

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL)	
DEFENSE LAWYERS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS)	Civil Action No. 18-2399 (KBJ)
)	
and)	
)	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

FOURTEENTH JOINT STATUS REPORT

Per the Court’s order, Plaintiff National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (“NACDL”) and Defendants Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) and Department of Justice (“DOJ”) respectfully submit this Fourteenth Joint Status Report. *See* Minute Order, Apr. 28, 2020.

Overview

1. At issue in this case are three Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) requests filed by NACDL with various of Defendants’ component offices, which the parties have called “the BOP Request,” “the Main Justice Request,” and “the EOUSA Request.” *See* Ex. A to Am. Compl., ECF No. 9-2; Ex. B to Am. Compl., ECF No. 9-3; Ex. C to Am. Compl., ECF No. 9-4; *see also* 8th Joint Status Report (“8th JSR”) ¶¶ 2–6, ECF No. 31 (describing requests and parties’ previous litigation).

2. The parties have filed thirteen previous Joint Status Reports that provide more detail about their negotiations and the agencies’ productions to date. *See* Joint Status Report, ECF

No. 20; Joint Status Report, ECF No. 22; 3d Joint Status Report, ECF No. 23; 4th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 24; 5th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 25; 6th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 26; 7th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 30; 8th JSR; 9th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 32; 10th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 33; 11th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 35; 12th Joint Status Report, ECF No. 36; 13th Joint Status Report (“13th JSR”), ECF No. 37.

Updates

3. As mentioned in the parties’ most recent Joint Status Report, the defendants have completed processing records responsive to NACDL’s requests. 13th JSR ¶ 3.

4. NACDL has identified potential challenges it might raise regarding the adequacy of one of the searches conducted and various withholdings of information in the produced records. NACDL has communicated the relevant search and records challenges to the appropriate defendants.

5. The parties remain committed to narrowing the scope of their dispute as much as possible. To that end, the parties have agreed to continue negotiating to see if the list of potential challenges can be limited further.

Proposed Next Step

6. The parties propose filing on or before on June 5, 2020, another joint status report with a recommendation on how to further proceed. If the parties have not resolved the dispute by that point, they intend to propose a schedule for filing a Second Amended Complaint, Amended Answer, and summary judgment briefing per the Court’s individual rules. *See* ECF No. 6.

Dated: May 5, 2020

/s/ Megan Graham
Megan Graham (*pro hac vice*)
Catherine Crump (*pro hac vice*)
Samuelson Law, Technology & Public
Policy Clinic
U.C. Berkeley School of Law
353 Law Building
Berkeley, CA 94720-7200
(510) 664-4381
mgraham@clinical.law.berkeley.edu

Counsel for Plaintiff

Barry J. Pollack, D.C. Bar #434513
Robbins, Russell, Englert, Orseck,
Untereiner & Sauber, LLP
1801 K Street, N.W.
Suite 411L
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 775-4514 phone
bpollack@robbinsrussell.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

Respectfully submitted,

TIMOTHY J. SHEA, D.C. Bar #437437
United States Attorney

DANIEL F. VAN HORN, D.C. Bar #924092
Chief, Civil Division

By: /s/ Robert A. Caplen
Robert A. Caplen, D.C. Bar #501480
Assistant United States Attorney
555 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 252-2523
robert.caplen@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants