1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )
4	Plaintiff, )
5	vs. ) H-85-50
6	VICTOR GERENA, et al., )  Defendants. )
9	February 17, 1987 10:00 A.M.
10	•
11	BEFORE: HONORABLE T. EMMET CLARIE, U.S.D.J.
12	APPEARANCES
13	Por the Plaintiff:
14	OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY
15	450 Main Street
16	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
,,	BY: ALBERT S. DABROWSKI, ESQUIRE JOHN A. DANAHER, ESQUIRE
17	WILLIAM J. CORCORAN, ESQUIRE
18	STANLEY A. TWARDY, ESQUIRE
19	DAVID A. BAVINGER, ESQUIRE CARMEN E. VAN KIRK, ESQUIRE
20	For the Defendant Antonio Camacho-Negron:
21	LINDA BACKIEL, ESQUIRE
22	424 West Schoolhouse Lane
23	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19144
24	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS P.O. Box 1532
25	Hartford, Connecticut 06101
	(203) 247-8200

.

1	For the Defendant Norman Ramirez-Talavera:
2	JUAN R. ACEVEDO, ESQUIRE 107 Franklin Avenue
3	Hartford, Connecticut 06114
4	For the Defendant Ivonne Melendez-Carrion:
5	HAROLD MEYERSON, ESQUIRE
6	6 East 45th Street New York, New York 10017
7	For the Defendant Elias Castro-Ramos:
8	DIANE DOLLAN GCOULDE
9	DIANE POLAN, ESQUIRE 265 Church Street
	Suite 808
10	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
11	For the Defendant Carlos Ayes-Suarez:
12	SHIPMAN & GOODWIN
13	799 Main Street
	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
14	BY: JAMES BERGEN, ESQUIRE
15	For the Defendant Isaac Camacho-Negron:
16	RICHARD REEVE, ESQUIRE
	Assistant Public Defender
17	234 Church Street
18	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
19	For the Defendant Juan E. Segarra-Palmer:
20	LEONARD I. WEINGLASS, ESQUIRE
21	6 W. 2oth Street New York, New York 10011
	Mew Tolk, Mew Tolk Tooll
22	For the Defendant Filiberto Ojeda-Rios:
23	WILLIAM M. KUNSTLER, ESQUIRE
24	13 Gay Street
25	New York, New York 10014
23	

1	
•	For the Defendant Jorge Farinacci-Garcia:
2	AVERY & FRIEDMAN
	Six Beacon Street
3	Boston, Massachusetts 02108
4	BY: ELLEN WADE, ESQUIRE
5	For the Defendant Angel Diaz-Ruiz:
6	MARGARET P. LEVY, ESQUIRE
_	60 Washington Street
7	Suite 1402
8	Hartford, Connecticut 06106
9	For the Defendant Orlando Gonzalez-Claudio:
10	MICHAEL E. DEUTSCH, ESQUIRE
	343 S. Dearborn
11	Chicago, Illinois 60604
12	
	For the Defendant Hilton Fernandez-Diamante:
13	TOWN HITTITING PARTIES
	JOHN WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE
14	51 Elm Street
15	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
	For the Defendant Luis Alfredo Colon-Osorio:
16	
17	RONALD L. KUBY, ESQUIRE
	1,3 Gay Street
18	New York, New York 10014
19	For the Defendant Luz Maria Berrios-Berrios:
20	BLUME, ELBAUM & SEIDMAN, ESQUIRE
	50 Columbus Bouldvard
21	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
22	BY: JACOB WIESELMAN, ESQ.
22	
23	For the Defendant Paul Weinberg:
24	BUCKLEY & SANTOS
25	51 Russ Street
23	Hartford, Connecticut 06106
	BY: F. MAC BUCKLEY, ESQUIRE

WITNE	SSES:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT RE	CR
JOHN '	WILLIAMSC	on 12	57 (Polan)		<u>-</u>
EXHIB	 ITS:	DESCR	IPTION	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	P#
GOVER	nment:				
2.2		. W. 178 A. F. W. F. F. S. C.			
23 24 A		DENDUM EARCH 302			4
24 B		EARCH LOG			
25		NVENTORY			
DEFEN	DANTS:				
42	SI	BINVENTOR	Y		
43		EARCH WARR			
47	T	IE STATE A	ND REVOLU	TION"	
48				IZU-CAMPOS	
50		11-2 D 1			٠
51 52		LE FOLDER		H FOR PEACE	•
53		CUMENT-MI		H FOR PEACE	
54		ST OF MED			
55				ENTO CRITICO	
56				ST GROUP THERAP	7
57	EI	LECTION FL	YERS		•
	(	CAPITOL CO	URT REPOR	RTERS	
			Box 1532		
	Ha	rtford, Co		: 06101	
		(203)	247-8200		

 $F_{ij}$ 

THE COURT: Would you call the
role, Madam Clerk, please?
THE CLERK: Diane Polan?
MS. POLAN: Here.
THE CLERK: John Williams?
MR. WILLIAMS: Here.
THE CLERK: Jim Bergen? Absent,
Your Honor.
Juan Acevedo?
MR. DEUTSCH: Your Honor, Mr.
Acevedo missed his plane, and he asked me to
stand in for him until he gets in today, and I
will.
THE CLERK: Ron Kuby?
MR. DEUTSCH: I'm also standing in
for Mr. Kuby.
THE CLERK: Mac Buckley? Absent
Jacob Wieselman? Absent. Michael Avery or Ellen
Wade?
MS. WADE: Yes.
THE CLERK: Margaret Levy?
MS. LEVY: Here.
THE CLERK: Leonard Weinglass?
MR. DEUTSCH: I'm going to be
standing in for Mr. Weinglass this morning as

```
1
     well, Judge.
2
                   THE CLERK: Linda Backiel?
                   MS. BACKIEL:
                                   Here.
3
                   THE CLERK: Richard Reeve?
4
5
     Michael Deutsch?
6
                   MR. DEUTSCH:
                                   Here.
7
                   THE CLERK: Harold Meyerson?
8
                   MR. ANGLADA-LOPEZ: Good morning,
9
     for Mr. Meyerson.
10
                    THE CLERK: William Kunstler?
                   MR. DEUTSCH: I'll be standing in
11
12
     for Mr. Kunstler as well.
13
                    THE CLERK: Roberto Maldonado?
                    MS. LEVY: Excuse me, I'll be
14
15
     standing in for Mr. Kuby.
                    MR. DABROWSKI: I thought Mr.
     Deutsch was standing in for Mr. Kuby?
17
                    MR. DEUTSCH: It's all right.
18
19
     Levy, for the record, can stand in for Mr. Kuby.
     I have enough people I'm standing in for this
20
21
     morning.
22
                    THE CLERK: Antonio
23
     Camacho-Negron?
24
                    MS. BACKIEL: In Puerto Rico.
25
                    THE CLERK: Norman
```

```
1
     Ramirez-Talavera?
                   MS. POLAN: He's in Puerto Rico
2
     pursuant to a waiver.
3
                   THE CLERK: Ivonne
4
5
     Melendez-Carrion?
                    MS. MELENDEZ-CARRION:
6
                                            Here.
                    THE CLERK: Elias Castro-Ramos?
7
8
                    MR. CASTRO-RAMOS: Here.
9
                    THE CLERK: Carlos Ayes-Suarez?
     Absent. Isaac Camacho-Negron? Absent.
10
     Juan Segarra-Palmer?
11
                    MR. SEGARRA-PALMER: Good morning.
12
                    THE CLERK: Filiberto Ojeda-Rios?
13
                    MR. OJEDA-RIOS: Here.
14
                    THE CLERK: Jorge
15
     Farinacci-Garcia?
16
                    MS. WADE: In Puerto Rico.
17
                    THE CLERK: Angel Diaz-Ruiz?
18
19
                    MS. LEVY: In Puerto Rico pursuant
     to a waiver.
20
                    THE CLERK: Orlando
21
     Gonzalez-Claudio?
22
23
                    MR. DEUTSCH: He's in Puerto Rico
24
      pursuant to a waiver.
25
                    THE CLERK: Hilton Fernandez-
```

1	Diamante?
2	MR. WILLIAMS: In Puerto Rico.
3	THE CLERK: Luis Colon-Osorio?
4	MS. POLAN: Also in Puerto Rico
5	pursuant to a waiver.
6	THE CLERK: Luz Berrios-Berrios?
7	MR. SEGARRA-PALMER: She's in
8	Puerto Rico pursuant to a waiver.
9	THE CLERK: Roberto
10	Maldonado-Rivera? Absent. And Paul Weinberg?
11	Absent.
12	THE COURT: Do you have all counsel
13	now recorded?
14	THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.
15	MR. REEVE: I'm sorry I was a few
16	minutes late, Your Honor. I don't know if I'm
17	recorded or not.
18	THE CLERK: Yes.
19	THE COURT: All right. Counsel
20	ready to proceed?
21	MS. VAN KIRK: We are, Your Honor.
22	The Government is going to call Jose Rodriquez to
23	the stand on rebuttal of the statements.
24	MS. POLAN: Your Honor, excuse me.
25	Good morning, Your Honor. My understanding with

1 Mr. Dabrowski yesterday is that we were going to start with Agent Williamson on the search. 2 don't even have my notes with me about the 3 statements. That was my understanding of what we 5 are going to do today. We were going to finish the statements tomorrow. 6 7 MS. VAN KIRK: Okay. I wasn't 8 aware of that. 9 THE COURT: Is there an agreement? MR. DABROWSKI: No, Your Honor. 10 did say we would start with Agent Williamson on 11 the Elias Castro-Ramos search. I said that, but 12 we haven't completed this matter. I assumed we 13 would complete this matter this morning. 14 MS. VAN KIRK: We still have Agent 15 Fernandez, Your Honor. I really have no 16 objection to that except if Mr. Williamson isn't 17 here. 18 MR. DABROWSKI: He may be here. 19 just sent him upstairs on the assumption -- to 20 check on another witness, Your Honor. I'm not 21 sure that he's here. He'll be back within a few 22 23 minutes, I'm sure. 24 THE COURT: If there is an

agreement, let's live by it. If there isn't,

let's proceed.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, we were going to try and complete each matter as best we could. I don't think it really makes that much difference the way we proceed. There is no reason why we can't get Agent Rodriquez on and off. It's a very short matter, and it will bring to a conclusion --

THE COURT: What's he going to cover, so maybe if counsel knew she wouldn't have any objection. What's he going to cover?

