

[ORAL ARGUMENT HELD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2005 AND MARCH 22, 2006]

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

LAKHDAR BOUMEDIENE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Appellants,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 05-5062
	)	consolidated with
GEORGE W. BUSH, President of the	)	No. 05-5063
United States, et al.,	)	
	)	
Appellees.	)	
<hr/>		
	)	
KHALED A. F. AL ODAH, et. al.,	)	
	)	
Appellees-Cross-Appellants,	)	
	)	No. 05-5064
v.	)	consolidated with
	)	Nos. 05-5095 - 05-5116
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Appellants-Cross-Appellees.	)	
<hr/>		

**GOVERNMENT'S OPPOSITION TO PETITIONERS' MOTION TO  
LIFT THE STAY**

Petitioners have filed a "Motion to Expedite Issuance of Decision on the Merits and to Lift the Stay." The Government takes no position on the expedition motion and defers to this Court as to the question of when it is ready to issue an opinion in this case. We do, however, oppose the motion insofar as it seeks to lift the district

court's stay governing petitioners' habeas actions. The district court here stayed its proceedings pending the outcome of the merits ruling in the appeals pending in the above-captioned cases. More than 120 similar stay orders from virtually every district court judge in this Circuit have been issued in detainee habeas cases. In each of those cases, the district courts properly recognized that proceeding with the habeas cases would be inappropriate until this Court issues its decision in these cases addressing the fundamental jurisdictional and constitutional issues.

Moreover, the propriety of such stays have already been fully briefed and argued to this Court in several related appeals. See Kiyemba v. Bush (D.C. Cir. Nos. 05-5487 through 05-5492, and 06-5042) (argued September 11, 2006); Paracha v. Bush (D.C. Cir. 05-5194, 05-5211, 05-5333) (argued December 8, 2005). As more fully explained in our briefs in those related appeals, a stay of the district court proceedings in this context is an entirely proper case-management order that is well within the district court's discretion. In addition, vacating the district court's stay to permit petitioners' habeas and conditions-of-confinement claims to proceed in the district court would be contrary to the Military Commissions Act, which eliminates the district court's subject matter jurisdiction over petitioners' habeas and condition-of-confinement claims. Notably, this Court in both Kiyemba and Paracha, when faced with arguments that the district court stays were erroneous, did not vacate the

stays. To the contrary, this Court itself stayed proceedings, after oral argument, pending the outcome of the merits appeals pending in these cases.

1. Petitioners seek to immediately lift the district court's order staying the proceeding in Al Odah, pending the outcome of these appeals. That stay, however, was an entirely proper order, well within the district court's discretion. A district court "has broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident to its power to control its own docket." Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997); accord Rhines v. Weber, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 1534 (2005). In exercising that discretion, the district court "must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance." Landis v. North Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936). When a case presents "great issues" and "novel problems of far-reaching importance to the parties and the public," and a stay "will settle many and simplify them all," a stay is unquestionably proper, so long as it is "kept within the bounds of moderation." Landis, 299 U.S. at 256. As the Supreme Court has explained, "[e]specially in cases of extraordinary public moment, [a plaintiff] may be required to submit to delay not immoderate in extent and not oppressive in its consequences if the public welfare or convenience will thereby be promoted.'" Clinton, 520 U.S. at 707 (quoting Landis, 299 U.S. at 256).

In accordance with these standards, the district court properly exercised its discretion in staying the proceedings in Al Odah pending this Court's resolution of

the merit appeals in Al Odah and Boumediene. The stay was entered to ensure consistent and expeditious treatment of overlapping, complex and fundamental issues critical to the litigation of these cases. The appeals before this Court raise the fundamental questions of: whether the district court has habeas jurisdiction and, if so, what is the scope and nature of that habeas review; whether the action should be transferred to this Court's jurisdiction under the Detainee Treatment Act ("DTA"); whether the detainees, as aliens outside the United States detained as enemy combatants, can invoke rights under the U.S. Constitution; and, if so, whether the process afforded in enemy combatant tribunal proceedings violated any constitutional due process rights that the detainees might have. In sum, the decision from the Court in the present appeals will provide guidance as to how petitioners' habeas cases should proceed, if at all. Recognizing this fact, the district courts in this Circuit have issued well over 120 stay orders – staying disposition of the habeas claims until this Court renders its ruling in Al Odah and Boumediene. The broad consensus reached by the district court judges in this Circuit is that permitting the cases to move forward absent guidance from this Court would waste the resources of the judiciary and the parties.

As noted above, the propriety of such stays has already been fully briefed and argued to this Court in several related appeals. See Kiyemba v. Bush (D.C. Cir. Nos.

