you, Mr. Elkarra. That's all I
 6
 7
      have for this witness, Your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: Thank you.
 9
          Any questions?
10
               MR. KOSSAK: No questions, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate it.
11
12
          Next witness, please.
13
                MS. LAHOOD: Marie LaHood for the plaintiffs.
14
          The last plaintiff who will be testifying is Mr. Khaled
15
      Quzmar, who's on Zoom.
16
                THE COURT: I'm sorry?
17
               MS. LAHOOD: On Zoom.
18
                THE COURT: He's on Zoom. Very well.
19
                THE CLERK: Hello, sir. Can you hear me?
20
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
21
                THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
22
23
                              KHALED QUZMAR,
24
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
25
       testified via Zoom as follows:
```

```
1
                THE WITNESS:
                              Yes.
 2
                THE CLERK: You can go ahead and put your hand down.
 3
           If you could please state for the record your full name
 4
       and spell your first and last name.
 5
                THE WITNESS: My name is Khaled Quzmar, Quzmar,
 6
       Q-U-Z-M-A-R.
 7
                THE COURT: All right. You may proceed, counsel.
 8
                MS. LAHOOD:
                             Thank you.
 9
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
10
      BY MS. LAHOOD:
11
           Mr. Quzmar, where are you joining us from?
12
           I'm joining from Palestine, Occupied Palestinian
13
       Territory, Ramallah.
14
           And where do you work?
15
           I Work Defense for Children International Palestine.
      Α.
16
           What is your role at Defense for Children International
17
       Palestine?
18
           I'm the general director.
      Α.
19
           And how long have you worked there?
20
           I joined DCI 1995, but I become the general director in
21
       January 2015.
22
           And what's your educational background?
23
           I have a bachelor degree in law. And then I studied -- I
24
       did LLM in international human rights law in the National
25
       University of Ireland in Galway, human right -- the Irish
```

Centre for Human Rights.

- Q. Can you tell you also about DCIP and its mission?
- A. DCI Palestine established to -- to provide legal services to the Palestinian children and the Israeli military court system in 1991.

And also to document the violation against the Palestinian children inside the Israeli military system and to advocate for their rights.

But after that, after establishing the Palestinian

Authority, we also expand our way to include the Palestinian

children under the Palestinian Authority, to provide them, the

children who are in conflict with the Palestinian law or are

victim of -- violence, to support them with psychosocial

support and of course legal support.

And also we participated in building a child juvenile justice system in -- under the Palestinian Authority. And we build the capacity of the juvenile judges, juvenile prosecutors, and juvenile police.

- Q. And does DCIP also monitor and document human rights violations against children?
- A. Yes. We take it as a package. We document the violation against all the Palestinian children -- to visit in our advocacy to hold the perpetrators accountable regardless who is the perpetrator.
- Q. How is DCIP connected to this case against Biden, Blinken,

and Austin?

- A. Yeah, DCIP is a plaintiff in this case because we believe that we have a mandate to protect and to create a protective environment -- environment for the Palestinian children in the Occupied Palestinian Territory. So we decided to file this -- this case in order to try to offer any kind of protection or to stop the genocide that are committed against the Palestinians in Gaza.
- **Q.** And where is DCIP based?
- A. We work in all the Occupied Palestinian Territories, but we have offices in Ramallah, and we have in the north, the West Bank in Nablus, and we have in Hebron in the south. And of course we have a presence in East Jerusalem and in Gaza Strip.
- **Q.** Who on your staff is currently in Gaza?
  - A. We have a permanent staff since 20 years, Ahmad Abu Rokbeh.
    - Q. And Mr. Abu Rokbeh also connected to this case?
- **A.** Of course.
  - **Q.** How is he connected?
- **A.** He is also a plaintiff.
- **Q.** Okay. And are you in contact with Mr. Abu Rokbeh?
  - A. Usually, yes. Before the 7th of October, yeah, we used to be in daily basis. But after the Israeli assault against Gaza and the genocide, so in the best scenario, we are in touch

every five days or even more sometimes.

- Q. Okay. How has DCIP's work in Gaza been impacted over the past 16 weeks?
- A. Completely impacted. And even the -- the colleague there is unable to do his work. And so now usually in such circumstances, we contracted other field workers in order to manage -- to document all the violation against the children during the assaults and the war.

But this time is different than any time before. So we -since more than 16 -- 16th week, we only manage to work in the
week of the two -- maybe the third or fourth week of the
genocide. So that work only done by visiting the shelters and
interviewing children to know more about their -- their
situation and the way of life of the children. And after
that, there is no work.

- Q. Okay. Do you know how Mr. Abu Rokbeh has been personally impacted in the last 16 weeks?
- A. Of course. I believe that every family in Gaza are impacted and affected by the Israeli genocide -- ongoing genocide. And the Mohammed family, like the other families, are also impacted.

I know that he was displaced there for several days and displaced from the north to the middle and from the middle to the south. So I -- I think he -- four or five times, he was forced to move from place to place with his family in order

seeking for any kind of protection and for safer place.

- Q. And do you know how Mr. Abu Rokbeh's family has been impacted in the last 16 weeks?
- A. Yes. I know that, I think from his close family, like brothers and nephews he lost.

And the recent attack, I believe it was a few days ago, few weeks ago, that his mother was shot by Israeli sniper, Israeli soldier, and her leg was even cut off as a result of the shot.

- Q. And was he able to get medical care for her?
- A. Yeah, he was starting to find a way to help her and to manage to -- to let her get out of Gaza to travel outside.

  And even he contacted me in order to use my communication, my colleagues to support him to -- to let her get out.

But unfortunately, I tried with all the international organization that I work with, the UN agencies, even the Red Cross. The answer was usually always is we have tens of thousands of cases like this and it's impossible.

At the end, he failed to find a place even she was -- they cut off her leg then.

- Q. Do you know where Mr. Abu Rokbeh is now?
- A. The last few days, I believe that he was in -- in Rafah in a net -- a tent. I don't know if he's still there or moved because since that time, I have no communication with him, no access to Internet or communication.

- Q. You mentioned during the -- the pause that DCIP was able to do some work in Gaza interviewing children. Can you tell us about that?
  - A. Yes. During the truce, we -- Mohammed, he managed to visit some schools, shelters. And he interviewed some of the children to know about their feelings about the -- the way of the life that they are living.

So, yeah, it was -- we managed to share it and to -- to reflect part of the suffer of the Palestinian children in Gaza.

So the cases are really short. In few -- in one minute, they manage to -- to share with us which kind of atrocities that -- that they are live in.

Just I would like to say -- to say that one of the cases, which is Noonia [phonetic]. Noonia was with her family at home. And during the night, the Israeli war plane bombed the house and they killed her mother, her father, and brother and sister.

And her, she was lucky that only her leg was cut off. So she was -- she went to the hospital, and she found that all the family are gone. And she was not much -- think only, she was -- her dream is to get to travel outside the country to -- to have the new leg. And also to -- to continue her study to become a doctor to -- to treat and to help the children.

Unfortunately, while she was in the hospital after two

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

QUZMAR - DIRECT / LaHOOD weeks of the accident, she was hospitalized in the hospital, Israel, again they bombed the hospital, and then she was killed. And by killing her, they killed all her dreams and her -- her life. Has DCIP been monitoring the general situation of children in Gaza over the last 16 weeks? A. As I said, the situation in Gaza, it's unpleasant even before. We witnessed the many Israeli assaults against Gaza since 1995. But what is happening this time is different than anytime in the past. And they completely put us in a place that we are not able to do the work that we are doing. Usually, we document the -- each case in a detailed documentation with evidence, testimonies from the eyewitnesses, visiting the hospitals, provide medical reports. So this time it's impossible to do that. We are now not able even to control the number of the killing. So all the time we are expanding our network to -to also to work with the international human rights organizations, with the UN agencies, in order at least to collect the numbers. So no one can provide you with the -- with the exact number of the killing, because already now we are talking

about almost 50,000 civilians killed, among them more than

10,000 children. But also still under the rubble around

