Summary of Administrative Review Board Proceedings for ISN 727

The Administrative Review Board was called to order.

The Designated Military Officer (DMO) was sworn.

The Board Reporter was sworn.

The Presiding Officer announced the convening authority and purpose of the Administrative Review Board proceedings.

The Administrative Review Board members were sworn.

The Assisting Military Officer was sworn.

The Assisting Military Officer presented the Enemy Combatant Notification form, Exhibit EC-A, to the Administrative Review Board.

The Assisting Military Officer presented the Enemy Combatant Election Form, Exhibit EC-B, to the Administrative Review Board.

It was noted by the Presiding Officer that from Exhibit EC-B, the Detainee had chosen not to be present for the Administrative Review Board proceedings.

The Presiding Officer confirmed that the Assisting Military Officer had met with the Detainee and informed him of his rights regarding the proceedings, that the Detainee appeared to understand the process, that the Unclassified Summary of Evidence was read to the Detainee, that a translator was used during the interview, and that the Assisting Military Officer confirmed that the translator spoke the same language as the Detainee.

The Designated Military Officer presented the Unclassified Summary of Evidence, Exhibit DMO-1, and DMO-2, the FBI Redaction Memorandum to the Administrative Review Board.

The Designated Military Officer stated that a copy of these exhibits had been previously distributed to the Assisting Military Officer and Detainee.

The Designated Military Officer gave a brief description of the contents of the Unclassified Summary of Evidence, Exhibit DMO-1, to the Administrative Review Board.

The Presiding Officer asked the Designated Military Officer for any further unclassified information.
The Designated Military Officer confirmed that he had no further unclassified information and requested a closed session to present classified information relevant to the disposition of the Detainee.

The Presiding Officer acknowledged the request.

When asked if the Assisting Military Officer had any information to present on behalf of the Detainee to the Administrative Review Board, the Assisting Military Officer stated that he previously submitted a summary of the interview.

The Assisting Military Officer presented the Detainee's written statement (Exhibit EC-C 1 - 5). The Assisting Military Officer stated that he had not reviewed the above-mentioned documents due to Detainee's impulsive presentation.

The Administrative Review Board recessed at 1332 hours, 3 June 2005, in order for the Board Members, the Assisting Military Officer and the Designated Military Officer to review Exhibit EC-C 1-5.

The Administrative Review Board was reconvened at 1343 hours, 3 June 2005.

Presiding Officer: During the recess the Assisting Military Officer provided the Administrative Review Board panel with three exhibits. The exhibits were provided to the Assisting Military Officer by the Detainee on this date at approximately 1230 hours. The Detainee provided these items and the first one is [marked] as Exhibit One. This [exhibit] includes six different items. First is a report by Professor Timothy Valentine of Valentine Moore (ph) Associates. This item is a written compilation that describes that the Detainee was not the person shown in a video describing terrorist activity in Chechnya. The next item is an unclassified document [which is] still within the large packet brought in. [It] starts with page five, a statement of facts on Omar Deghayes. This is some kind of background information on him. It starts with page five and goes through page twelve. The next item in this packet is a two-page item, from thirty-two to thirty-three and it starts out with an item by Douglas, Ford, J. Frank and B. Frank, Not Guilty, Number 12, 1957. The next item in this packet of information starts out [with] Exhibit A, declassified materials, Deghayes, March 14, 2005. The next item in this packet is a three-page item, pages seventeen, eighteen and nineteen, describing abuse at Guantanamo Bay as it relates to Mr. Deghayes, the Detainee. The next item on this large exhibit is another compilation of pages that go from six through twelve. It starts, “one problem involves the use of incompetent translators...PR number one brought with him a translator who sounded as if he was probably Iraqi but spoke bad English and bad Arabic.” Those six items are in a strange collection of information that has been presented as Exhibit One and they will be marked appropriately by the Assisting Military Officer. The Assisting Military Officer also brought information marked ‘Privileged Attorney Detainee Materials Embargoed until 10 AM, Thursday, February 17, 2005.’ It is marked as an Exhibit by the Assisting Military Officer. It is a single page document. The next item is an unclassified report that is four
Administrative Review Board Member’s questions:

Board Member: I noticed in this one packet you gave us [that] it had a collection of these different items, in the upper left hand corner there is a pencil mark that appears to describe a sequence of documents and it looks like document seventeen is not in the package. I am wondering where document seventeen is. It is not in my package anyway.