05-5487 through 05-5492, and 06-5042) (argued September 11, 2006); Paracha v. Bush (D.C. Cir. 05-5194, 05-5211, 05-5333) (argued December 8, 2005). As we have more fully explained in our briefs in those related appeals, a stay of the district court proceedings in this context is an entirely proper case-management order that is well-within the district court's discretion. In both Kiyemba and Paracha, when faced with arguments that the district court stays were an abuse of discretion, this Court did not vacate the stays. To the contrary, this Court itself stayed proceedings, after oral argument, pending the outcome of the merits appeals pending in these cases. This Court has likewise stayed other related appeals and petitions filed under the DTA. See, e.g., Parhat v. Gates (No. 06-1397), Bismullah v. Rumsfeld (No. 06-1197), Al Genco (Nos. 06-5191, 06-5196, 06-5197, 06-5198, 06-5205, 06-5235, 06-5236). This Court's act of staying these cases demonstrates that the similar stays entered by the district courts were not an abuse of discretion.

2. The rationale for staying the cases is even stronger given the enactment of the MCA, which withdraws jurisdiction from the district court in these cases. As we have explained in our supplemental brief to this Court, pursuant to the Military Commissions Act of 2006, Pub. L. No. 109-366, 120 Stat. 2600 (MCA), which became law on October 17, 2006, the district courts no longer possess jurisdiction over petitioners' cases, including their claims challenging their conditions of

confinement. See also Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, No. 04-1519 (JR), 2006 WL 3625015, at \*2-3 (D.D.C. Dec. 13, 2006). The MCA amends 28 U.S.C. § 2241 to provide that “[n]o court, justice, or judge shall have jurisdiction” to consider any action “relating to any aspect of the detention, transfer, treatment, trial, or conditions of confinement” of aliens detained by the United States as enemy combatants. See MCA § 7(a). This amendment to Section 2241 took effect on the date of enactment and applies specifically “to all cases, without exception, pending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act which relate to any aspect of the detention, transfer, treatment, trial, or conditions of detention of an alien detained by the United States since September 11, 2001.” MCA § 7(b). Thus, petitioners’ requested relief – vacatur of the district court stay of proceedings – would be futile in that the district court no longer possesses jurisdiction over this matter.

Petitioners’ reliance on their conditions-of-confinement claims as a ground for vacating the district court stay of proceedings is particularly inappropriate. While petitioners, in supplemental briefing regarding the MCA, have argued that the MCA’s elimination of jurisdiction over habeas detention claims violates the Suspension Clause of the Constitution, the MCA’s removal of jurisdiction to consider claims pertaining to conditions of confinement clearly does not implicate the Suspension

Clause.<sup>1</sup> Thus, regardless of how this Court rules in regard to the MCA's effect on the pending habeas detention claims, section 7 of the MCA unambiguously removes jurisdiction over petitioners' claims regarding conditions of confinement.

---

<sup>1</sup> As we have explained in other cases (see U.S. Br. in Paracha (Nos. 05-5194, 05-5211, 05-5333) at 42-43) habeas action is not an appropriate vehicle for challenging conditions of confinement. See, e.g., Wilkinson v. Dotson, 544 U.S. 74, 86 (2005) (Scalia, J., concurring) (condition-of-confinement claims in habeas would “utterly sever the writ from its common-law roots”); Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 526 n.6 (1979). In Miller v. Overholser, 206 F.2d 415 (D.C. Cir. 1953), this Court recognized that a habeas action “is not the correct remedy” for challenging “discipline or treatment.” Id. at 419-20; see also id. at 419 (“legal validity of confinement in a certain place is a different problem” than “discipline or treatment in a place of legal confinement”); Blair-Bey v. Quick, 151 F.3d 1036, 1041-42 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (“pure prison-conditions cases” are “easy to identify” as outside the scope of habeas corpus); Brown v. Plaut, 131 F.3d 163, 1689-69 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (use of habeas corpus to challenge conditions of confinement would extend “beyond the ‘core’ of the writ”).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should deny petitioners' motion to vacate the district court stay of petitioners' habeas actions.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER D. KEISLER  
*Assistant Attorney General*


GREGORY G. KATSAS  
*Principal Deputy Associate Attorney General*

DOUGLAS N. LETTER  
(202) 514-3602



---

ROBERT M. LOEB  
(202) 514-4332



---

CATHERINE Y. HANCOCK  
(202) 514-3469

*Attorneys, Appellate Staff  
Civil Division, Room 7268  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001*

FEBRUARY 2007



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have on February 14, 2007, served a copy of the foregoing "Government's Opposition to Petitioners' Motion to Lift the Stay" on the following counsel of record by causing a copy to be sent by first-class mail:

Tom Wilner  
Neil H. Koslowe  
SHEARMAN AND STERLING LLP  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 508-8000  
Email: [Twilner@shearman.com](mailto:Twilner@shearman.com)  
Email: [neil.koslowe@shearman.com](mailto:neil.koslowe@shearman.com)

Stephen H. Olesky  
Robert C. Kirsch  
Melissa A. Hoffer  
Mark Fleming  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 526-6000  
[Rob.Kirsch@wilmerhale.com](mailto:Rob.Kirsch@wilmerhale.com)  
[Melissa.Hoffer@wilmerhale.com](mailto:Melissa.Hoffer@wilmerhale.com)  
[Mark.Fleming@wilmerhale.com](mailto:Mark.Fleming@wilmerhale.com)

David J. Cynamon  
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman, LLP  
2300 N Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1122  
202-663-8000  
[david.cynamon@pillsburylaw.com](mailto:david.cynamon@pillsburylaw.com)

Jon W. Norris  
641 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 842-2695  
[jonnorrislaw@hotmail.com](mailto:jonnorrislaw@hotmail.com)

L. Barrett Boss  
1627 I Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1605  
[bboss@cozen.com](mailto:bboss@cozen.com)

Joseph Margulies  
Macathur Law Center  
Northwestern University Law School  
357 East Chicago Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60611  
(301) 503-0890  
[j-margulies@law.northwestern.edu](mailto:j-margulies@law.northwestern.edu)

Adrian Lee Steel, Jr.  
Mayer, Brown Rowe & Maw Llp  
1909 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-1152  
(202) 263-3237  
[asteel@mayerbrownrowe.com](mailto:asteel@mayerbrownrowe.com)

Baher Azmy  
Seton Hall Law School  
Center for Social Justice  
833 McCarter Highway  
Newark, NJ 07102  
(973) 642-8700  
[azmybahe@shu.edu](mailto:azmybahe@shu.edu)

Barry J. Pollack  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
3050 K Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 342-8472  
[bpollack@kelleydrye.com](mailto:bpollack@kelleydrye.com)

Eric M. Freedman  
250 West 94th Street  
New York, NY 10025  
(212) 665-2713  
[eric.m.freedman@hofstra.edu](mailto:eric.m.freedman@hofstra.edu)

Richard J. Wilson  
Muneer I. Ahmad  
American University Washington College of Law  
4801 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20016  
(202) 274-4140  
[mahmad@wcl.american.edu](mailto:mahmad@wcl.american.edu)

Shayana Devendra Kadidal  
Center for Constitutional Rights  
666 Broadway, 7th Floor  
New York, NY 10012  
(212) 614-6431  
[kadidal@ccr-ny.org](mailto:kadidal@ccr-ny.org)

George Brent Mickum, IV  
Douglas James Behr  
Keller & Heckman, Llp  
1001 G Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
(202) 434-4100  
[mickum@khlaw.com](mailto:mickum@khlaw.com)

Michael Ratner  
Center for Constitutional Rights  
666 Broadway, 7th Floor  
New York, NY 10012  
(212) 212-614-6464  
[mratner@igc.org](mailto:mratner@igc.org)

Erwin Chemerinsky  
Duke Law School  
Corner of Science Drive & Towerview Road  
Durham, NC 27708  
(919) 613-7173  
[CHEMERINSKY@law.duke.edu](mailto:CHEMERINSKY@law.duke.edu)

Pamela Ann Chepiga  
Allen & Overy  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020  
212-610-6300  
[pamela.chepiga@newyork.allenoverly.com](mailto:pamela.chepiga@newyork.allenoverly.com)

Ralph A. Taylor  
Dorsey & Whitney Llp  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington Square, Suite 1250  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-442-3000  
[taylor.ralph@dorseylaw.com](mailto:taylor.ralph@dorseylaw.com)


Kevin B. Bedell  
Greenberg Traurig  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1200  
McLean, VA 22102  
703-749-1300  
[bedellk@gtlaw.com](mailto:bedellk@gtlaw.com)

David H. Remes  
COVINGTON & BURLING  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Suite 803E  
Washington, DC 20004-2494  
(202) 662-5212  
[dremes@cov.com](mailto:dremes@cov.com)

Marc D. Falkoff  
2166 Broadway  
New York, NY  
347-564-5043  
[mfalkoff@niu.edu](mailto:mfalkoff@niu.edu)

Wesley Powell  
Hunton & Williams  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10166  
(212) 309-1013  
[wpowell@hunton.com](mailto:wpowell@hunton.com)

Julia Symon  
James Hosking  
Clifford Chance US LLP  
31 W. 52nd St.  
New York, NY 10019  
(212) 878-8000  
[Julia.Symon@cliffordchance.com](mailto:Julia.Symon@cliffordchance.com)  
[James.Hosking@cliffordchance.com](mailto:James.Hosking@cliffordchance.com)

  
Catherine Y. Hancock