| | Case 3:07-cv-05278-SI | Document 25 | Filed 11/26/2007 | Page 1 of 7 | | |
|--------|---|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--|
| | | http://www.i | dsupra.com/post/documentViewer.a | | at JDSUPRA | |
| 1 | IEFEDEV S DIICHOLTZ | 114p.// 114p.// | | | | |
| 1 2 | JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ Acting Assistant Attorney General CARL J. NICHOLS | | | | | |
| 3 | Deputy Assistant Attorney General SCOTT N. SCHOOLS | | | | | |
| 4 | United States Attorney ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO | | | | | |
| 5 | Assistant Director, Federal Program ANDREW I. WARDEN (IN Bar N | o. 23840-49) | | | | |
| 6 | Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Civil Division, Federal Programs E | Justice | | | | |
| 7 | 20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Roo Washington, D.C. 20530 | m 6120 | | | | |
| 8 | Telephone: (202) 616-5084 Facsimile: (202) 616-8460 | | | | | |
| 9 | Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov | | | | | |
| 10 | Attorneys for Defendant Office of t Director of National Intelligence | he | | | | |
| 11 | UNITE | 'D 6TATES DIS' | FDICT COUDT | | | |
| 12 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | |
| 13 | FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | | | | |
| 14 | SA | | | | | |
| 15 | ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUN | DATION, | Civil Action No | o. 3:07-5278 (SI) | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff, | | DEFENDANT | 'S ANSWER TO | | |
| 17 | V. | | PLAINTIFF'S FOR INJUNC | COMPLAINT FIVE RELIEF | | |
| 18 | OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF | NATIONAL |) | | | |
| 19 | INTELLIGENCE, | | | | | |
| 20 | Defendant. | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| | Case 3:07-cv-05278-SI Document 25 Filed 11/26/2007 Page 2 of 7 | |
|--------|---|-----------------------------|
| | Document hosted at JDSU http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=d628e81f-c10a-459f-a577-fce5ae | JPRA [™] edeca3 |
| 1 | | 500000 |
| 1 2 | Defendant, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, by and through | |
| 2 | undersigned counsel, hereby answers plaintiff's complaint in the above-captioned matter as | |
| 3 | follows: | |
| 4 | <u>First Affirmative Defense</u> | |
| 5 | Plaintiff's complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. | |
| 6 | Second Affirmative Defense | |
| 7 | The Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's complaint because defendant | |
| 8 | has not improperly withheld information within the meaning of the Freedom of Information Act | |
| 9 | ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552. | |
| 10 | Third Affirmative Defense | |
| 11 | The FOIA request that is the subject of this lawsuit may implicate certain information | |
| 12 | that is protected from disclosure by one or more statutory exemptions. Disclosure of such | |
| 13 | information is not required or permitted. | |
| 14 | Fourth Affirmative Defense | |
| 15 | Defendant denies each and every allegation contained in the complaint except as | |
| 16 | hereinafter may be expressly admitted. | |
| 17 | In response to the numbered paragraphs and sentences of the complaint, defendant | |
| 18 | admits, denies, or otherwise responds as follows: | |
| 19 | 1. The allegations contained in first two sentences of this paragraph consist of | |
| 20 | plaintiff's characterization of its complaint, to which no response by defendant is required. To | |
| 21 | the extent a response is deemed required, defendant admits that this action arises under the FOIA | |
| 22 | and that the Office of the Director of National Intelligence is the named defendant, but denies the | |
| 23 | remainder of the allegations contained in these sentences. The third and fourth sentences of this | |
| 24 | paragraph consist of plaintiff's conclusions of law and characterization of the nature of | |
| 25 | plaintiff's action, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, | |
| 26 | defendant denies the allegations. | |
| 27 | 2. Defendant lacks knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the | |
| 28 | allegations of this paragraph. | |

allegations of this paragraph. I

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=d628e81f-c10a-459f-a577-fce5aeedeca3

3. Admitted.

1

5

6

7

4. The allegations contained in this paragraph consist of legal conclusions regarding
 the scope and extent of the Court's jurisdiction, to which no response from defendant is required.
 To the extent a response is deemed required, the allegations are denied.

5. The allegations contained in this paragraph consist of legal conclusions regarding the venue of this action, to which no response from defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the allegations are denied.

8 6. The allegations contained in this paragraph consist of legal conclusions regarding
9 the scope and extent of the Court's jurisdiction, to which no response from defendant is required.
10 To the extent a response is deemed required, the allegations are denied.

11 7. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization 12 of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required. 13 To the extent a response is deemed required, with respect to the allegations contained in the first 14 sentence, this sentence quotes a portion of a December 15, 2005 article in the NEW YORK TIMES, 15 to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and accurate statement of its contents. With 16 respect to the allegations in the second sentence, defendant admits that, in a radio address made 17 on December 17, 2005, the President of the United States described certain activities of the NSA 18 which he authorized following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The Court is 19 respectfully referred to the transcript of that radio address, available at 20 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/12/20051217.html, for a full and accurate 21 description of the President's statement.

8. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization
of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required.
To the extent a response is deemed required, this paragraph quotes a portion of a December 24,
2005 article in the NEW YORK TIMES, to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and
accurate statement of its contents.

9. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization
of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required.

To the extent a response is deemed required, this paragraph quotes a portion of a February 6, 2006 article in USA TODAY, to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and accurate

statement of its contents.

1

2

3

7

4 10. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization 5 of various lawsuits related to certain activities of the NSA following the terrorist attacks of 6 September 11, 2001, to which no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, defendant admits that various lawsuits have been filed throughout the United 8 States related to certain activities of the NSA, but denies plaintiff's characterization of these 9 lawsuits.

10 11. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's 11 characterization of the Protect America Act of 2007, to which no response by defendant is 12 required. To the extent a response is deemed required, defendant denies plaintiff's 13 characterization of the Act except to admit that the President of the United States signed the 14 Protect America Act of 2007 into law on August 5, 2007. The Court is respectfully referred to 15 the Act for a full and accurate statement of its contents. See Protect America Act of 2007, Pub. 16 L. No. 110-55, 121 Stat. 552.

12. 17 The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization 18 of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required. 19 To the extent a response is deemed required, this paragraph quotes a portion of a August 5, 2007 20 article in the NEW YORK TIMES, to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and accurate 21 statement of its contents.

22 13. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization 23 of a public statement by the President of the United States concerning the Protect America Act of 24 2007, to which no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed 25 required, the Court is respectfully referred to the entire statement for a full and accurate statement of its contents. See 26

27 http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/08/20070805.html.

28

14. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization

http://www.jdsupra.com/post/documentViewer.aspx?fid=d628e81f-c10a-459f-a577-fce5aeedeca

of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required. 1 2 To the extent a response is deemed required, this paragraph quotes a portion of a August 22, 3 2007 article in the EL PASO TIMES, to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and 4 accurate statement of its contents.

5 15. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute plaintiff's characterization 6 of matters contained in published news reports, to which no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, this paragraph quotes a portion of a September 20, 8 2007 article in NEWSWEEK, to which the Court is respectfully referred for a full and accurate 9 statement of its contents.

10 16. Defendant admits that it received two facsimiles from plaintiff on August 31, 11 2007, but defendant otherwise denies plaintiff's characterization and description of the contents 12 of those facsimiles. For a full and accurate statement of the contents of the facsimiles, the Court 13 is respectfully referred to Exhibits K & L of the Declaration of Marcia Hoffman, filed in support 14 of plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.

> 17. Admitted.

18. Admitted.

19. Defendant denies the allegations in this paragraph, except to aver that defendant is continuing to process Plaintiff's FOIA requests and, as explained in the declaration of John F. Hackett, filed in support of defendant's opposition to plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction, defendant anticipates providing plaintiff with an interim response to the FOIA requests on or before November 30, 2007, and a final response on or before December 31, 2007.

20. 22 The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which 23 no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the 24 allegations are denied.

25 21. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the 26 allegations are denied. 27

28

7

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which

no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the
 allegations are denied.

3

16

23. Defendant repeats and realleges the responses made in paragraphs 1-22.

4 24. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which
5 no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the
6 allegations are denied.

7 25. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which
8 no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the
9 allegations are denied.

10 26. The allegations contained in this paragraph constitute conclusions of law to which
11 no response by defendant is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, the
12 allegations are denied.

WHEREFORE, having fully answered plaintiff's complaint, defendant prays for a
judgment dismissing the complaint with prejudice and for such further relief as the Court may
deem just.

| 17 | Dated: November 26, 2007 | Respectfully submitted, |
|----------|--------------------------|---|
| 18 | | JEFFREY S. BUCHOLTZ Acting Assistant Attorney General |
| 19 20 | | CARL J. NICHOLS |
| 20 21 | | Deputy Assistant Attorney General SCOTT N. SCHOOLS |
| 22 | | United States Attorney ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO |
| 23 | | Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch |
| 24 25 | | <u>/S/ Andrew I. Warden</u> ANDREW I. WARDEN (IN Bar No. 23840-49) |
| 23 26 | | Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch |
| 27 | | 20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Room 6120 Washington, D.C. 20530 |
| 28 | | Telephone: (202) 616-5084 Facsimile: (202) 616-8460 E-mail: Andrew.Warden@usdoj.gov |
| | | |

| | Case 3:07-cv-05278-SI | Document 25 | Filed 11/26/2007 | Page 7 of 7 | | | |
|---|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | http://www.ir | dsupra.com/post/documentViewer.a | Document hosted at JDSUP aspx?fid=d628e81f-c10a-459f-a577-fce5aeed | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Attorneys for Defendant Office of the Director of National Intelligence | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| í | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
|) | | | | | | | |
|) | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Civil Action No. 3:07-5278 (SI) – | Defendant's Answer | To Plaintiff's Complaint Fc | r Injunctive Relief 6 | | | |