Assisting Military Officer: I cannot give a satisfactory answer to that question because I copied it just as it was handed to me by the Detainee.

Presiding Officer: So there is a possibility that there is a page missing here or that he missed the count?

Board Member: He may have missed the count because it goes from eight to nine on the bottom right hand side but I just wanted to clarify for record that there is what appears to be an item missing but it doesn’t appear that document seventeen may have ever existed because these go in sequence in the bottom. In the event that anyone asks the question ‘where is document seventeen?’ like I did, I don’t think there is a document seventeen.

Assisting Military Officer: One possibility is that in the process of copying the original that he handed us, which we gave back to him, it (referring to the copy machine) may have double fed two sheets...or...

Presiding Officer: Or he missed the count.

Assisting Military Officer: Or he missed the count!

Board Member: Who put the marks on the upper corner, you or him?

Assisting Military Officer: They were here...

Board Member: OK.

Board Member: I have a question, I was reading through this package you provided us and it is on the...it is on this thirty-three page package...it’s the second number ‘seven’ page and what I want to ask you about is your perception of his thought processes...because on the second page ‘seven’ footnote eight, [it states] ‘one reason Mr. Deghayes needed legal assistance with the CSRT process is that he suffers from what counsel clearly recognizes as psychotic thought processes’. Can you...what is your assessment? I know you’re not an expert on this but when you asked him a question did he seem to respond? Was he...
cognizant of the question and responded in a comprehensible manner? What was your assessment?

Assisting Military Officer: I thought that he was quite lucid and he answered all of my questions satisfactorily. He did tend to want to run the show every time we interviewed him.

Board Member: Did he tend to go off the subject or go off on a tangent or...

Assisting Military Officer: Well, overall sir, I would say he did because I kept trying to steer him to the fact that the purpose of this review board is to assess his future behavior and he kept going back to the injustices done to him in the past.

Board Member: Did he speak English with you?

Assisting Military Officer: He speaks very good English.

The Presiding Officer read the remainder of the unclassified portion of the Administrative Review Board proceedings, and then adjourned the proceedings.

The Presiding Officer opened the classified portion of the session.

The Presiding Officer adjourned the classified portion of the session and the Administrative Review Board was closed for deliberation and voting.

AUTHENTICATION

I certify the material contained in this transcript is a true and accurate summary of the Administrative Review Board proceedings.

Colonel, USA
Presiding Officer
From: Deghayes, Omar Amer
To: Presiding Officer
Via Assisting Military Officer

Subject: Translation of Detainee's Written Statement Submitted by Deghayes, Omar Amer, ISN#(727), on 02 Jun 2005 by OARDEC Linguist OL- 10

(x.x.x) – Refers to the paragraph number on the Unclassified Summary of Evidence.
Notes in square brackets [] are translator and AMO comments

In the name of ALLAH, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

I and my Lawyer answered all accusations mentioned at the CSRT or at the interview before. It was just four accusations. I answered all of them in details with preemptory proof it was not true. Some of these papers and answers are enclosed in Exhibit 2

After the windup from the first board (CSRT), why I am seeing creation or making up anew accusations different than the old accusations? And all these accusations also are not true. I demand statements from many parties to prove that all these accusations are not true. You did not allow me or the AMO to call my family and other people, which I demand statements from. For example, I am not an employee at Sanibel charity organization. I demand a statement from the head of attorneys in England and their society (Law Society), which I am associated. I demand a statement from newscaster for the nightly news program at BBC Broadcasting station, whom he searched accusations against me, he found it is not true and he announce this live to the people in England.

The newscaster agreed to send his statement. His name is Jeremy Paxman; the one who assisted him in his search was Peter Marshall. The head of the Law Society his name is Peter Carter and he has knowledge of the accusation he said they are not true.

I demand from you to contact the minister of Foreign Affairs, Barones Symons, who played a major part in the government decision (UK government) to directly intervene in my case as reported by the Independent on Sunday 24 Apr 05.

I demand a statement from Professor Bill Bowys who is a barrister in Britain.
UNCLASSIFIED

I demand a statement from the British consulate (British Embassy)

You didn’t let to coordinate with the AMO to bring these written statements. The day before yesterday, 01 June 2005 I met with the AMO. He mentioned to me about the ARB and I mentioned to him what I needed to defend myself and bring out the mistake you fall in.

He said he would try to bring all of them, and the next day, 02 Jun 2005, came to tell me the ARB proceeding will be on 03 Jun 2005. He didn’t call all the people I demand the statements from to be on my side.

When the AMO first met with me the day before yesterday, 01 Jun 05, he told me the ARB meeting will be in the coming days, he didn’t say on 03 Jun 05

When I met with the AMO I told him I need to consult with my lawyer, and my lawyer Clive Smith wanted to talk to the AMO. I gave my lawyer’s web site and his email. My Lawyer want to ask some questions about my accusations and the ARB so he can furnish what is necessary for statements and legal advice to me. Going to the Internet doesn’t cost any effort or difficulties, but the AMO didn’t call my lawyer.

Yesterday, 02 Jun 05 the AMO told me that the ARB meeting will be on 03 Jun 05. I was surprised; I said to him I need to call my lawyer to consult with him about some legal things as you said to us we are allowed to call a lawyer in an emergency case. Until this hour the AMO never came back to me and let me know if I can. With all my insistence for the importance of this call before, I go in front of the ARB.

I don’t have enough time to prepare one logical defense; this is a wrongdoing and not the right way to reach truth and fairness.

This is a very different way from what we hear that the United States is a democratic state and the law agrees with the human rights. This way brings memories of the procedures of the Revolution Committees in Libya.

About the count #A, Commitment.
I have some answers for all these points, some of them mentioned in Appendix A and B, but I will mention little things only. For example, on count #5,

[3.a.5: The detainee went to Bosnia to join the mujahideen. The detainee enjoyed his experience in Bosnia and believed it was a good Muslim cause],

I went to Bosnia with a Canadian charity organization, registered in Canada. It doesn’t have anything to do with any religion connections. It is a human organization named Human Rights Agency. It supports Muslims by giving them food and clothes and others, too. What makes bad act?

#6 [3.a.6: Detainee’s travel from Pakistan to Afghanistan was facilitated by a senior al Qaida Lieutenant]

I answer this on Appendix A. You didn’t tell me when and where and who is he so I can defend myself.

About accusations on B, Training

[3.b.1: The detainee received small arms training during secondary school in Libya]

Now this became an accusation to me while it’s mandatory for all Libyan students in the Libyan schools.

[3.b.2: The detainee received training at the Khaldan Camp after arriving in Afghanistan and then joined the fighters in 1999]

Training at Khaldan. The whole count is not true and is vague. Needs approve, which fighters in 1999

About the count C, Associations:

[3.c.1: The detainee traveled to Afghanistan with a false passport]
UNCLASSIFIED

Not true. Answered in Appendix 2

[3.c.2: The detainee stayed at the guesthouse of a senior al Qaida leader]
Not true

[3.c.3: The detainee had a good relationship with Usama Bin Ladin]
Not true. What is the evidence on that?