MS. VAN KIRK: He's going to testify, Your Honor, in rebuttal to the testimony of Carmen Delores Silva, the defendant's wife, who testified last Friday, I believe.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I don't have any of my notes from that hearing with me because as Mr. Dabrowski spoke yesterday, he said that Agent Williamson, who is the search agent, is going to testify today. And we discussed whether he would take all day.

Ms. Van Kirk understands. I already discussed the fact that there is another agent from the statements hearing who is not going to be here until tomorrow. And it was my

1 understanding that hearing would conclude tomorrow so Agent Rodriquez could testify then. 2 I just wasn't prepared for this because I wasn't 3 aware that Agent Rodriquez was coming in. 4 THE COURT: If you had an 5 agreement, let's proceed in accordance with what 6 was agreed to. We'll excuse the witness 7 temporarily. He can always be called back. 8 MR. DABROWSKI: The Government 9 calls John Williamson. 10 11 12 13 JOHN WILLIAMSON 14 THE CLERK: Please state your name 15 and spell your last name for the record. 16 THE WITNESS: John Williamson. 17 WILLIAMSON. 18 THE CLERK: Your address, please? 19 THE WITNESS: San Juan, Puerto Rico 20 21 THE CLERK: Thank you. 22 23 24 25

## 12 1 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DABROWSKI 2 Agent Williamson, you are a special 3 0. agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is 5 that correct? 6 Α. Yes, it is. 7 How long have you been with the F B I? Q. 8 Since November 1977. 9 You are currently assigned to the F B I Q. office in Puerto Rico? 10 11 Α. Yes, that's correct. 12 How long have you been there in Puerto 0: 13 Rico? Since July 1984. 14 Now, can you tell us just a little bit 15 0. 16 about your educational background; have you been 17 to college, where, and if so and beyond, tell us about it? 18 19 I graduated from the University of Rochester in 1972. I graduated from Albany Law 20 21 School in 1976. I'm a member of the New York 22 State Bar. 23 $\mathbf{Q}$ . When did you pass the Bar?

24

25

Α.

 $Q_{\bullet}$ 

1977.

Do you speak Spanish?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Could you describe your fluency or lack thereof, whichever is easier for you?
- A. I attended a five-month training program at the Foreign Service Institute as part of the Department of State in Roslyn, Virginia, in 1984. And they have a testing scale. And on the scale of one to five, I'm a level 3 Spanish speaker.
- Q. As part of your duties and responsibilities as an F B I agent in Puerto Rico, I assume you go out into what's called the field there, the streets in Puerto Rico?
- A. Yes, I do. And I conduct interviews in Spanish.
- Q. Could you describe your ability in reading Spanish as opposed to speaking it?
- A. I'm a level 3 reader also, which is -it's considered professional level, which means I
  can get by, you know, in all conversations. I
  can read it. There are vocabulary words,
  obviously, that I don't know, and I have to look
  up in the dictionary.
- Q. Now, in connection with this case, prior to your duties and responsibilities in

1 connection with the August 30th searches which occurred in this case, did you participate in the 2 investigation which led to this indictment? 3 No, I did not. Α. 5 Did you participate in any physical 0. surveillances of Elias Castro-Ramos in connection 6 7 with this case? 8 No, I did not. Α. 9 Did you participate in any electronic Q. surveillance of Elias Castro-Ramos, if such 10 occurred, to your knowledge, in connection with 11 this case? 12 13 Α. No, sir. Are you aware of or did you prepare at 14 15 any time a psychological profile of or in 16 connection with Elias Castro-Ramos? 17 No, I did not prepare one, and I'm not 18 aware of any. 19 Now, directing your attention to August Q. 30th of 1985, did you participate in a search of 20 21 the residence of Elias Castro-Ramos, one of the 22 defendants in this case? 23 Α. Yes, I did. 24 Were you, in fact, the search team

25

leader?

A. Yes, I was.

- Q. Would you describe to the court the duties and responsibilities of a search team leader?
- A. The search team leader was designated to be in charge of the search team. And we had the responsibility to coordinate all movements of the team, the preparation of the team, the assignments of each team member during the search. And I was in charge of all the -- for my team, all the preparation prior to the search.
- Q: When did you first learn or when were you first made a search team leader in connection with the search of the residence of Elias Castro?
- A. I don't remember the exact date but it was within a month of the search.
- Q. So that would be during the month of August of 1985?
  - A. Yes, as I recall.
- Q. Do you recall how it came about that you became the leader of that search team?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Now, as part of your duties and responsibilities as a search team leader, were you required to brief the other members of your

team?

A. Yes, I was.

- Q. Could you first tell us who those other members were; and if they had particular duties and responsibilities, what those were?
- A. Okay. The team consisted of four members. Myself, I was the search team leader. And we had Agent Dan Reilly. He was the photographer, he was in charge of the taking photographs at the searches.

we had Agent Jim Lyons. He was our explosives expert. His responsibility was prior to the search commencing, he was to clear the area of any booby traps or explosives. And we relied on him during the search for advice on whether an item was an explosive device and if we had concern for our safety during the search.

And there was Agent Caldwell. John Caldwell was in charge of the sketch of the residence during the search.

- Q. Let's go back to Agent Reilly. He was the photographer?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, how did Agent Reilly, if you know, become the photographer; was he chosen by you,

were you given him -- how did Agent Reilly become the photographer?

4

5 6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

15

14

17

18

19

16

20 21 22

24

25

23

He was not chosen by me. He's not assigned to the San Juan Division. He's assigned to another division of the F B I. He has a long history of photographic experience.

So he, in effect, came to you assigned 0. by someone else?

> Α. Yes.

Do you know who it was that made those 0. assignments?

> Α. No, I don't.

Q. Now, could you just tell us whether or not there was any briefing with regard to Agent Reilly, between Agent Reilly and yourself as to what he would be doing in connection with this search?

Yes, there was. I briefed each of the team members separately and in groups numerous From the time they arrived in Puerto Rico, they were immediately notified that they were part of my team. And I was their only contact for the duration of their stay in Puerto Rico, as far as the searches were concerned.

> Q. Now, Agent Reilly as the photographic

\_

. 

expert, is it fair to say that you didn't brief him with regard to how he should go about the particulars of taking the photographs?

A. Right. We had some guidelines as to the order of when photographs would be taken. I briefed him on those guidelines. But actually how to take the photographs, he had his own gear, and he was well versed in photography.

- Q. What lens to use, et cetera; that was within his discretion?
  - A. Exactly.
- Q: What were the guidelines that you gave him?

A. Well, initially, after the bomb search was -- we had a bomb sweep made of the residence to clear it for booby traps and any explosive devices that would risk the person that was searching. He was to photograph the premises both inside and outside prior to the search.

Once that -- those photographs were taken, the other photographs he would take were any items of significant evidentiary value that were found. He would photograph those at the time. And then when the search was completed, he would take another set of photographs of the

residence to show the state of the residence before we exited.

- Q. So in other words, I gather that the first thing that was to occur would be Agent Lyons, that is the explosives expert, would determine whether or not there were explosives in the residence. And if so, he would take appropriate action?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. Then Agent Reilly would begin his photographing process?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And where would Agent Caldwell come in, the sketch agent?
- A. He -- he was able to do his sketch along with Agent Reilly. As I recall, he assisted Agent Reilly in maintaining a photographic log as Reilly took the photographs.

  And it was during that time that he was able to make a sketch of the residence.
- O. Now, in connection with these briefings of these individuals, did you discuss with them an affidavit and the search warrant itself in connection with this residence?
- A. Yes, I did. And they were each

1 instructed to read the affidavit, which I 2 provided to them to read. Did you, in fact, read the affidavit 3 Q. 4 prior to the execution of the warrant? 5 Yes, I did. Α. 6 When did you get that affidavit? 0. 7 It was within -- I don't recall the 8 exact date, but it was within a week of August 9 30th. 10 So several days and as long as a week Q. before the execution of the warrant, you received 11 12 a copy of the affidavit? 13 Yes, that's correct. Now, was that affidavit at that time 14  $Q_{\bullet}$ 15 signed; in other words, had it been signed and 16 authorized by a United States magistrate? 17 Α. No, sir. 18 So you were given a copy of the Q. 19 affidavit that was going to be presented to the 20 magistrate? 21 Α. That's correct. 22 You read that affidavit? 0. 23 Yes, I did. Α. 24 What did you do with regard to that Ω.

affidavit and the other search team members?

I met with the arrest team leader,

25

Α.

3

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Frank Flores, because as part of the arrest, our search team assisted in the arrest of Mr. Castro-Ramos. So I was present for part of the

- 0. Now, so in other words, as far as you know, only Agent Reilly, Lyons, Caldwell and yourself as members of the search team were required to and did, in fact, read the affidavit?
  - Α. Yes, sir.

planning of the arrest.

- During these discussions with those Q. agents, did you discuss with them the kinds of evidence or the type of evidence that they would be permitted to seize at the residence of Elias Castro-Ramos in the event the magistrate actually did authorize that warrant?
- Α. Yes, we did. There was a two-page addendum that each of them read. And we discussed that addendum which listed the particular items that we could seize.
  - What did you discuss? Q.
- We discussed the procedures that we would follow in seizing each individual item of evidence. I described to the team members that I would be assigning them specific locations within the residence. And that as they located each

piece of evidence which they thought would fall within the warrant, that they were to identify that piece of evidence to me. And then I would make the final determination whether that fit within the warrant.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the Court has a copy, has part of the copy, filed in the records of this case, of the search warrant and written affidavit. I have another complete copy, and it's sixty-seven pages long. Rather than file that, I would propose simply that I file the two-page addendum, that it would be sufficient for my purposes.

If counsel wants an extra copy of the warrant filed, I'll do that. But I don't think it's necessary to file an additional sixty-seven page document with the Court -- not an additional, it would be a duplicate of what's already on file.

