

1 MICHAEL F. HERTZ  
Acting Assistant Attorney General  
2 DOUGLAS N. LETTER  
Terrorism Litigation Counsel  
3 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
Director, Federal Programs Branch  
4 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO  
Special Litigation Counsel  
5 ALEXANDER K. HAAS (SBN 220932)  
Trial Attorney  
6 U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
7 20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 6102  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
8 Phone: (202) 514-4782—Fax: (202) 616-8460  
*Attorneys for the United States of America*  
9

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY )  
12 TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS )  
LITIGATION )  
13 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
14 This Document Relates To: )  
15 *United States v. Rabner, et al.* (07-1324); )  
*United States v. Gaw, et al.* (07-1242); )  
16 *United States v. Adams, et al.* (07-1323); )  
*United States v. Palermino, et al.* (07-1326); )  
17 *United States v. Volz, et al.* (07-1396); )  
*Clayton, et al. v. AT&T Communications of the* )  
18 *Southwest, Inc., et al.* (07-1187) )  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ )

**No. M:06-cv-01791-VRW**

**UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
DEFER BRIEFING**

Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor  
Judge: Hon. Vaughn R. Walker  
Hearing: March 26, 2009

20 On December 23, 2008, United States filed an eight-page motion for summary judgment  
21 in the above-captioned state cases pursuant to Section 803 of the FISA Amendments Act, 50  
22 U.S.C. § 1885b. Section 803 is an express preemption statute enacted by Congress to  
23 specifically preclude state attempts to investigate the alleged intelligence activities of the United  
24 States, through, among other things, state demands for the disclosures of certain information  
25 from Electronic Communication Service Providers. It is clearly applicable here.

26 The United States contacted counsel in the state cases in an attempt to agree upon a  
27 modified schedule for briefing and a hearing on this motion.<sup>1</sup> The United States proposed that

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Because the first available motion date for the Court was in late-March, the ordinary  
operation of Local Rule 7 would have given the states nearly three months to oppose the eight-

1 the states respond to the motion by mid-February with the United States reply due in mid-March.  
 2 The states refused and instead advised they would seek to put off the United States' motion  
 3 entirely through the instant administrative motion. The states' motion is meritless and should be  
 4 denied. The Government requests that the Court enter the briefing schedule set forth below.

5 The only basis cited by the states for their refusal to brief the issues related to Section 803  
 6 is that a separate matter is now *sub judice*—*i.e.*, whether Section 802 of the FAA requires  
 7 dismissal of claims against electronic communication service providers brought by private  
 8 litigants. A delay in the state cases to await the outcome of that question would be unwarranted.  
 9 Sections 802 and 803 of the FAA serve different purposes and operate independently from one  
 10 another. Indeed, regardless of how the Court rules with respect to Section 802, Section 803  
 11 would still operate to preempt the state authority at issue and would require entry of judgment for  
 12 the United States in these cases. The States have identified no reason to halt briefing on the  
 13 United States' motion in light of the Section 802 issue now under submission.<sup>2</sup>

14 Accordingly, the states' administrative motion should be denied, and the United States  
 15 requests that the court enter the following schedule for consideration of its motion

16 **February 18, 2009:** Consolidated Brief of the States in response to United States' Summary  
 17 Judgment Motion under Section 803;

18 **March 4, 2009:** Consolidated Brief of the Telecommunication Carrier Defendants in  
 19 Response to the Motion and Opposition of the Federal and State Parties

20 **March 18, 2009:** United States' Reply in Support of Its Motion under Section 803

21 **April 1, 2009:** Hearing on the United States' Motion under Section 803 (this hearing date  
 22 has been set by the Court previously)

### 23 CONCLUSION

24 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny the administrative motion to defer  
 25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 page motion and then given the United States seven days to reply.

28 <sup>2</sup> Even if Section 802 had any bearing on resolution of the state cases under Section 803,  
 that matter could be addressed through supplemental briefing after the Court ruled on Section  
 802 without delaying the motion on Section 803 preemption.

1 briefing on the United States' motion for summary judgment in the state cases and enter the  
2 foregoing briefing schedule.

3 Dated: January 21, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

4 MICHAEL F. HERTZ  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

5 DOUGLAS N. LETTER  
6 Terrorism Litigation Counsel

7 JOSEPH H. HUNT  
8 Director, Federal Programs Branch

9 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO  
Special Litigation Counsel

10 /s/ Alexander K. Haas  
11 ALEXANDER K. HAAS (SBN 220932)  
Trial Attorney

12 United States Department of Justice  
13 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Rm. 7142  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
14 Phone: (202) 305-9334—Fax: (202) 616-8460  
15 Email: alexander.haas@usdoj.gov  
*Attorneys for the United States of America*