[3.c.4: The detainee was the financial supervisor for operations at the Sanibel organization in Kabul, Afghanistan]
Not true. I asked the AMO if he can help me to call my lawyer or for the AMO himself to call my lawyer to contact Sanibel organization which registered in Manchester (England) is public and legal according to the British laws, to bring a statement from the director that I never worked in this organization anytime, official documents are with the office charity register in Britain, it is possible to be looked at anytime.

About the count D, other relevant data

[3.d.2: The detainee received two months of solitary confinement as punishment for assaulting a soldier at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba]
This is not right. We move all the time with chains on our hands, legs and the middle of the body. How can I assault a soldier in this case? But what happened to me in these camps is the reverse, assaults from the soldiers against detainees … etc. Details in Appendix 2. Also, I was in a solitary confinement at Oscar and November more than 1-year punishment, for what? Not only two months. And now for more than one year in Camp V — solitary confinement punishment for what?
I have a lot to say [about] the procedure for the ARB didn't give me chances to defend myself, taking in consideration time, lack of fulfillment to provide me with a paper and pen, for example ... etc. That is why I decided not to attend, protesting and showing to all people that we are not getting nearer square deal of requirements, agreed upon all human beings. I have a lot of answers and replies, for all the accusations but I will keep it till I will have the right and fulfillment of some fairness.

For your information I don't have pencil or papers to write on, any notes or comments in the meetings. I got these papers yesterday only (02 Jun 05) [note: 'yesterday' would have been 01 Jun 05]. The pencil was very bad and given to me yesterday only. They took it back when they exchange soldiers. They brought hardly back today in the morning (03 Jun 05) [note: 02 Jun 03; the writer is off by one day)

For many other reasons I remain my full right to answer at the appropriate time and place.
للناصري - عبد الله عبد اللطيف

UNCLASSIFIED

1. معذور، باحث 4.34، UUID الذكرى 3، الليلة 4، ورقة 4.6، ذكرت

2. الأسئلة ذات الصلة، وهي مشتركة، ثم بذلك، في الرجاءات مختصر ت 2.346.

3. عدد الزهور من النبات زراعة 4.346.35. أفاد امرأة أسئلة أو الكريب أو ورقة

4. في مكتب معمورเด ساقي، والآن، فإن هذه اليوم أرى في الديوان.

5. ولم تدخل القوة، حيث انتقلت عدة مرات من الأردن، حيث أدى إلى أن تكون لجنة

6. حيث، في الموت، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.

7. الرجوع، فالأعمال، تمت بعد أن كانت النباتات - تجادل - في شرفة، بل وتم تسلم

8. بال]){ يارب ساقي، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.

9. ولم يأت، في الموت، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.

10. السباق، في الموت، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.

11. في الموت، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.

12. السباق، في الموت، وتمت الموافقة من الأردن، بناءً على ذلك، بل وتم تسلم في دور 5.
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الجهة القانونية، وبناءً على الرسالة الملتزمة A800 لجنيه دينار ونجمة

نؤكدكم مرة أخرى على أننا نحن أهل العلم، هذا افتتاح قوة القوة مع الدولة.

تقولون خبرنا أنكم تنفيذوا اتفاق متبادل وربما هناك طرق للتفاوض، وفقاً للقرارات المستقلة.

استعلم من العقل والقلب. ومن هذه المواقع تأتي أذننا،agnostic.

الأخلاق تبدأ أولاً بمعرفة الحقائق، فإنها أعمد الأمان، سواء في الحب والكرامة.

وندعو إلى الأخلاق الوارفة في حياتنا، دعاؤنا هو أن نكون أولاً مثالًا.

إلى ليست

اسم المقدم

الجهة القانونية

الجهة القانونية

نوفمبر

م. ب. ك. و

المقدم

الجهة القانونية

الجهة القانونية

EC-C
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7/10 19-05

UNCLASSIFIED
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.
لا يوجد نص يمكن قراءته بشكل طبيعي من الصورة المقدمة.