MS. POLAN: I just want to clarify with the Clerk, Your Honor, that the search warrant affidavit is in the file somewhere because I'm not clear about that. I have no objection to what Mr. Dabrowski is saying if it is on file. But I'm not totally convinced of

1 that. THE CLERK: It is. THE COURT: I believe it is on 3 Is that right, Madam Clerk? file. THE CLERK: Yes. Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: The Clerk reassures me. 7 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) I show you 0. 8 Government Exhibit 23 for identification. 9 (Handing) 10 Would you examine that document and 11 tell us if you recognize it? 12  $\Lambda$ That's the addendum that we Yes, sir. 13 used in conducting the search of Mr. 14 Castro-Ramos' house. Now, tell us in terms first of the 15 Q. 16 briefing sessions -- well, first in terms of 17 briefing sessions, how did you utilize that 18 document, those two pages, in briefing the 19 agencts that were members of your search team as to what items they could or should not seize in 20 21 connection with the search? 22 Α. Well, during the briefing session this 23 document was essential. This listed particular 24 items that we could seize during the searches.

And the team members were made aware of that.

These were the items that could be seized.

- Q. Explain in a little more detail why you considered that document essential?
- A. Well, this listed the individual items that could be seized, and it's a very extensive list. Therefore -- well, it's almost impossible for anyone to memorize this list. This was going to be our guide for conducting the search, this two-page addendum.
- Q. Now, did you, in fact, remove those two pages from the warrant itself?
  - A. Yes, I did.

- Q. For what purpose?
- A. For my own use during the search as the search team leader. In fact, during the execution of the warrant, I kept this with me on the table that I was using for writing out the inventory. And at various times throughout the execution of the warrant, I needed to refer to this list to see if a particular item fell within the warrant.
- Q. This list is -- this particular exhibit consisting of two pages which you removed from the warrant itself and kept right in front of you during the search?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. All right. Let's go back first to the briefing session. I assume there came a time when you were notified that the search was going to take place?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And when did that happen, and how did it happen?
- A. The final notification came on the morning of August 30th. I received notification about 2:30 in the morning.
  - Q: How did you receive that?
- A. I received a telephone call from Special Agent Clow at my residence.
  - Q. Do you recall what Agent Clow told you?
- A. He told me that -- I don't recall the specific words. But he told me that it was a go for August 30th, for that morning, and to go ahead and pick up my team members, and to respond to the predesignated location.
- Q. So Agent Clow called you, said it was a go. And then did you, in turn, call the rest of the search team?
  - A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. You assembled at a predetermined

location?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Generally what time did you assemble at this location?
- A. I don't recall exactly the time. It was before 5:00 in the morning.
- Ω. Just generally, what happened when your team came together at that location?
- A. We were given a short general briefing again. It was an extension of the continual briefings that I had been giving the team members up until that point. We went over our plan once again for arrest and the search. And then we proceeded to an area near Mr. Castro-Ramos' residence.
- Q. When you say, "We", are you referring to the arrest team, the security team and the search team?
- A. Yes, sir. The search team, they were all in my vehicle. I drove them to the location.
- Q. All right. And again, so the record will be clear, they are Agents Reilly, Lyons, Caldwell and yourself?
  - A. Yes, sir.
    - Ω. Now, what time did you arrive in the

Q. Now, at that particular time, I assume you did not have the copy -- you could not have had a copy of the warrant that the magistrate

22

23

24

25

been signed.

actually signed?

- A. No, I did not.
- Q. Could you just generally describe to us how it was that you gained entry in the residence; tell us what happened in connection with the arrest and the search as far as you were concerned?

THE COURT: Can we ascertain the time when he received that notification that it had been signed?

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Do you recall what time you had been notified that the warrant had actually been signed?
- A. I don't recall the exact time, Your Honor. It was prior to the arrest. The notification went out to all teams.
- Q. Tell us how you went about executing the warrant; first, how did you gain entry to the residence of Elias Castro-Ramos?
- A. Entry was gained during the arrest of Mr. Castro-Ramos. Myself and Agent Reilly covered the back of Mr. Castro-Ramos' house.

  Agent Lyons was in the -- in my automobile monitoring the radio. And the other agents were in the front of the residence.

After knocking and announcing they had an arrest warrant and a search warrant for Mr.

Castro-Ramos, entrance to his residence was subsequently obtained by forcing his door through use of a sledgehammer.

Q. Were you able to hear and observe things while at the back of the residence?

A. I could not hear -- I could hear a discussion in loud voices. I could not hear the exact words, no, sir.

Q. Now, in connection with the actual

- Q. Now, in connection with the actual search itself, there came a time when you went inside the residence?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Tell us how that happened, where you vent?
- A. After the arrest of Mr. Castro-Ramos, I proceeded to the front of the residence. And at that time he was handcuffed. Shortly thereafter, he was placed in a bureau vehicle and transported from the scene. At that point once the -- as I recall there were two minor children in the house that had to be taken care of.

Once the residence was free of any other individuals, then we proceeded with our

bomb expert, Mr. Lyons, and he made the sweep of the house. Mr. Reilly, Agent Reilly took the photographs. And then we entered and eventually proceeded with the search.

Q. Now, would you just -- first generally describe how the search was conducted; where were you located, and what did you do?

A. I was in an area which was off of the kitchen. It was a dining area that was one room, a dining, living area. There was a table where I located myself. I had inventory papers, a copy of this addendum.

And I would assign the agents to proceed to individual rooms in the residence, search those and when they located an item of evidence, to bring it to me. I would determine if that item fell within the scope of the warrant. And if it did, then we would initial a label which we placed on the bag containing the item of evidence. And then I logged it in on the inventory form.

- Q. Government Exhibit 27, the two-page addendum, that was located on the table?
- A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. And --

MS. POLAN: Excuse me, Your Honor. Mr. Dabrowski referred to that before as 2 Government Exhibit 23, and I'd just like to know 3 which it is. MR. DABROWSKI: It's Government Exhibit 23. 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. It was on the table during the search. And as items of evidence were brought to me at various times, I had to refer to this addendum. 11 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Now, who were the Q. agents that were bringing the items to you? 12 13 There were the members of the search team: Agents Lyons, Caldwell and Reilly. In 14 addition, one of the security team members, Agent 15 Homero Rivera, he also was used to collect 16 17 evidence. THE COURT: Would you repeat that 18 19 name? THE WITNESS: Homero, H O M E R O, 20 21 Rivera, R I V E R A. THE COURT: His station was which 22 23 -- what was his position? 24 THE WITNESS: He was part of the

25

security team.

THE COURT: Security team.

THE WITNESS: But our plan prior to the search was that if the security team members were not fully occupied keeping the location secure, that they could be used as evidence gatherers, which he was.

And prior to his being used, he was -he read the addendum of the search warrant so he
knew what he could search for.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Who is the person, if there was one person, who made the decision as to whether or not to seize any particular item?
  - A. I did.
  - Q. How did you make that decision?
- A. Based upon my knowledge of the warrant and the addendum. And as I say, on many occasions, I had to refer back to the addendum.

  And also we discussed it among ourselves, certain pieces of evidence, whether to seize them or not.
- Q. So if Agent Reilly found a piece of item -- a piece of evidence or an item that he was interested in, he would bring that item to you?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. And you would then make the

determination as to whether or not to seize, that is, take possession of that item pursuant to this warrant?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Was there any instance during this particular search when that didn't happen; that is, when someone else made the decision to seize the evidence?
  - A. No. never.
- Q. Was there anyone other than Homero
  Rivera and the other three agents who actually
  participated in bringing items to you for this
  decision?
  - A. No.
- Q. Did you, yourself, participate in the search in the sense that you actually go in and search a room; or were you simply coordinating it at this table?
- A. I was coordinating it at the table; however, on those occasions where there was no evidence for me to log in or to make decisions about, I would get up from the table, go to the individual rooms to see how the search was proceeding.
  - Q. Now, did there come a time when a

quantity of -- well, excuse me.

Was the wife of Elias Castro present in the residence at the time of the search?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Was she present at all times?
- A. No. She would leave the residence, go out to the front of the house to talk with friends or a female that identified herself as her attorney.
- Q. Was that female who identified herself as an attorney, was that individual permitted to enter the premises?
  - A. No, she was not.
- Q. Did you have a conversation with either the attorney or the wife of Elias Castro-Ramos concerning the search warrant itself, the signed copy?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Of the search warrant. Tell us about that conversation?
- A. Well, the only conversation I recall with the attorney was, upon leaving the residence, she was given a copy of the inventory and requested to sign the inventory which she refused. With Mr. Castro-Ramos' wife, there were

various conversations throughout the execution of 2 the search warrant. Was the attorney and Elias 3 0. Castro-Ramos' wife given a copy of the warrant once it arrived? Yes, they were. Did you have a conversation with the 8 attorney --THE COURT: Excuse me, what time 10 was that? THE WITNESS: I don't recall, Your 11 12 Honor. On my search log I noted the time that we 13 sent Agent Homero Rivera to pick up the warrant. 14 THE COURT: When was that? THE WITNESS: I'd have to review 15 the search log. I believe it was around 8:30. 16 17 THE COURT: It may be in for identification, the log. 18 19 Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Showing you 20 Government Exhibits 24 A and 24 B, would you 21 identify those? 22 Twenty-four A is the search 302 Α. Yes. 23 which I prepared subsequent to the search at Mr. 24 Castro-Ramos' residence on August 30, 1985.

24 B is the search log that I prepared on August

	30, 1985.	
~	MR. DABROWSKI; Your Honor, I would	
<b>m</b>	move for the full admission of Government	
	Exhibits 23, which is the addendum, 24 A and	
<b>₽</b>	24 B.	
•	THE COURT; Without objection, full	
~	exhibit.	
<b>30</b>		
<b>o</b>	/ernment's Exhib	
0.	offered and marked into evidence)	
	overnment's Exhibit	
13	offered and marked into evidence)	
	(Government's Exhibit 24B offered and marked into	
*	idence)	
51		
91	Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) That's the search	
~	log you testified about or a copy of it, is that	
20	correct?	
9	A. Yes, sir.	
8	Q. From looking at that document, can you	
2.1	tell us what time that the warrant itself arrived	
22	or approximately what time?	
23	A. Well, this shows that at 7:30 a.m.	
<b>5</b> *	Agent Homero Rivera left to pick up the original	
75	warrant. But I did not write down at what time	

the warrant arrived.

- Q. Agent Williamson, this search log is in your handwriting, is that correct?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Ω. Could you just, so that it will be intelligible to us, take us down and very briefly explain these entries?
- A. Okay. Well, at the top of the log, that's the file number of the case and the identification of the location where the search was conducted. At 6:55 a.m., that's the first entry, that's the arrest.