```
1
       10,000. So nobody knows what happened to those 10,000.
 2
      Mostly they are kin.
 3
          What can you tell us about injuries that children in Gaza
 4
      are sustaining?
 5
           I believe the problem with the injuries is more worse than
      those who are killed. Those who are killed, already they
 6
 7
       left. But those who stayed with their pain, with their sick,
      with their -- with injuries, injured. But with -- not lack --
 8
 9
      with no medical treatment. Hospitals are attacked. All the
10
      hospitals in Gaza are being attacked and bombed by the
11
       Israeli.
12
          There is no medical treatment for the -- for those who are
       injured. So they are dying. And even those who are dying
13
14
       from the injury -- from their injuries, from the no food, no
15
      water, so that -- this kind of situation put them in suffer --
16
       in ongoing suffer. And, of course, for their families or the
17
      rest of their families who's still alive. So it's an ongoing
18
      and very complicated problem for them.
19
          What can you tell us about the impact of the lack of food
20
      and water on children in Gaza?
21
          Of course, as a human being, they have food going through
22
      the system three times a day, and their food, water, every --
23
      all the -- the time, around hour.
24
          But the Israeli policy was clear from the beginning, the
```

intention to do the side [sic] -- the genocide. So we hear

the Israeli defense minister from the second day -- the first day of the aggression, the 7th of October, he, in a press conference, he declared that from the moment, no food -- even he used his fingers -- no food, no water, no electricity, no fuel, and to open a war against the -- no civilians there -- open the war against those who are in Gaza, they are human animals.

Unfortunately, this message was taken seriously direct from the Israeli army. And the result is now we are seeing -- following that the number of the killing.

We -- I never witnessed to see that every five minutes a child killed in any place in the world. But in Gaza, that's happened in every seven minutes.

So this is why I believe we feel that all the time that our hands are cuffed.

So this is why we start to search for any place to obtain justice or to stop the genocide.

We witnessed and we try, we experienced the Israeli military system, legal system, even the Israeli civil legal system. We never, during my work with more than 30 years in this field, we never manage to obtain any kind of justice for the Palestinians in the Israeli military system nor in the Israeli civil system. Because the system are designed in order to banish the Palestinian and to legitimate [sic] the Israeli crimes against the Palestinian.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Case 4:23-cv-05829-JSW Document 100 Filed 02/27/24 Page 136 of 167 136 QUZMAR - DIRECT This is why we -- we felt that we are seeing the killing, we are seeing the genocide, why we are not able to do anything to stop the crime. What can you tell us about the impact on children whose parents or families are killed? The case of the children is something -- it's a unique situation. Never happened. When you talk about those who lost their life, it's a bigger problem. Those who are injured and they live with their suffer is a bigger problem. Also, those children who are left alone, just to -- recall the short video with one of them, I think the name of the little girl, she is 13 years old, Sarah. She woked [phonetic] up in the -- she found that she is in the hospital while the -- the house was bombed. And she was talking that she lost her father, she lost her brothers, her sisters. But only she -- she was left with her mother and she -- her mother was asking her to come to her, while in fact her mother was also killed in the same accident. So this kind of cases, it will become the suffer with --

will be with the little girl, 13 years old, for all of her life.

And of course the case of Sarah is the case of hundreds of children left behind without any family to take care. it's -- it becomes responsibility on our shoulders and the government in order to see how we can solve this problem in

1 the future. 2 Is there anything else you can tell us about the 3 conditions of life for children in Gaza? 4 Gaza, I can use what the Secretary General of United 5 Nations said. Gaza become the graveyard for the children. 6 And I can say also, I can add that Gaza is become, according 7 to what Unicef said, is that the -- the high risk place, the 8 highest risk place in the world for children is Gaza. 9 Unicef published reports about the situation in Gaza 10 saying that all of the children around the world who killed 11 during -- in the armed conflict areas since 2019 until now is 12 less than half of the children who were killed in Gaza in 13 three weeks. 14 So Gaza is -- the common issue in Gaza is the killing. 15 The killing. So everyone is expect -- expect to be killed 16 every minute. And those who are still alive, not because they 17 are smart, not because they did something, only by the chance, 18 so everyone in Gaza now all in his mind is not to dream what to be in the future, just to keep alive, to keep survive. 19 20 This is the situation in Gaza. 21 MS. LAHOOD: Thank you, Mr. Quzmar. I have no 22 further questions. 23 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 24 Any questions?

MR. KOSSAK: No, Your Honor.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you very much.
 2
           Thank you, sir. We appreciate your testimony.
 3
           Next witness.
 4
                MS. SPEES: Thank you, Your Honor. Pam Spees with
 5
      the plaintiffs.
           We call Dr. Barry Trachtenberg.
 6
 7
                MR. KOSSAK: Your Honor, may I have one moment?
 8
                THE COURT: Yes.
 9
                MR. KOSSAK: We recognize -- sorry. Jonathan Kossak
      on behalf of the defendants.
10
11
           We recognize that we previously objected to the proposed
12
      testimony of Dr. Trachtenberg and in -- in opposition to the
      plaintiffs' motion for live testimony.
13
14
           We also understand that you already allowed it, but for
15
      the record, we want to renew our objection to
16
      Dr. Trachtenberg's proposed testimony on the public interest,
17
       given that it touches on a question of law and is
18
       inappropriate subject of expert testimony, given that it's the
19
      Court's role to weigh the public interest.
20
                THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled.
21
           It's important, I think, for the Court to hear all that
22
       the plaintiff has to propose to the Court, including expert
23
      testimony, so that the Court can make a fair decision on a
24
       full and complete record.
25
           So the government's objection is noted and overruled.
```

```
1
           Please call your next witness.
 2
                MS. SPEES: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
           Dr. Trachtenberg.
                THE CLERK: Good afternoon.
 4
 5
           If you could please step on the stand. Please raise your
       right hand.
 6
 7
 8
                            BARRY TRACHTENBERG,
 9
       called as a witness by the plaintiffs, having been duly sworn,
       testified as follows:
10
11
                THE WITNESS: Yes.
12
                THE CLERK: Please be seated.
13
           Please speak clearly into the microphone. Please state
14
       your full name and spell your first and last name for the
15
       record.
16
                THE WITNESS: My name is Barry Trachtenberg,
17
      B-A-R-R-Y, T-R-A-C-H-T-E-N-B-E-R-G.
18
                THE COURT: Welcome, Doctor.
19
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you.
20
                             DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MS. SPEES:
21
22
           Dr. Trachtenberg, can you state where you currently work?
23
           I work at Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem,
24
      North Carolina.
25
           And what is your position there?
```

- A. I hold the Ruben Presidential Chair in Jewish history.
  - Q. And can you share with the Court your educational history and background?
  - A. Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

I was in school for a while. But I did an undergraduate degree in English at what was then Glassboro State College in New Jersey which is now Rowan University.

I went from there to the University of Vermont to do a master's in ultimately what became Holocaust Studies U.S. History.

From there I went to Oxford University for a postgraduate diploma in Hebrew and Jewish studies where I began studying Yiddish.

And from there, I went to UCLA for my Ph.D. in European history with a specialization in Jewish studies and Holocaust studies. And while I was there, spent, I think, approximately 14, 15 months living in Jerusalem as part of my research.

- Q. Um-hmm. And did you ever go to Gaza while you were in --
- A. I spent time --
- Q. -- doing research in Jerusalem?
- A. Yep. When I was living in Jerusalem, I was -- visited
  Gaza in June of 1998.
  - Q. And have your studies -- or has your work required you to study other genocides in history?
    - You mentioned the Holocaust. Have you studied others?

A. I have. As -- as part of being a historian of the Holocaust, much of the work that we do is talk about the precedence, you know, that happened -- that allowed the Holocaust to take place and, of course, the genocides that have happened since.

I've taught several classes of comparative genocide, to graduate students, to upper-level undergraduate students.

And every academic year since coming to Wake Forest in 2016, I teach a class on Modern European History, which has a whole unit that examines genocide.

- Q. And have you published any works on -- on these issues?
- A. I have. I've published two books related to the Nazi
  Holocaust. The first was The United States and the Nazi
  Holocaust: Race, Refuge and Remembrance, which came out in
  2018, which is about the United States' relationship to the
  Holocaust.

And then more recently in 2022, I published a book called The Holocaust & the Exile of Yiddish, which looked at the impact of the Holocaust on the Yiddish language and the political and cultural ideologies associated with it.

