

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MAJID ABDULLA AL JOUDI, *et al.*,

Civil Action No. 05-0301 (GK)

Petitioners/Plaintiffs,

v.

GEORGE W. BUSH, *et al.*,

Respondents/Defendants.

DECLARATION BY JULIA TARVER, ESQ.

I, Julia Tarver, declare that the following statements are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief:

1. I am a member of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, counsel for the *Al Joudi* Petitioners in the above-captioned action. I offer this Declaration in support of Petitioners' Motion to Compel Access to counsel and Information Related to Petitioners' Medical Treatment.

2. Based on our communications with them, we believe that the majority, if not all, of our clients are participants in the current hunger strike.

3. In July 2005, my colleagues and I visited with nine clients at Guantánamo.

4. During this visit, we learned that countless detainees – as media accounts had already revealed – were participating in a hunger strike to protest the inhumane conditions at Guantánamo.

5. Through our meetings, we learned that several, if not all, of our clients had been or were participating in the hunger strike. They confirmed media reports

that the reasons for the hunger strike included Respondents continued abusive, inhumane treatment, lack of clean water and adequate medical care, and a demand – one Petitioners have pursued in these proceedings – that the detainees be formally charged by the United States Government and told the reasons for their continued detention.

6. One of our clients who participated in this hunger strike was a juvenile at the time of his detention by the United States, and we believe he is one of the youngest detainees held at Guantánamo.

7. For approximately one month, our client refused food. For nine to ten days, he refused water.

8. Prior to our visit, our client had been hospitalized for several days. He was unconscious for at least four days' time, and fed intravenously. Indeed, he had to be transferred from the clinic in a medical van to meet with us. He was very weak and in a precarious medical condition that was obvious even to us as laypersons.

9. Our client told us that the day before our visit he ended his participation in the hunger strike because he had received repeated visits from individuals purporting to be high-level military officers. These individuals assured him that the Government had already agreed to his release, that authorizations of such release had already been signed in Washington, and that he was scheduled to leave Guantánamo in approximately three weeks' time.

10. As a result of this news, our client agreed to end his participation in the hunger strike.

11. As evidenced by the within application, our client has not been released, nor have Respondents provided any notice of such release.

12. Hence, because more than six weeks have passed since our last visit – and the Government has failed to provide the Court-ordered thirty-days’ notice of release – we have no choice but to assume that these were false promises that were made to him by the Government, most likely to save Respondents from the domestic and international shame and embarrassment that would result from a dead juvenile detainee at Guantanamo, who had starved himself to death because of the deplorable conditions there.

13. Undoubtedly, the realization that the Government deceived him has likely had a terrible impact on our young client.

14. We believe that our client has likely rejoined the current hunger strike, and, in light of his serious medical condition resulting from the last strike, we strongly believe his health is in grave danger.

15. In addition, we believe other clients have also chosen to participate in the hunger strike.

16. At least three of these clients have chronic medical conditions -- including epilepsy – which will only be exacerbated by the refusal of food and water, and which require immediate medical attention.

17. The Government has failed to allow us any form of reliable access to our clients.

18. In the past, our mail to clients, sent via Respondents’ legal mail channels, has been delayed for well over six weeks.

19. Nor have we received mail from our clients in a timely fashion. In fact, just this afternoon, we learned that letters from clients, dating back to June 2005,