And I wrote down the subject's wife and two children were present, that the subject was notified that there was an arrest and a search warrant. At 7:00 a.m., the subject was transported, a bomb sweep was started and the search. At 7:15 a.m. the photos and the sketch were commenced of the residence. And at 7:30 the agent left to -- Agent Homero Rivera left to pick up the original warrant.

At 7:50, an automobile with license plate 23 A 270 arrived at the house with a Puerto Rican male and female of whom we took photographs. They met with Mr. Castro-Ramos'

1 wife. That vehicle departed at 8:00 a.m. 2 the actual search for items pursuant to the warrant started at 8:30 a.m. 3 At 9:45 a.m., a briefcase was located 4 5 containing money, masks, a ledger, keys, notebook, phone numbers, names and addresses and 7 some revolutionary-type documents. And at 10:45 a.m., the money which was located in that briefcase was counted as \$863. At 12:55 p.m., Castro-Ramos' wife and her attorney reviewed the 10 documents and refused to sign the documents. 11 12 Q. Those documents, that was the 13 inventory? Α. Yes, sir. 14 THE COURT: Had you completed at 15 that time, 12:55? 16 17 THE WITNESS: Yes, we had. Then at 1:06 p.m., we were clear of the 18 residence. And we arrived at our evidence 19 control center at 1:48 p.m. 20 21 Ω. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) At 10:45 a.m. there 22 is an entry on the log, that says money counted. It's \$863? 23 24 Α. Yes, sir.

Could you tell us first of all, did you

25

0.

1 have a discussion with the attorney about whether 2 or not to seize that money? Not that I recall. 3 Α. Did you have a discussion with Elias  $\Omega$  . 5 Castro's wife concerning whether or not you should seize that money? 7 We had a lengthy discussion among team members which included myself calling the command post at our office on two separate occasions 10 concerning the money. 11 Did you make that call at the request Q. 12 or insistance of the attorney? 13 Α. No, sir. 14 Q. The addendum, Government Exhibit 23, 15 speaks in terms of seizing money in amounts over a thousand dollars, is that correct? 16 17 That's correct. Α. This was clearly an amount under one 18 0. thousand dollars? 19 A. That's correct. 20 21 Q. Did you seize that money? 22 Α. No, we did not. 23 Could you tell us what went into the 24 decision-making process that ultimately resulted

in your decision not to seize that money?

- ١ Well, the -- there were several things. Α. The fact that the money was less than one 2 The serial numbers on the ten thousand dollars. 3 dollar bills and twenty dollar bills, I called 5 those in to our command post. And those serial numbers did not match with any numbers that we 7 were looking for. And the specific instructions of the individual that I spoke to at the command post. 10
  - Q. Were not to seize the money?
  - Yes, sir. Α.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

- Now, you indicated that that money as well as other items were found in a briefcase, is that correct?
  - Α. That's correct.
- Showing you Government Exhibits 18, 19, Q. 20 and 22, do you recognize those photographs? (Handing)
  - Α. Yes, I do.
- Q. Would you tell us what items are depicted in those photographs?
- Α. Government's Exhibit 20, that's a photograph of the briefcase and the items that were located within the briefcase. Government's Exhibit 18 and 19 are photographs, more close up

,

photographs, of specific items that were located within the briefcase. And Government's Exhibit 22, this is not the briefcase, this was a hand basket that contained two wigs, two walkie-talkies, some plastic gloves and some gun cleaning brushes.

- Q. Did you have a conversation with Elias Castro's wife, first -- when you first entered concerning whether or not you would find items of evidentiary value in that house?
- A. Yes, I did. We had several discussions.
  - Q. What was -- what did she say?
- A. Well, throughout the first part of the search, she repeated on several occasions that she could not understand why we were searching the residence, that we would not find any evidence within the residence.
- Q. Did there come a time when the material depicted in these photographs was in effect laid out in the living room in her presence?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. At that particular time, for example, in connection with the money, you were trying to make a determination as to whether or not to

actually seize it, is that correct?

)

A. Yes, sir. I -- at that point I recall specifically that I asked Mr. Castro-Ramos' wife, after we found this briefcase with the evidence inside it, what she thought of what we had found because she had said that we wouldn't find anything. And at that point she stopped talking to us.

- Q. Did she have any -- was there any other kind of a reaction from her?
- A. It was -- her silence was quite a reaction. She sat down in a chair, turned her eyes up towards the ceiling and refused to say anything more to us.
- Q. She didn't explain to you that some of these items may, in fact, for example, have come from the grandparents or belonged to the children?
- A. No, she said absolutely nothing about the items.
- Q. Now, are you certain that you don't recall a conversation with the attorney about whether or not you should seize this money?
- A. No, sir. I don't recall that conversation. The attorney was outside of the

22

23

24

25

Showing you Government Exhibit 25 for identification -actually I believe without objection, I can move that for a full exhibit.

MS. POLAN: No objection.

THE COURT: Full exhibit.

.

(Government's Exhibit 25 offered and marked into evidence)

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I would also note for the record -- let me -- I'll ask the agent.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Agent Williamson, is that a copy of the inventory?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, for the record, the Government is making a full exhibit at this time of a copy of the inventory. The defense intends to introduce in their portion of the case, without objection from the Government, a copy of a subinventory, which is more particularized in nature. So that the Court will not be confused, this is the inventory. There will also be a subinventory, a more particularized inventory utilized in connection with the defense.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Agent Williamson, this is the document that was prepared at the residence in your presence, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you tell us what it is and explain it to us?

A.

prepared at Mr. Castro-Ramos' house during the search. On each page it's broken down into columns. We gave each item seized an item number, and I described the items seized.

This is the evidence inventory that I

 I gave a description of the place where the item was found and I put the initials of the searching agent that located the item of evidence. And there is a remarks column where we could put in any specific remarks that I thought were appropriate.

Q. Page 1 refers to room area number, and it says, "Carport"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under the item description, it says, "Nothing taken." I presume that nothing was seized from the carport?

A. That's correct.

Q. Similarly from bedroom B, which is page 2, nothing was taken; I assume that nothing was taken from bedroom B?

A. That's correct.

Q. Now, on page 3, the room or area that

1 was searched was bedroom C, is that correct? 2 A. That's correct. Now, under the column, Item 3 Description, that is a description of the item that was seized? 5 A. Yes, sir. 7 And who made that entry? I did. A. Q. In fact, did your signature appear on that page as well as the other pages from here on 10 after? 11 Yes, sir. My signature appears on each 12 13 page. The place found, the first entry would 14 0. be closet. Now, you yourself did not -- could 15 you tell from this form who seized the first 16 item, C 11 from the closet? 17 Yes, sir. The initials D A R appear A. under the initials. And that's Agent Dan Reilly. That's the photographer? Q. 20 Yes, sir. Α.  $\Omega$ . Who is now participating in the search? 22 That's right. 23 Α. 24 Now, how do you know that he found that Q.

item in the closet?

A. He told me.

1

2

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. So the entry under "Place Found" is in your handwriting based upon information you received from the agent who brought the item to you?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that agent, that agent's initials are placed there by "Agent" in that column by you, is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir, that's my handwriting.
- Q. Is there any entry on this page 3 that was not made by you?
  - A. No, sir.
- Q. The entries in this Evidence Inventory

  Form were made by you based upon personal

  knowledge or based upon information you received

  from the agents that were there participating in

  the search?
  - A. That's true.
  - Q. D A R is Agent Reilly, is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
    - Q. All right. J H R is who?
- A. That's Agent Homero Rivera.
- Q. And J D C?
- A. That's agent John Caldwell.

Q. J L?

1

2

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That's agent James Lyons.
- Q. Now, you previously examined this Evidence Inventory Form?
  - A. Yes. I have.
- Q. Is it fair to say that only those four agents brought items of evidence to you which were seized?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. During the course of the execution of this search warrant, did you have occasion to make a decision as to whether or not to seize books?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. In fact, were some books brought to you by the other agents?
  - A. Yes, sir.
  - Q. Did you seize those items?
- A. I recall seizing pamphlets and photocopied papers. I don't recall actual hardcover books being seized.
- Q. Do you recall whether or not the agents actually picked up and looked at hardcover books?
  - A. Yes, sir, they did.
  - Q. For example, was there a book by Lenin

at that residence, if you recall? 2 I don't recall. A. Do you know whether you seized a book 3 0. by Lenin from that residence? 5 I don't recall seizing a book by Lenin. Α. You did seize some pamphlets? 0. 7 Yes, sir. Α. 8 Did you make a determination regardless Q. 9 of whether or not you can recall a book, the 10 specific title or author of a book, did you make a determination not to take certain books? 11 12 Yes, sir. Α. 13 All right. And you similarly -- excuse Q. me -- you also made a decision to seize certain 14 15 pamphlets? 16 Yes, sir. 17 What is it that caused to you seize 18 pamphlets; and what is it that caused you not to 19 seize books? 20 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I have to 21 object to books. There were so many written 22 materials seized. I think Mr. Dabrowski should 23 be more specific as to what pamphlet he is 24 referring to. They seized hundreds and hundreds 25 of written documents. I have no idea what he's

referring to. And I'm not sure the agent does, but I certainly don't. If he's referring to a particular political pamphlet or a photocopy of a book, I'd like to know what.

ŧ

THE COURT: You'll have the chance to cross examine him, but you're talking in generalities now.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'll withdraw the question.

THE COURT: Under what authority did you take it into your custody. When you looked at a pamphlet, under what authority did you take it into your custody. Then we'll get the point.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'll rephrase the question.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) What, Agent Williamson, what did you use to determine whether or not to seize a particular item, whether it was a book, a pamphlet or whatever?
- A. I used the two-page addendum from the search warrant.
  - Q. And tell us exactly how you used that?
- A. Well, as each item of evidence was brought to me, and I'll say more so in the

beginning than as the search progressed, I would refer to this addendum to see whether that specific piece of evidence was listed on the addendum. And if it were, then we would seize it. If the document or book did not fall within the addendum, we did not seize it.

And at various times if one of the agents had a question, I would have a discussion with that agent whether it fell within the addendum. And I'd make my decision based upon that discussion and how I read the addendum.