- Q. Have you ever testified previously as an expert on these issues?
- A. In 2017, I testified to Congress regarding the question of antisemitism on college campuses.
- Q. I see.

```
1
                MS. SPEES:
                            Your Honor, may I approach?
 2
                THE COURT: Yes, sure.
 3
                        (Pause in the proceedings.)
 4
                MS. SPEES:
                            (Handing document.)
 5
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you.
 6
      BY MS. SPEES:
 7
          I've just handed you a document. Can you say what -- what
 8
       that is?
 9
           This is my CV. It's a record of my academic work.
      Α.
10
          And can you just look at it and make sure that it's a true
11
       and complete copy of your CV.
12
          Yes. This is up-to-date.
      Α.
13
       Q.
          Thank you.
14
                MS. SPEES: Your Honor, at this point, I'd like to
15
       introduce Dr. Trachtenberg's CV into the record.
16
                THE COURT: Any objection other than what you've
17
       stated before, counsel?
18
                MR. KOSSAK: We object --
19
                THE COURT: Please stand.
20
                MR. KOSSAK: Sorry, Your Honor.
21
           We object to the extent that this was just given to us
22
       last night and we haven't really had a chance to review it
23
       thoroughly.
24
                THE COURT: Well, I'll overrule the objection.
25
       if you wish to cross-examine -- do you want -- if he's offered
```

```
1
       and you wish to voir dire him on his credentials, I'll allow
 2
      you to do that as the federal rules allow.
 3
           So for the moment I will overrule the objection, and I
      will admit the document.
 4
 5
           Can we mark that, Madam Clerk, as Plaintiffs' Exhibit
      No. 1 for this hearing?
 6
 7
                THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: Thank you very much.
 9
             (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 marked for identification)
               (Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1 received in evidence.)
10
                MS. SPEES: And at this time, Your Honor, I would
11
      tender Dr. Trachtenberg as an expert.
12
13
                THE COURT: In what area?
                MS. SPEES: In -- apologies.
14
15
           In the area of Jewish history, Holocaust studies, and
16
       genocide studies.
17
                THE COURT: Do you wish to voir dire?
18
                MR. KOSSAK: No, Your Honor. But the plaintiffs had
19
      originally proposed eliciting this testimony --
20
                THE COURT: Would you speak closer to the microphone.
21
      Or come up to the lectern, please.
22
           Thank you.
23
                MR. KOSSAK: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
24
                THE COURT: Yes.
25
                MR. KOSSAK: The plaintiffs proposed that their --
```

```
1
       Dr. Trachtenberg's testimony would be about the public
 2
       interest, not about Jewish history and the Holocaust.
 3
                THE COURT: What's your response?
           Is there -- so you're claiming there's a notice issue?
 4
 5
                MR. KOSSAK: That's correct, Your Honor.
                THE COURT: Counsel?
 6
 7
                MS. SPEES: So, Your Honor, first of all,
 8
      Dr. Trachtenberg has already submitted a declaration with two
 9
      other experts in this case where he's set out his -- his
10
       opinions. And the public interest factor in this case
      necessarily has to address the public interest in preventing
11
12
       genocide.
13
           If the -- if one of the factors is the public interest in
14
      the injunction weighed against the irreparable harms,
15
      Dr. Trachtenberg is uniquely placed to offer -- offer the
      Court expert testimony on those issues.
16
17
                THE COURT: Your response?
18
               MR. KOSSAK: Your Honor, Dr. Trachtenberg's
19
       declaration -- he was asked to opine on the unfolding attack
20
       on the Palestinian population in Gaza and whether it has the
21
       indicia of genocide.
22
           It is not regarding the public interest, and we object to
23
      his testimony on public interest in that regard.
24
                THE COURT: All right. Objection is overruled.
```

I will accept him as an expert in the field that he's

145 TRACHTENBERG - DIRECT 1 offered and allow him to give his opinion under the rules. 2 MS. SPEES: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 So, Dr. Trachtenberg, you've just heard us refer to your declaration that you submitted on November 13th in connection 4 5 with the motion that we're here to deal with today. Could you just briefly summarize your opinion that you 6 7 shared in that declaration. 8 Along with my colleagues, Victoria Sanford and John Sure. 9 Cox, we looked at the unfolding situation that was happening in Gaza and asserted our understanding that we were watching a 10 11 genocide that was unfolding, and then compared it to more 12 recent genocides from the second half of the 20th century and 13 the early part of the 21st century. 14 Can you share with the Court what you reviewed to arrive 15 at your -- at that opinion? 16 We looked at a range of materials including histories of 17 genocide. We looked at more recent reports from organizations 18 like the United Nations and Humans Rights Watch, organizations 19 that were reporting from the ground, as well as a wide range 20 of media sources, including journalists who are reporting 21 directly from Gaza. 22 And are these the kinds of resources that, as a scholar, 23 you would normally review in the course of your studies on

genocides?

Yeah, these are absolutely among them. And, you know, one

24

of the challenges is -- of studying genocide is that genocides themselves destroy their own evidence. You know, as we heard from so many of the -- the people who gave testimony today, that archives are being destroyed, memorial sites are being destroyed, and human beings who hold that history is destroyed.

Unfortunately this is all too common for genocides. And so as scholars, we have to develop techniques to try to understand those absences, to account for those absences, and to try to tell a story as best as we can of those genocides. And those absences, those voids are part of the story we have to tell.

- Q. What was it that you reviewed -- what was it about what you reviewed that made you and your -- or let me just ask you --
- A. Sure.