Q: Agent Williamson, directing your attention to Government Exhibit 23, that is the addendum. I gather, then, you will not admit that those paragraphs did not aid you in determining — did not aid you in determining what to seize and not to seize?

A. No, sir. These were essential in that -- this addendum was essential in my making my decisions as to what to seize and what not to seize.

- Q. Did you consider your authority to be unlimited; that is, that you could take anything you wanted to?
  - A. No, sir. My understanding was that I

,

could only take what was particularly described in the warrant.

Q. Did you at any time abandon the warrant, abandon that addendum and seize items simply by instinct?

A. No, sir.

Q. Had you, in fact, reviewed, not only yourself but with other agents, in detail, the affidavit and the addendum which was signed by Magistrate Arenas on that morning?

A. That's correct.

Q: In fact, did there come a time when that warrant itself was brought back to the residence by Agent Homero Rivera and, in fact, a copy of that was given to Mr. Castro-Ramos' wife?

A. That's correct.

MR. DABROWSKI: I have nothing further, Your Honor.

MS. POLAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

Your Honor, I think it might make things easier for the Court. I have extra copies of the addendum and the subinventory which I have for the Court, and I've mentioned it to Mr. Dabrowski.

```
1
                   THE COURT: I think I have a copy
    here of the inventory.
2
                   MS. POLAN: The inventory I'm going
    to use is a lot more detailed, the subinventory.
    And I have a copy of the addendum for the Court
    as well. Perhaps they should be marked as
7
    Court's exhibits?
                   THE COURT: Very well. What's the
     difference between the two so I'll know
     immediately?
10
                   MS. POLAN: Well, I can have the
11
     agent testify but --
12
13
                   THE COURT: No, you tell me in your
     own words first.
14
                   MS. POLAN: The subinventory lists
15
     what was actually taken. That inventory you have
16
     will have a category. It will say, "C 11, brown
17
     file with revolutionary materials." On this
18
     subinventory, it lists everything that was in
19
     C 11.
20
21
                   THE COURT: This is --
22
                   MS. POLAN: This is a more complete
23
     document.
24
                   THE COURT: This is a subinventory
25
     so-called, right?
```

MS. POLAN: Yes. There is a detailed list of what was taken out of the house 2 that was --THE COURT: You're going to mark that as what? MS. POLAN: I can make that either a defendants' exhibit or Court's exhibit. But I 1 have a copy, extra copy for the Court. Let's make it a defendants' exhibit. THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, may 10 the interpreters have a copy also, please. 11 MS. POLAN: I don't have another 12 13 copy. THE INTERPRETER: Could we please 14 request that from now on an extra copy be made 15 16 for the interpreters of any document that's going to be referred to in court. 17 THE COURT: Maybe we have one here. 18 (Handing) 19 THE INTERPRETER: Thank you very 20 much. 21 22 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I have also -- I have a copy of the addendum for the Court. That's already in evidence so perhaps I

could just give it to Your Honor.

1 (Handing) THE COURT: Thank you. 2 MS. POLAN: The third thing I have, 1 Your Honor, this is -- I don't know if you want this marked. This is the three pages of the Government's exhibit list that has to do with 7 exhibits taken -- that are on the exhibit list that are from Mr. Castro's house. I've shown this to Mr. Dabrowski. Just so the Court will 10 have it, these are the things from Mr. Castro's house that the Government does intend to 11 introduce at trial. 12 13 (Handing) 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 MS. POLAN: This is the 16 subinventory, Your Honor. 17 (Handing) MS. POLAN: What's that marking? 18 19 THE CLERK: Forty-two. 20 MS. POLAN: The subinventory is 21 marked Defendant's 42 for identification. 22 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, Mr. Dabrowski has indicated he has no objection to 23 24 making that document a full exhibit, that

25

subinventory.

,

(Defendant's Exhibit 42 offered and marked into evidence)

## CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. POLAN

Q. Now, Agent Williamson, I think you testified that you've been in Puerto Rico, assigned to Puerto Rico since July of 1984?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And you testified also that you were not involved in the investigation of the Macheteros prior to August 30th of 1985?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Were you assigned to some kind of terrorism squad in San Juan?
  - A. No, I was not.
  - Q. What was your assignment in San Juan?
- A. Prior to August 30th, I worked organized crime.
- Q. All right. I think you testified that prior to your assignment as the search team leader for this arrest, you had no prior involvement in the investigation of Elias Castro?

- ١ That's correct. Α. And so it would be fair to say you had 2 3 no knowledge about Mr. Castro? Α. That is correct. 5 Did you have any information about him 0. 6 prior to your assignment as the search team 7 leader? 8 Α. No. I did not. Did you know who he was? Q. 10 No. I did not. Α. I think you testified that sometime 11 0. in -- approximately a month before August 30th, 12 you were given this assignment? 13 That's correct. 14 Α. 15 Q. And is that the same time that the 16 other members of your team got their assignments? I think I was probably notified prior 17 Α. to their receiving notification. 18 All right. And you testified on direct 19 Q. 20 examination that you briefed each one of the search team members separately and in groups? That's correct. Α.
  - O. Several times?

24

- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And you said that was after

they arrived. And I take that to mean they all came to San Juan from somewhere else? A. That's correct. None of them were assigned to San Juan? Ο. That's correct. Α. Can you tell me approximately in what Q. period of time those briefings took place? Those briefings took place Α. approximately over a two-week period. Q. Prior to August 30th? Α. That's correct. 0. So between the 15th and the 30th? I can't tell you exactly if it was the 15th but --More or less? 0. Α. Approximately a two-week period. Can you just generally tell me what it Q. is you did -- well, question withdrawn. The first time you met with the search team, was that individual meetings or a collective meeting? The first time I met with the team members is when I transported some of the members when they flew into Puerto Rico to where they

were staying. I don't recall exactly which

2

)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

members those were.

- Q. So you had a conversation in the car?
- A. That's correct.
- $\Omega$ . At that time did you discuss the -- question withdrawn.

At that time did you have the search warrant affidavit in your possession?

- A. No, I did not.
- Q. All right. So at that discussion in the car, you didn't discuss the affidavit, the allegations in the affidavit with them?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. What did you discuss with them?
- A. I think at that point, at the very beginning of this approximate two-week period, those were very general discussions of what would happen, what our responsibilities would be as a search team.
- Q. And is it fair to say that those discussions had nothing to do with the particulars of this investigation or this search in terms of what was being sought in the search?
- A. I don't recall the specifics of those discussions. They were very general at the

beginning of the two-week period.

- Q. You didn't have the affidavit, the proposed affidavit at that time?
  - A. No, I did not.

- Q. And you didn't have the addendum at that time, did you?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. All right. What was the next time you recall having any kind of briefing with the search team members?
- A. During the period from the time that I picked up the search team members until August 30th, I had continual meetings. I don't recall exactly how many, but those would be on an almost daily basis. Because I was their contact with the San Juan F B I office and with this case and with their assignments.
- Q. So all of the information they received came from you?
- A. That's correct, from me and from the documents that I provided them to read.
- Q. Now, you said in your direct testimony that there came a time when you were provided with a copy of the proposed affidavit for the search warrant?

1 A. That's correct. And at that point the affidavit had not 2 ) been signed? That's correct. 5 All right. Can you tell me approximately when that was when you received the 7 affidavit? I don't know exactly when that was but it was within the week prior to the August 30th 10 search. All right. And you testified on direct 11 Ω. 12 examination that you took that affidavit to one 13 of the briefing sessions? 14 That's correct. Α. 15 What did you -- how did that --Ο. question withdrawn. 16 17 Did you have copies of the affidavit or 18 just one copy? 19 A. I had one copy. 20 Q. All right. So you read it to the other 21 agents? 22 Α. No, each one of them read it. 23 So they each sat down and read a Q. 24 sixty-nine page affidavit in your presence?

25

Α.

That's correct.

1 About how long did it take each of them Q. to read it? 2 I don't recall. Our sessions would 3 last several hours. 4 So you sat in a room while somebody • Q. read the affidavit to himself? That's correct. Α. 3 All right. Then what happened after he . Q. would read it to himself? We would discuss what our duties were 10 and how we were planning to proceed with the 11 search, among other things. 12 Now, at that time did you also have 0. 13 this Addendum 2? 14 I don't recall. Α. 15  $\Omega$ . Now, other than that one time where you 16 had each of the agents read the affidavit, were 17 they ever provided with copies of the affidavit? 18 Their own copies? I don't recall. A. 19 So it's your best recollection that you brought it to a briefing session approximately a 21 week before August 30th, they each read it once, 22 23 and you had some discussion about it? 24 Α. There were several of these briefing

sessions. I don't recall whether they all read

1 8

10 11

12

14

18

19 20

22

24

25

the affidavit at that first session when I brought the affidavit. Each one of them was required to read it. And they read it in my presence.

- On one occasion each?
- At least once.
- All right. But as far as you know, you didn't provide them with copies to take with them?
  - As far as I recall. I don't remember.
- Your best recollection is that you 0. didn't have Addendum 2 at that time?
- I don't remember whether I had it or not at those initial briefing sessions. I had it several days prior to the search. And at least at one of those occasions prior to the search, we would have discussed the addendums.
- Now, do you specifically remember having a briefing session where you discussed the addendum?
  - Yes, I do. Α.
- Do you remember any of the discussions Q. that took place about it?
- Well, we discussed what items we could seize.

understanding of this Addendum 2 was that there

2

3

4

5

1

10

11

13

14

15

16

20

24

25

was no time limitation with respect to the dates

Its just a yes or no question. Could

(Record read as requested)

THE WITNESS: No, that's not

- (BY MS. POLAN) What was your
- I think if we had found some ancient bank records, we would not have seized those.
  - What's your definition of ancient?
- I guess -- well, I can't define that, but I guess if they were extremely old and had no possible relevance to this case, I would not have
- Is that because the warrant contained a limitation with respect to the time period or was that a limitation that you would have imposed
- I think based upon, at the time, my knowledge of Mr. Castro-Ramos' participation in a

affidavit and the fact that these items listed in the addendum are based upon the fact that they had contained evidence of specific crimes which are listed in the addendum.

- Q. So based on your knowledge of the investigation, would you have permitted the seizure of a bank statement from 1969?
- A. I don't -- I don't know whether I would have or not. The fact is that issue did not specifically arise during -- the fact whether or not to seize a bank statement because of its age -- that issue did not arise during the search of Mr. Castro-Ramos' residence.
- Q. But when one of the search team agents asked you about bank statements, you told them that the warrant authorized you to take any bank statements, is that correct?
  - A. As I recall.
  - Q. All right.

THE COURT: Just so that it will be clear to me, whatever bank statements there were, I haven't examined them. Do you know now how far back they did go? Was it 1980, 1977, if you know?

١ THE WITNESS: I don't know, Your ? Honor. THE COURT: All right. ) Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Do you remember any • other questions any of the agents asked about this Addendum 2 when you discussed it? 1 Α. I recall the -- there was quite a bit . of concern about explosive devices. 0. About whether they could be seized? 10 About whether they would be found at Λ. Mr. Castro-Ramos' residence. 11 12 That has nothing to do with the Q. 13 question of what could be seized? 14 Α. Well, it was explosives. 15 MR. DABROWSKI: I'll object to the 16 question as being irrelevant, Your Honor. The 17 whole line of inquiry is irrelevant. 18 happened at that briefing did have, in fact, 19 nothing to do with the ultimate question to be 20 resolved; that was, what was seized and was the 21 seizure overly broad. 22 THE COURT: What was the measure, 23 that was the question. Can we stay within a

MS. POLAN:

Yes.

I think if Agent

24

25

peripheral of --

Z

.

,

4

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

70

21

22

23

24

25

Williamson believes there is or isn't a

limitation with respect to any particular thing
in the warrant, that would help the Court in

making its ultimate determinations in this matter
about this warrant.

THE COURT: Simple question. Was he -- was it unlimited in time, as far as the documents were concerned?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, as far as the documents were concerned, I did not consider myself limited in time.

MS. POLAN: Fine.

THE COURT: All right.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, other than questions about the possible presence of explosives, did the agents ask you any other questions about what could be seized when you discussed Addendum 2?
- A. Yes, they did. But I don't recall the specific questions.
- Q. Do you remember the specific categories they asked you about?
- A. I think we discussed almost every category or we discussed every category.
  - Q. Now, that was a discussion you had with

But you had the only copy when you went

25

Q.

Dabrowski doesn't want to give me his copy of the

4

7

5

.

10

11

12

13

16

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

search warrant. So I would ask the Clerk if she could find the original that's in the files. just want to ask the agent as to the time he put on the warrant, that he executed it. And Mr. Dabrowski doesn't want to let me show it to him for that purpose.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, that's not the reason that I just want to --

THE COURT: Let's not quibble over nothing. There are many important things here. Let's not waste time on things like that.

- Q: (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, showing you Defendant's Exhibit 43 for identification, which I believe is the search warrant, and directing your attention to the second page, can you tell me what time you wrote on that that you executed the search warrant?
  - Α. 6:55 a.m.
- That's correct, is it not; that's the Q. right time?
  - That's the time that I wrote on there. Α.
- That you executed the search warrant. 0. Were you telling the truth?

THE COURT: Careful now, counsellor. The one I have says 6:55 a.m.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this is the
agent himself. That's his handwritten notes when
he came in the house. This is what he put on the
warrant on the return.
Q. (BY MS. POLAN) That's your
handwriting, is it not?
A. It appears to be, yes.
MS. POLAN: I would offer this.
Any objection?
MR. DABROWSKI: I have no
objection, Your Honor.
efendant's Exhibi
orrered and marked into evidence)
THE COURT; Who served the arrest
warrant?
THE WITNESS: Agent the agents
that arrested Castro-Ramos announced both that
they had a warrant for his arrest and to search
his premises.
THE COURT: Your search commenced
when?
THE WITNESS: Your Honor, I put on
my search log that the actual search for items,

5

ŧ

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

Q.

6:55?

22

23 24

25

That's correct. Α.

when the agents actually started going to the rooms and looking for items, was at 8:30 in the morning. We were at the residence at -- 6:55 a.m. is when the, as far as my log is concerned, that's when we announced to Mr. Castro-Ramos that there was a warrant for his arrest and to search his residence.

THE COURT: But the search, you claim on this memo, didn't start until 8:30 a.m., is that it?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. By the log. That's what I mean when I say the search started. Prior to that time we had already photographed the scene, we had been in the residence sweeping for explosive devices. We were in charge of the residence at that point.

THE COURT: That's clear.

MS. POLAN: If the Court would like to -- that's the exhibit with the return.

return, in the place where it said the time that

the search warrant was executed, you put down

(Handing)

(BY MS. POLAN) So when you filed that

- It's correct, is it not, that you were in control of the premises from that time?
  - That is correct.
- And it's also correct that in the course of the bomb sweep, that Agent Lyons looked at different things, didn't he?
- He looked at items, he examined things during his bomb search, didn't he?
- I assume that he did. I don't know. was outside of the residence.
- So it's not really correct to say that there was no search going on until 8:30; that's the time when you started picking up things and started bringing them to the table?
- That's when we started searching for items within the purview of the warrant.
- But the agents were in the house from 6:55; and some of them were looking at things, is
- There were some agents in the house
- Were they looking at things in the house?
  - They were not searching for items Α.

١ And that's the signed search warrant? Ο. 2 That's correct. All right. You testified on direct 3 Q. examination that you don't know what time it was 5 that he returned? That's correct also. 7 I notice that you didn't put down in Q. • your log what time he returned with the warrant? Α. Correct. 10 Is that because you didn't think it was 11 important when the warrant got there? 12 I don't know why I did not write that Α. 13 down. 14 Q. Well, what was your intention in making 15 this log? 16 To keep a record of certain events that 17 happened during the search. 18 Q. Was it your intention to keep a record 19 of important events? Certain of the important events, yes. 20 21 You didn't think it was important what 0. 22 time the search warrant actually arrived? I don't recall why I did not write that Α. 24 down. 25 Q. It must not have been as important as

photographing and taking the license plate down of somebody who came to the house, right?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. She's being argumentative with the witness.

THE COURT: It is -- just ask the question.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Can you tell me why you wrote down on your log that at 7:50 a.m. a Puerto Rican male and female arrived, and their license plate was written down, and they were photographed; can you tell me why you put that down on your log?

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the sole issue is overbreadth of the search warrant. This question is completely irrelevant to that issue.

MS. POLAM: Your Honor, I think

it's certainly a proper cross examination with

respect to what this log is worth in the Court's,

you know, in the Court's review of the log, what

he chooses to put on it, what he chooses to leave

off of it.

MR. DABROWSKI: What Ms. Polan thinks is relevant is also irrelevant, Your

Honor. Neither her statements nor the area she's inquiring into have any relevance whatsoever on this issue.

THE COURT: Well, it gets down, really, to an argument. In other words, if you put down this trivia, why didn't you put down when the warrant came. And let him answer it if he can. If he can't, say, "I don't know why. I was so busy, I didn't get to it", or -- I don't know what he's going to say. I don't know how it's going to help one way or the other.

time that that vehicle arrived and the individuals were meeting with Mr. Castro-Ramos' wife, myself and the other agents were extremely concerned for our own safety. And we didn't know if these were other members of the terrorist organization that were coming to attack us.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) What did you do with that license plate number; did you phone it in?
  - A. I don't recall.
- Q. Is that also the reason that you photographed all of the neighbors who came to observe the search?
  - A. I did not photograph anybody.

.

Q. Well, did you instruct Agent Reilly to take photographs of the people who were standing outside the house during the search?

- A. I instructed Agent Reilly to take a photograph of the -- that vehicle that arrived at 7:50 a.m.
- Q. Do you know why he would have taken photographs of other people who were outside the house during --

THE COURT: How is that going to help the Court in any way? We could go through this, all the trivia of all of this. It isn't going to help me to make the decision you're looking for. Why don't you get to the meat of it.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, you don't remember what time the warrant came?
  - A. No, I do not.
- Q. Now, were you on the premises when Agent Lyons did this bomb sweep?
  - A. No, I was not.
  - Q. Where were you?
  - A. Outside of the residence.
  - Q. Was anybody else inside with him?
  - A. Mo.

- Q. How long did it last?
- A. I don't recall.
- Q. Now, you said that you were already at Mr. Castro's residence when you got a radio message that the warrants had been signed, is that correct?
  - A. I don't recall stating that.
- Q. Well, I believe you testified you had gotten some radio message in the car?
- A. Right. We were notified while the team was in the automobile that the warrants had been signed:
- Q. So that was somewhere between when you left the briefing session and when you arrived at Mr. Castro's house?
  - A. That's correct.
- O. So that would probably be between 5:30 and 6:30 in the morning?
- A. I don't recall the exact time. It was sometime prior to arresting Mr. Castro-Ramos.
- Q. At the briefing session itself, were you told whether or not there were signed search warrants that morning?
  - A. I don't recall.

THE COURT: It's now 11:30. Recess.

(Recess)

\*\*\*\*

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, I think we were talking about the time between when you executed the search warrant at 6:55 a.m. and when you put on your log that "8:30, search starts for items". Can you tell me what the difference is, as you understand it, between a search and a seizure?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your
Honor. That's a question of law for the Court to
decide. It doesn't --

MS. POLAN: He's a lawyer.

THE COURT: Point well taken.

Sustained. Let's get to the facts.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, is it your testimony that the agents in the house did not examine anything in the house between 6:55 and 8:30 a.m.; is that your testimony?
- A. I think my testimony was the agents were not looking for items pursuant to the warrant until 8:30 in the morning.
  - Q. What were they doing is what I'm trying

to find out?

A. They were securing the residence,
making sure that it was secure as far as bombs
and booby traps. That was the first step.

And the next step was for an agent to go in, one agent to photograph each of the rooms prior to any items being seized or the search being conducted and also a sketch to be made prior to our search for evidence.

- Q. It's your testimony that that process took an hour and a half?
- A. I don't think I've ever testified as to the time that took. But on my log I see that the search started at 8:30.
- Q. Well, what's your best recollection of how long those things took that you just described?
  - A. It took quite awhile.
  - Q. Did it take an hour and a half?
- A. On the log I see that the bomb sweep started at 7:00 a.m. The photographs began at 7:15 a.m. which would indicate that the residence was safe for the photographer to proceed.
- Q. So that means the bomb sweep was over at 7:15; is that what you mean when you say it

was safe?