- Q. -- for your response to this -- that made you believe what was happening was a genocide?
- A. What made me -- and I can speak for my -- I think my colleagues as well, believe that what was going on and what is at this very moment as we're sitting here is a genocide, is the correspondence between the actions that we're seeing on the ground and the statements and actions of intent. Right? We're very well familiar that to have an event sort of fall under the 1948 Convention of Genocide requires both action and

intent. And here, we see that very, very clearly in a way that seems really quite unique in history.

Very often the statements of intent are not declared publicly, they're not declared openly by the people who are responsible for carrying out the violence. But they use code words or they use euphemisms or they speak to simply the will of various leaders.

But here the statements of intent were made from the very, very beginning. And the actions correspond so very clearly to them that there was no reason for me and my colleagues to not take the Israeli leaders at their word.

- Q. Can you describe some of those statements that struck you?
- A. Yeah. Absolutely.

Some of the -- the early statements were, for example, the President of Israel declaring that all Gazans were responsible for this, that there are no innocent people in Gaza.

Hearing the Minister of Defense, as we've heard from other witnesses, talk about there being no food, no water, no electricity will be allowed to Gaza.

The Israeli Minister of Energy who declared that there'll be no water, not a single battery will be given until Gazans disappear entirely.

And the one that was most alarming to me was hearing the Prime Minister of Israel, Netanyahu, declare many, many times that they're -- Israel is fighting a war against Amalek,

right, this biblical image that is seen as the eternal enemy of the Jewish people and who, in Hebrew scripture, you know, the Israel -- Israelite people were commanded to destroy them utterly, men, women, children, even their cattle.

And this is an image that resonates with every Jewish person who knows scripture, with every Israeli.

And, again, we see that the military is not just taking this as sort of symbolic rhetoric, but this is what they're doing.

Q. So you submitted this declaration with your colleagues on November 13th.

And as we sit here today, has there been anything that has happened since then that has changed your mind or impacted your opinion that you shared?

A. When I read the declaration now that we submitted then,

I'm struck by how much worse the situation has become and how

everything that we feared and more is unfolding.

Then, if I remember correctly, we were talking about 11,000 people known to be dead. Now the number as of this morning is over 26,000 people who are dead. There's some 63,000 people who are injured.

What we're also seeing are clear efforts by Israeli authorities to destroy the conditions of life, which again, is forces of violation of the 1948 Convention. And for this, I would point to Israel's decision to not allow food aid into

```
1
       Gaza, to not allow medical supplies either for Gazans or for
 2
      the people who are still being held hostage.
 3
          We see Israel going so far as to make decisions to flood
      the tunnels that, to my mind, are not illegal -- maybe what
 4
 5
      you do with the tunnels may be a violation -- but to flood the
      tunnels with millions of gallons of seawater which are
 6
 7
      threatening to destroy the aquifer and to not allow --
 8
                MR. KOSSAK: Objection, Your Honor.
 9
                THE COURT: Stand, please.
10
               MR. KOSSAK: Your Honor, I object to
11
      Dr. Trachtenberg's characterization of what's going on with
12
      the tunnels. He's not an expert in the field of military
13
      affairs or what's going on in that regard.
14
                THE COURT: Overruled.
15
          Continue, please.
                THE WITNESS: In effect, what we're starting to see
16
17
       is them salting the earth, right, which will prevent food from
       growing and from Gazans to be able to survive.
18
19
          And so to my understanding, this seems to be a --
20
               MR. KOSSAK: Your Honor, objection. There's been no
21
      question --
22
                THE COURT: Overruled.
23
               MR. KOSSAK: -- posed.
24
               MS. SPEES: He was finishing his response --
25
                THE COURT: Overruled.
```

```
1
                          (Simultaneous colloquy.)
 2
                THE COURT: Let me just say -- let me ask you, why
 3
       don't you ask the next question so just so we're on sort of
 4
       the same page and same framework.
 5
           Thank you.
 6
                MS. SPEES: Sure.
 7
           So having studied the Holocaust and other genocides in
 8
      history, can you describe the international responses to these
 9
       atrocities and efforts --
10
                          (Simultaneous colloquy.)
11
                THE WITNESS: Are you referring to what's happened
12
       since October 7th? Or do you mean --
13
      BY MS. SPEES:
           No, in -- in general. The -- the frameworks --
14
15
           Um-hmm.
      Α.
16
       Q.
           -- in the international community --
17
      Α.
          Yeah.
18
           -- to --
       Q.
19
      Α.
          Yeah. Absolutely.
20
                MR. KOSSAK: Objection. Vaque.
      BY MS. SPEES:
21
22
           -- to attempt to prevent genocide.
23
                THE COURT: Overruled.
24
           You may answer, Doctor.
25
                THE WITNESS:
                              Thank you, Your Honor.
```

Since 1948, with the Convention on the Prevention of Genocides passed by the United Nations, we now have a framework under international law both to prevent and punish the crime of genocide.

As we've seen in nearly every genocidal effort since, the legal actions always seem to come afterwards. They come late after those who have been killed in the genocide are dead, and then there's an attempt to try to bring justice for the victims against the persecutors of it.

What makes this situation so unique is we're watching the genocide unfold as we speak. And we're in this incredibly unique position where we can actually intervene to stop it using the mechanisms of international law that are available to us.

## BY MS. SPEES:

- Q. What, in your view, do those mechanisms entail or include?
- A. Those mechanisms include punishing the -- the people who are prosecuting, you know, these -- these genocides. And in this particular case, I think we have an opportunity here in the United States to stop the transmittal of weapons that are being used. You know, as we've heard from plaintiffs after -- plaintiff after plaintiff, the bombs that are dropping are bombs from the United States. And we have this unique opportunity to intervene with that.
- Q. And in the course of your review of the materials that you

```
1
       reviewed to put together the declaration, did you yourself
 2
      review reports about U.S. weapons and what was being used?
 3
           I did.
      Α.
          Aside from what you heard today?
 4
 5
          Yeah, I did. Some of it repeats what we've heard today,
      Α.
       such as the use of Hellfire missiles, such as the use of these
 6
 7
       2,000-pound bombs that are being sent.
 8
           You know, there's been billions of dollars that have been
 9
       sent since October 7th to Israel by the United States in
      circumvention of Congress.
10
           And it seems that we have this opportunity now through --
11
                THE COURT: Let me interrupt. I'm just interested.
12
13
      When you say contrary to the intent of Congress --
14
                THE WITNESS: Yeah.
15
                THE COURT: -- can you explain what you mean?
16
                THE WITNESS: Sure. I've just seen objections by
17
      members of Congress who feel they've not been consulted and
18
      that there's been an end-run that's being done around them
19
      where President Biden seems to be supporting a war without
20
      Congressional approval.
21
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you.
22
                MR. KOSSAK: Your Honor, I would object to that
23
      testimony.
24
                THE COURT: On what ground?
25
                MR. KOSSAK:
                             On the ground that he's not an expert in
```

national security or Congressional affairs or -- and there's nothing in his declaration about this. It's -- he's a scholar of Jewish history and genocide, not about Congress's internal or -- Congress's public negotiations about the U.S. support for Israel.

THE COURT: My view, counsel, is that we don't have a jury here. We have this Court. I am -- I'd like to think that I am savvy enough to be able to consider only the evidence that is appropriate under the law and the Constitution.

And I will weigh that and -- and if, as, and when you would wish to present cross-examination or the government wants to prevent -- present countervailing evidence, they have the right to do so.

So the objection is overruled.

THE WITNESS: May I -- may I continue?

THE COURT: Yes, please continue.

I overruled the objection. You can continue.

THE WITNESS: You know, what we study is how genocides happen, right? Scholars of genocide get into this because we want to learn how genocides occur, right? And it's out of this concern for stopping genocide that we do this work.

And we look at the various mechanisms that allow for genocides to happen. And so the reason why I'm weighing in on

1 the issue is because we're seeing it happen before our eyes. 2 And history teaches us, and American history teaches us, 3 that there's moments of intervention that can happen such as with the United States and the Nazi Holocaust that are 4 5 overlooked that, that they're ignored, they're not paid attention to. And it's only afterwards that we then have to 6 7 have this reckoning, right? 8 And so my own field of Holocaust studies, and in 9 particular, we've seen since the end of World War II that we 10 have a whole culture of memory and quilt around the Holocaust 11 in the United States to the point where we have a museum on 12 the National Mall of the United States. 13 And those of us who engage in this research do it because 14 we don't want that to happen again. 15 THE COURT: Understood. 16 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 17 THE COURT: Continue. 18 MS. SPEES: I have no further questions, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. Cross-examination? 20 CROSS-EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. KOSSAK: 22 Good afternoon, Dr. Trachtenberg. 23 THE COURT: Would you reintroduce yourself, please. 24 MR. KOSSAK: Yes. My name is Jonathan Kossak. I'm

counsel, along my colleague Jean Lin, for the defendants.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            Okay.
                                    Continue.
 2
      BY MR. KOSSAK:
 3
           Dr. Trachtenberg, you do not have a law degree, correct?
 4
      Α.
           Correct.
 5
           You do not have a degree in international relations,
 6
       correct?
 7
           Correct.
      Α.
 8
           You're not an expert on the constitutional principle of
 9
       separation of powers, correct?
10
           Correct.
      Α.
11
           You are not an expert on U.S. national security interests,
12
       correct?
13
       Α.
           Correct.
14
           You are not an expert on U.S. foreign diplomacy, correct?
15
           I've studied quite a bit of U.S. diplomacy, especially as
      Α.
16
       it relates to genocide and during World War II.
17
       Q.
           You do not have a degree in foreign policy, correct?
18
                I wasn't aware that's a degree.
      Α.
19
           You've not written on -- strike that.
20
                MR. KOSSAK: If I can have one moment, Your Honor.
21
                THE COURT:
                            Sure.
22
                            No further questions, Your Honor.
                MR. KOSSAK:
23
                THE COURT:
                            Thank you, counsel.
24
           Any further questions?
25
                MS. SPEES:
                            No, Your Honor.
```