ş

- A. That's what it would indicate to me.
- Q. All right. So is it your testimony that the photographing and sketching process took an hour and fifteen minutes?
- A. To the best of my knowledge, that's how long it took.
- Q. All right. And what was -- what were the other agents doing who were in the house while that process was going on?
- A. As I recall, during this time there was a problem with individuals gathering in front of the residence. And we had somewhat of a security problem. During that time I radiced to our command post to have a marked police car come to the scene at the residence. That we were again -- we were becoming concerned with the security of the agents.
- Q. Was that what all the agents were doing while the photographing was going on?
- A. As I recall, prior to the search, we also carried in the equipment that we were going to use for the search. But as to the other specific duties, I don't recall.
  - Q. So you also testified on direct

3

5

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

examination that Homero Rivera was involved in the search although he was not a member of the search team?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. He was not at any of your previous briefings where you had discussed the warrant affidavit, is that correct?
- A. That's correct. He would have been at security briefings.
- Q. So he was not at the discussion where you discussed the content of the affidavit?
  - A. He was -- the only time --
- Q. It's just a yes or no question. Was he at the briefing where you discussed the affidavit or not?
  - A. Which briefing?
- Q. Any briefing where you discussed the search warrant affidavit where you had the agents read it and you sat there?
  - A. No, not the affidavit.
- Q. And he was not at any of the briefings you had before August 30th where you discussed Addendum 2 with the search team members?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. You did testify that he read the

addendum?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Was that on the morning of August 30th?
- A. That's correct. That was at the residence.
- Q. Did you have a discussion with him about it?
  - A. No, I didn't. I don't recall.
  - Q. Did he have any questions?
  - A. I don't recall that either.
- Q. Now, you also testified that a woman who identified herself as an attorney came to the house and she was not permitted to enter?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Why was that?
- A. That was my decision that the only person that would be permitted in the residence during the search would be Mr. Castro-Ramos' wife.
- Q. Was that based on some instructions you had been given?
- A. I don't recall if I had been given specific instructions to that effect.
  - Q. Is that an F B I policy?
  - A. As far as I know, yes.

4 5

. 

Q. Now, you testified about the search and seizure of some -- question withdrawn.

You testified that at some point some money was found in a briefcase?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And you also testified that you called in to headquarters about that money?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Could you tell me what generally your conversation with headquarters was?
- A. Well, the -- we discussed whether or not we could seize the money.
- Q. Now, directing your attention to Exhibit 23, the addendum which I think you have there in front of you, was there anything unclear about that language in the warrant with respect to the amount of money you could seize?
  - A. The discussion that we -- well --
- Q. My question is: Is there anything unclear in the language of the warrant?
  - A. No.
- Q. It's pretty clear, is it not, that it just says, "Sums of money in excess of a thousand dollars and money with serial numbers that match those in the National Crime Information Center

computer"?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. So when you called in, were you given a list of any serial numbers to check this money against?
  - A. No. I called in the serial numbers.
- Q. Did someone then tell you that those weren't the serial numbers they were looking for?
- A. Yes. They told me they were not the serial numbers.
- Q. So it was your understanding that somebody at the F B I office had a list of particular serial numbers that they were interested in?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Do you know if those serial numbers had to do with money from the Wells Fargo robbery?
  - A. Which serial numbers?
- Q. Well, the serial numbers that you were asking about or being told about?
- A. It was my understanding from the warrant they were entered in the our N C I C computer.
- Q. So it was your understanding that there were serial numbers of money from the Wells Fargo

in, they checked the money at Mr. Castro's house against those serial numbers?

- A. That was my understanding that there were -- I don't know if it was specifically from the Wells Fargo robbery. But I know that there were numbers entered into the computer that would be checked against numbers that I called in.
- Q. Now, you decided after these conversations not to seize the money; why was it photographed?
- A. The first conversation I had with our headquarters -- we called in the serial numbers. After discussing it some more with the members of the team, it was still our opinion, and mine also, that we should seize the money.
- Q. Okay. Can you tell me what that opinion of yours was based on?
- A. Okay. The -- we considered that perhaps this money was, specifically, contraband or evidence of a crime, although it did not fall specifically within the warrant.
- Q. What crime did you believe it was evidence of?
  - A. Well, looking at the way that the money

was found. It was my opinion the way that it was bundled and wrapped in a ledger that appeared to have code names of terrorist members, and that it was in this satchel with goods and other evidence of the terrorist organization, that it was evidence of a crime; however, after discussing that with our headquarters, we made the decision not to seize the money.

- Q. So you believed at the time that you could take that money, even though it was less than the thousand dollars?
- A: That's what the discussion entailed, whether or not we could take this, even though it was not within the scope of the warrant.
- Q. Now, you were just referring to things, ledgers the money was wrapped in and hoods.

  Directing your attention to Government Exhibit

  20, can you tell me on the picture where are the hoods that you just referred to?
  - A. There is a black --
- Q. That's a handkerchief, isn't it, with two holes in it?
  - A. Two eye holes.
- Q. It's a black handkerchief with two holes; without characterizing what they are, it's

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a black handkerchief with two holes in it, is that right?

- I don't know if it's a handkerchief. It's a black piece of cloth with two holes in it.
- Is there anything else you're referring Q. to as hoods in your testimony?
- There is a red tee shirt with two holes Α. cut in it. And there is stitching across the middle of the tee shirt which would have -- that ran across --

THE COURT: Let him finish his answer, whatever it is.

THE WITNESS: And across the -between the two holes which would make it fit over an individual's head as a hood.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) That's a child's tee shirt, isn't it?
  - That I don't recall. Α.
- Well, directing your attention to Government Exhibit 19, doesn't that red tee shirt say twelve months on it in the label for the size?
  - Α. Yes, it does.
- So you testified about hoods. What you mean is a black handkerchief or piece of cloth

with two holes in it and an infant's tee shirt, is that correct; I just want the record to be clear?

- A. I'm referring to the black cloth with the two holes in it, the red infant's tee shirt with holes cut in it and with stitching about three quarter of the way up the tee shirt in a manner to close off the top of it and with some stitching between the two holes.
- Q. And so it's your testimony here that because \$863 was found in the same location with those items and some financial ledgers, that you believed you had authority to take it until someone at headquarters told you the contrary?
- A. And then there were some other documents that we thought were pertinent also.
- Q. So it's your testimony that because of the location of the money and what was near it, you believed you could take it under this warrant?
- A. No, not under the warrant. But as a piece of evidence of a crime in plain view, not within the scope of the warrant.
- Q. Wasn't this money found inside of a briefcase on top of a closet?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 24
- 25

- A. It was inside the briefcase.
- Q. Do you know where the briefcase was?
- A. I'd have to refer to the inventory.
- Q. Well, why don't you do that.
- A. This case was found in the upper right-hand area of a closet in bedroom C.
- Q. So it was on the top shelf of a closet inside of a briefcase, this money?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Were there any other instances during this search where you believed you could seize items that were outside the scope of the warrant?
  - A. Not that I recall.
- Q. Now, other than this occasion on which the search team members were given the affidavit to read and the discussion you had with them about Addendum 2, was there any occasion prior to the search when you had any discussion about the particular crimes for which evidence was sought under this warrant?
  - A. The discussion -- yes.
- Q. And what discussion; what was that discussion?
- A. The discussion -- it was an ongoing process. The meetings from the time that the

team members arrived in Puerto Rico to the time of the search. And during that time there were various occasions when the crimes were discussed that the terrorist group had committed.

- Q. And did you ever give them any instructions that they could only examine items that had some evidentiary value with respect to any of the enumerated crimes?
- A. I told them that they could only examine -- they could only seize items that were specifically enumerated in the warrant.
- Q: Now, I'm not talking about what they could seize right now; I'm talking about what you told them they could examine, read, look at. Did you give them any kind of instructions limiting what they could actually look at, while they were in the apartment -- the house, excuse me?
  - A. I don't recall any limits, no.
- Q. All right. Well, with respect to books and excerpts from books and pamphlets, did you give the agents any instructions as to what they were allowed to read?
- A. They were looking for documents or books that were specifically enumerated in the warrant.

. 

- Q. Well, did you give them any instructions as to whether they were permitted to read an entire article or not, if they found a photocopy of an article?
- A. The -- I don't recall giving them instructions like that.
- Q. You don't remember ever telling them that they had to be particularly careful in their examination of books?
  - A. Particularly careful? The --
  - Q. I just want to know what you told them?
- A: The main discussion concerning books was the fact that the other agents, three of the other agents searching did not speak Spanish.
- Q. So how were they going to examine books and documents that they found that were in Spanish?
- A. If they could not tell from the face of the document that it fell within the warrant, they would have to let a Spanish speaker review the document.
- Q. All right. Now, can you tell me, in your view, with respect to a book or an article, how they would know if it fell within the scope of the warrant from looking at it; what would be

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the signal to them?

- Either the title of the article and the first few pages or flipping through the article.
- So if the title of the article or book Q. had the word "Revolution" in it, it would be subject to their examination in your view?
- Is your question whether they would Α. continue to read it if it had said "Revolution" on the title? They probably would.
- What other things about the title would Q. indicate to them whether they should keep reading?
- Well, if it included some words that Α. were specifically from the addendum.
- Can you tell me what kind of words in Q. the title that would be from the addendum?
- Α. The second page of the addendum, third paragraph refers to training manuals, instructing individuals in the use of, among other things, firearms, incendiary devices, intelligence and counterintelligence techniques, clandestine operated procedures.

If some of those words appeared in the title of an article, that would certainly be of assistance to the agents in determining whether

5

that article or pamphlet was within the scope of this warrant.

- Q. All right. Any other kinds of words in the title that would give the agents a signal that they could continue reading that document?
- A. I think it's based on -- it's a practical application based on each agent's knowledge of this addendum, and what he felt was relevant when he read whatever the document was.
- Q. So it was up to the agent to decide whether it was covered by Addendum 2 when he started reading a document?
- A. He would review the document. The final determination was always made by me.
- Q. All right. Now, can you tell me, if you know, how these English speaking agents were able to review these books and articles and pamphlets to determine whether they were relevant to Addendum 2?
  - A. I don't know.
- Q. Well, did they ask you what they should do?
- A. Where they came upon pamphlets and articles that they could not read, they will allow one of the Spanish speaking agents to read

them.