```
1
                THE COURT: Thank you, Doctor. I appreciate it.
 2
               THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
                THE COURT: Thank you.
 4
          Does the plaintiff have any more witnesses?
 5
               MS. SPEES: We do not, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: You do not, okay.
 7
          Does the government have any witnesses?
 8
               MS. LIN: No, we don't, Your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: All right. So plaintiff rests?
10
               MS. SPEES: (Nods head.)
11
               THE COURT: Yes?
12
               MS. SPEES: Yes, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: And the government -- the defendant
14
      rests?
15
               MS. LIN: Yes, subject to --
16
               THE COURT: Subject to argument, yes.
17
          Okay. So let me have counsel -- lead counsel come up, and
18
       I'd like to hear -- and I will give you the opportunity, I
19
      promise.
20
          But I'll start from plaintiffs' counsel. And without
21
      necessarily repeating, I'd like you to sort of wrap it up and
22
      reflect on what we've heard, and in light of what we heard,
23
      you know, what you think the Court can do and should do.
24
               MS. SPEES: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
25
           Pam Spees, again, for the plaintiffs.
```

Well, after what we've heard, it's -- there's been some harrowing, horrific testimony from the plaintiffs. And I guess it's -- it's my job to speak now about the factors and the frameworks for preliminary injunctions in the Ninth Circuit and to talk about things like sliding scales and the balance of equities.

But hearing what we've heard and knowing that just since we've been here today, one of the plaintiffs had lost additional family members. And that when we filed this case in mid-November, the death count was at 11,000. And as the Court acknowledged today, it's well over 25,000.

2.2 million people are at risk of starvation. I would say that this -- that what's happening breaks the scales. The U.N. Secretary General has said the same thing. He said just this week that the entire population of Gaza is enduring destruction at a scale and speed without parallel in recent history.

All of these horrific records are being broken. There've been more journalists killed in just the first four-week period than in any conflict in the last three decades. And those are the storytellers, the people who are making the record of what's going on.

UN aid workers, more killed in the first month than in any comparable period in the history of the United Nations.

I will just say that the numbers are staggering for an

enclave like Gaza, and yet if proportionate to what that would feel like in the United States proportionally, it's all of Oakland, it's all of San Francisco, it's all of Berkeley, Sacramento, and San Jose with room left to spare, gone. And many, many, many scores more people facing the threat of starvation and famine, catastrophic famine.

And so when we talk about the sliding scale for preliminary injunctions and how one factor slides that scale, it's difficult to even analogize the cases that we have to cite to because they don't comprehend harm -- irreparable harm of this magnitude and scale.

But even so, when we talk about the balance of equities, and when they -- when they do point so sharply in the movants' -- movants' favor, the plaintiffs only need to show that there are serious questions going to the merits, the merits being that a genocide is unfolding and that there's a duty to prevent and the U.S. is failing in that, and in fact is enabling that genocide.

We would submit that we've shown that there are far more than serious questions, that there's a likelihood of prevailing on these merits ultimately.

As to the defendants, again when we filed, the numbers were in the -- were around 11,000. And there were already warnings, as Dr. Trachtenberg testified and as they submitted in their declaration and as is noted in the filings,

800 scholars joined them in raising the alarm, sounding the alarm that what was happening was a genocide. U.N. experts sounded that alarm.

And then today, the International Court of Justice just came in with its ruling which is almost unprecedented in terms of what it's recognizing as the harm that's happening now and the need to require preventative measures.

So that's their version of a preliminary injunction, Your Honor.

And it shows that there are judicially manageable standards that judges and courts have roles to play in enforcing and making real this duty that all of us in this world have to preventing a genocide.

And the government's only response is to say to this Court that it can't even engage with the question, that it should be allowed to continue because this touches on matters of foreign policy.

We're talking about clear allegations of illegality here of the most serious kind. That is not what the political question doctrine was for. That is not what separation of powers is for. Mr. Herzallah reminds us of what -- how important that is. And what separation of powers is not, is not unequal branches of government. They are coequal branches of government. The gov -- the administration wants to turn that on its head and have a free pass to keep going even in

the face of all of this recognition that what's happening is a genocide.

The government has said that these defendants can't be held responsible because Israel is an independent actor making unfettered decisions. Even Israeli officials acknowledge that that is not true. We have a quote from Minister of Defense Yoav Gallant where he is saying that it was the U.S. pressure that made them relent and let in a trickle of aid at a certain point. Not enough to address, by any measure, the humanitarian situation.

And what that says is that, A, the Israeli officials were intending to starve that population; and, B, the U.S. has a role to play and is playing a role in influencing these officials, in addition to the enormous, enormous amount of weapons and munitions that we are funneling. Because there were warnings all along the way, and the U.S. responses have been, and to this point still are, that they are not placing any conditions on the use of those weapons.

They are not drawing any red lines, and as

Dr. Trachtenberg said, rushing still more, bypassing Congress,
to make those weapons available to a military that they know
is using them. And even -- even President Biden has said it,
they are using them indiscriminately. And I would suggest
that that's a generous term.

Your Honor, the plaintiffs have come to you under these

stark daunting circumstances. They've come to this Court to ask it to do what courts do, which is to apply the law to these facts and make a determination.

We ask that the Court consider a declaratory judgment as set out in the briefing. And we think it is completely within the Court's authority to enjoin the government from continuing to send the weapons that have already been used repeatedly over and over again. We -- just last -- it was a month ago we heard that there were 20,000 bombs dropped on the small enclave of Gaza and that all of them had come from the United States.

And the government can confirm that. The government can share information about what is going, what is defensive, what is being used. And the Court can fashion a remedy that is —that will indeed have an impact on the behavior of Israeli military officials and civilian officials.

And with that, Your Honor, we -- yeah, we request the Court do so. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel?

MS. LIN: Your Honor, I just want to first reiterate what the Secretary of State has said, which is that we are in the midst of a human tragedy in the Middle East for Palestinians and Israelis alike. And we are seeing every day in Gaza the gut-wrenching events that are unfolding.

And we all want to see that the suffering of people who

are caught in the middle to end as quickly as possible. And that is why the executive branch is engaging in diplomacy relentlessly every single day.

But this Court is not the proper forum to provide redress for the plaintiffs' grievances. This Court is asked to sit in judgment of a foreign government, the State of Israel, to determine whether Israel has transgressed international limits, limits imposed by international law, with the assistance of the United States.

This case, as Your Honor noted earlier, is a -- falls within the quintessential political question doctrine. And so the Court is -- doesn't need to even engage in the preliminary injunction factors because if the Court grants the government's motion to dismiss because this case is simply not justiciable under the political question doctrine, then there's no need to determine the PI factors.

But even if the Court were to go further, the standard is quite clear that if a plaintiff fails to show a likelihood of success in this case whether the case is justiciable under the political question doctrine and other defenses we raise, then the Court need not consider the remaining factors. And that is Garcia vs. Google from the Ninth Circuit en banc.

So again that leads to the same place that this case simply cannot proceed under their well-established doctrines.

THE COURT: All right. Would you like to rebut

1 counsel, or do you have anything further to say? MS. SPEES: Your Honor, if the Court accepts this 2 3 position, all of this framework, the Genocide Convention, 4 everything that's been put into place to prevent genocides 5 means nothing when it's U.S. officials who are enabling it, if it can't be stopped by a court in the United States. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. 7 8 So the Court is going to take this matter under advisement 9 and -- and make a decision in its -- on a timely basis. I want to say as we close that --10 11 MS. LIN: I'm so sorry, Your Honor. 12 Would I be allowed an opportunity to address the points 13 that I intended to raise earlier? 14 THE COURT: All right. I thought you were doing 15 that, but go ahead. 16 MS. LIN: No. I was doing the concluding statement. 17 I'm sorry, Your Honor --THE COURT: Go ahead. Briefly, please. 18 19 MS. LIN: -- if I misunderstood you. 20 So just try to be very brief. There are three points that 21 we didn't have an opportunity to address in -- because they 22 were raised in the plaintiffs' surreply. 23 And the first one is we submitted a case yesterday to this Court, the United States versus Jewel case, which is Jewel vs. 24

NSA, which is actually Your Honor's decision.

And we did that because we had talked about relying on the Supreme Court's Patchett framework to determine whether the FTCA bars relief here. And the plaintiffs came back and said no, if the Patchett case is a quiet title case, it didn't talk about the FTCA so it's not relevant. So we submitted the Jewel vs. NSA case to show that this Court itself applied the Patchett framework to determine that even outside of the quiet title case context, the Patchett framework still applies. And Your Honor may remember the case was about a suit for injunctive relief concerning the federal government's alleged warrantless communications surveillance of U.S. citizens.

And -- and this Court held that the APA's waiver of sovereign immunity for injunctive relief didn't apply. And that was because Congress had waived sovereign immunity in -- for money damages in the Patriots Act.

And so that act provided money damages for violations of certain provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. So the limited waiver in the Patriots Act limited the relief under the APA.

So we think the same concept applies here.

**THE COURT:** Would you like to respond to that?

MS. SPEES: Just that it's not applicable at all,

Your Honor.

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

THE COURT: All right. All right. So as I said before, before we close, a couple of things.

Number 1, because of the justifiable public concern in this case, we have live-streamed this. And as soon as it's technologically possible, given we're dealing with the United States government, we will get this up on the website.

And by the way, the website is on the uscourts.gov website under "Cameras in Court," and it will be up unredacted, uncensored except for the beginning when there's -- before there was any discussion before the proceedings started. So that's going to be available to everybody.

And in fact, I wanted to mention, because there's been some concern expressed even while we're here in court from outside that -- about the number of licenses available. We had 500 licenses. We got another 500. We had a thousand licenses. And that's all we had.

So we have actually exhausted. So to those people outside who justifiably wanted to listen to these proceedings in real time, we tried. And that was the extent of our -- our technological ability to do it. So but that's going to be remedied as soon as this is posted.

So the last thing I want to say is the testimony that the Court heard was truly horrific, gut-wrenching. There really isn't any -- there aren't any words to describe what's been testified to, what's going on.

And there really isn't -- the government doesn't

dispute -- seriously dispute factually what's going on in Gaza to the -- to the people, to the population, people of Gaza, Palestinians.

And on this record, there is -- although there were objections on certain grounds to the testimony of Dr. Trachtenberg, there is now on the record uncontradicted evidence that at least in the opinion of scholars, one very highly regarded scholar, not from a legal standpoint, from a sociological and historical construct, they believe that there is a genocide in progress.

And I have to say that in 20-some-odd years on the bench, this is probably the most difficult case factually that this Court has ever had, and one of the most difficult cases legally that this Court has ever had. Because the Court needs to decide, as I said at the beginning and as counsel has argued, what are the limits of the Court's power within our constitutional framework.

And so I -- I have listened to, and I want to say to those witnesses who testified both directly in person and by Zoom, that you have been seen, you have been heard by this Court as a representative of the -- of the coequal branch of government. I'm going to consider your testimony, I'm going to consider the law, and apply the facts to the law and make the best decision I can consistent with my constitutional obligations.

1 And I want to thank counsel on both sides for really 2 helping the Court, giving me the information and the arguments 3 to help the Court make a very, very difficult decision. 4 of the most difficult -- the most difficult judicial decisions 5 that I have ever made. And I'm going to take it extremely seriously. 6 7 So thank you very much, everybody, for your attention and 8 for this -- presenting these very important facts in this 9 extremely tragic case. Thank you. 10 MS. SPEES: Thank you, Your Honor. 11 MR. KOSSAK: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 (Proceedings were concluded at 1:41 P.M.) 13 --000--14 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 15 16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 17 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 18 I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, 19 nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this 20 hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially nor 21 otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. 22 Rayne H. Merendo 23 Raynee H. Mercado, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR 24 25 Tuesday, February 20, 2024