- Q. Was that Agent Rivera?
- A. Homero Rivera or myself.
- Q. So either you or Agent Rivera would read the books and the pamphlets to decide if they were subject to seizure?
- A. If we were going to seize an item, prior to seizing it, one of us would have to at least look at those documents and pamphlets.
- Q. From your recollection of that search, did the English speaking agents there have any idea what they were reading when they came upon a Spanish language book or pamphlet?
- A. Some words -- yes. Some words in Spanish are so similar to English that that would at least give them a clue that a document my fall within the scope of the warrant.
- Q. Now, did you give the agents any specific instructions with respect to the language in the warrant that authorized the seizure of telephone numbers; that's in the fourth paragraph?
- A. I don't recall any specific instructions concerning telephone numbers.
  - Q. All right. Did you believe that that

language, that that search for telephone numbers, was limited in any way?

- A. No.
- Ω. So it was your understanding that that warrant allowed you to seize any and all telephone numbers that you found?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And you so instructed the searching agents?
- A. I don't recall any discussion or instructions concerning telephone numbers with the other agents.
- Q. But you didn't give them any kind of limiting instructions?
- A. I don't recall discussing telephone numbers with the agents.
- Q. How about distribution lists; that's in the second line of the fourth paragraph. Do you believe that that contained any limitation?
- A. I don't recall any discussions on distribution lists either.
- Q. Did you understand there to be any limitation on what kinds of distribution lists could be seized?
  - A. That -- I don't recall what my

. 

understanding was on August 30th.

- Q. What's your understanding now?
- A. I would say no.
- Q. So it was your -- you believe now as you look at Addendum 2 that this warrant authorized you to take any kind of distribution list that was in Mr. Castro's house?
- A. I would say that that whole paragraph is read as one sentence.
- Q. That whole paragraph is one sentence.

  Well, you've just lost me. Can you

  explain to me what you mean by that?
- A. I mean there are a number of items listed. And then at the end of the sentence it says, "Evidence of the crimes which facts are cited in the accompanying affidavit made out".
- Q. so it's your testimony that that last phrase in that fourth paragraph modifies everything that goes before, not just the words that go before it?
- A. I said that's part of the sentence. I don't see that -- as far as making a determination as whether distribution lists could be seized, I don't see that as a limiting factor.
  - Q. You don't. So we're talking now about

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

the last two lines of paragraph 4 which are, "Evidence of the crimes which facts are cited in the accompanying affidavit make out"?

- Right. Α.
- You did not understand that at the time Q. as limiting the kind of distribution lists that could be taken?
  - No. Α.
- All right. And let me ask you the same Q. question about membership lists, which are on the fifth line of that same paragraph. Did you believe there was any limitation with respect to the kinds of membership lists that could be taken?
- As I say, right now I don't see that that would limit it. I don't recall what my state of mind was at the time but --
- Well, do you remember telling the Q. searching agents anything which would have limited either the kind of distribution lists or kind of membership lists that they could examine and take?
- I recall rejecting certain evidence if it seemed like it had nothing to do with the crimes that were being investigated.

- Q. What do you recall rejecting in the way of distribution lists and membership lists?
- A. I recall that there were some records concerning Mr. Castro-Ramos' teaching. We did not seize some of those records.
- Q. Were they membership lists or distribution lists?
  - A. I don't recall specifically.
- Q. There is no authorization in this warrant to take materials that have to do with Mr. Castro's teaching, is there?
  - A: I think the answer would be yes.
  - Q. And what language is that?
- A. I think -- well, there is various language. The records pertaining to travel of Machetero members, and as Mr. Castro-Ramos is a member of the Machetero terrorist group, if those records were in the teaching records showing his travel, we could seize those records.
- Q. Any other language in the warrant that permitted you to seize teaching records?
- A. If there were any financial records we would have seized those.
- Q. But what if they were just records that had to do with his teaching; would they have been

Δ

seizeable within this warrant?

- A. I think if there were identification records concerning Mr. Castro-Ramos, those also would have been seized.
- Q. What about documents about his teaching; were they authorized in the warrant?

THE COURT: About his what?

MS. POLAN: About his teaching,
that's what we were talking about, as a teacher.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) I'm asking you, is there any other language that would authorize you to take records about his teaching?
- A. I think it would depend on the specific document whether it would fall within -- somewhere within Addendum 2.
- Q. So it would have to fall within the language of Addendum, 2 and some other language in order for you to be able to seize it, is that correct?
  - A. Any document that we seized.
- Q. Now, did you give the agents on the search team any particular instructions with respect to the newspaper articles and magazine clippings that they were entitled to examine?
  - A. I don't recall the specific

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

instructions.

2 attention to the part of the warrant that talks 3 about newspaper clippings which is also in paragraph 4, it's in the middle of the paragraph. 5 And I believe it says "Newspaper and magazine 6 7 clippings related to the Macheteros and other

terrorist groups"?

Α.

Can you tell me what your understanding 0.

Yes.

was of what that allowed you to take?

All right. Well, directing your

- Α. If we're referring just to that specific statement there, that would be newspaper and magazine clippings related to the -- it would have something to do with the Macheteros or other terrorist groups.
- So was it your understanding that you were not allowed to take all newspaper clippings?
  - That's correct.
- And how did you make the determination Q. with respect to a particular newspaper article if it had to do with another terrorist group?
  - By reading part of the article.
- So you would read the article and then  $\mathbf{Q}$  . decide whether it had to do with a terrorist

group?

- A. As far as this part of the addendum is concerned, yes.
- Q. All right. At the time you conducted this search, did you consider the Puerto Rican Socialist party a terrorist group?
  - A. I don't recall.
- Q. Well, what was the working definition of terrorist group that you were using for the purpose of the seizure of newspaper and magazine clippings?
- A. Again, it was a practical application based on our -- based on my knowledge of what a terrorist is and what was within the addendum.
- Q. Well, that's not giving me any kind of explanation. What was the basis on which you decided whether something was a newspaper article about a terrorist group?
- A. At that time -- I don't know what specific standards I was using at the time concerning --
- Q. Did you have any standards at the time?

  MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, this is

  like asking someone to define obscenity. It's a

  function of the particular document that was

Я

.

a judgement he made. Asking two years later to define terrorism and then to have to turn on it, just makes no sense whatsoever.

We've gone on long enough. I think we should start focusing in on the issue, that is, was a particular item or items taken that were not called for --

THE COURT: It seems to me the only way the Court is going to be helped -- you've got your list here. Go down through, say, "Look, these are things you took, right?"

"Yes."

"All right. Let's take such-and-such an item. Where is that within the provisions of this addendum?"

"I can't find that one."

"Well, you shouldn't have taken it then, should you?"

Then you come down, number two, and then proceed. Then you're getting somewhere.

MR. DABROWSKI: And limit that only to the question of items --

THE COURT: We can talk and philosophize here for the rest of the day. And I

won't be any better equipped at the end of the day than I am right now or than I was this morning. Let's put that it way.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I intend to do exactly what you just suggested. But it's also important for the Court's determination of whether this was an overbroad warrant if the agent can't tell us what that category was, "Newspaper articles related to terrorist groups", because the word has no definition. Then that speaks to the generalness of the warrant.

THE COURT: If he took in clippings, I don't know. I haven't seen them. If he took this clipping and you have them, say, "Look, this is what you took, you signed for them, right. Now, where is that within the provisions?"

This is about some political matter

down in Puerto Rico involving what, I don't know,

because I haven't seen it. But make him tell

you. If he can't, say, "Why did you take it?"

MS. POLAN: Well, Your Honor -THE COURT: I'll leave that to you.

I'm just calling it to your attention.

MS. POLAN: There are two issues.

That's one, whether the items were outside the scope of the warrant. The other issue is whether the warrant gave them enough guidance that they could figure out what they could take and what they could not take.

And I didn't draft this addendum and Mr. Dabrowski, you know, complains about the language, terrorism. I share his complaints that it is so general and so broad, no one could know what it meant.

So I think there is two different inquiries here: Whether an item was outside the scope of the warrant; or whether the warrant was so vague that they didn't know what was in it or what was out of it. And there are two separate questions I think the Court has to answer here.

And I think his understanding of what he was allowed to take within that category, just like within the bank statements, is a relevant question. And you know, if he doesn't know what it means, then we should know that.

THE COURT: It will help the Court if you particularize. Generalities don't help a bit.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson,

1,4

directing your attention to -- also again to paragraph 4, there is a phrase there that authorized to you seize literature regarding international terrorism and links to other self-proclaimed terrorist groups. Do you see that?

A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell me what you believe that language authorized you to take?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. It's not a question of belief. It's a question of what he actually seized and whether or not the particular item that was seized falls within or outside the scope of that language.

THE COURT: I suppose counsel can ask it. But the only trouble is it isn't going to help the Court, because it's going to be in general, like, maybe none of those items were taken. I don't know.

But when we get to things he did take,

"By what authority did you take this? By what

authority did you approve the taking of this

particular -- seizure of this particular item?"

Then he's got to explain it to you.

Take the next one.

•

the question in a --

•

But you do it your way. I'm listening.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor --

MR. DABROWSKI: The Government is

objecting to it being done this way. Number one, it wastes time. Number two, it's irrelevant to

THE COURT: It is a waste of time as far as the Court is concerned. But I'll leave it up to you. Proceed.

MS. POLAN. Could you read back the question?

(Record read as requested)

THE WITNESS: Again, I think it would depend on each document. I'd have to look at the document and if -- and make a determination of it, whether in my own belief it fell within the scope of this warrant, and what my definition at the time was of international terrorism.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, you said that you read and write Spanish, is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Were you able to read and understand

the contents of all of the Spanish language documents that were brought to you by the searching agents?

- A. No.
- O. You weren't?
- A. Not entirely.
- Q. So what would you do when you didn't understand a document?
- A. When I say I did not understand, I did not read the entire documents.
- Q. But you made the decision on whether the items should be seized?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. Now, with respect to items that were examined but they were not seized, was it also your decision that a certain item would not be seized?
  - A. Not always.
- Q. Okay. Did other agents make the decision after reading a document that it wouldn't be seized?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. The document would be read in some part before any decision was made?
  - A. Yes.

. 

Q. Now, when you, generally speaking, when you examined a particular item that someone had brought to you, for example a typed article of some sort, how did you determine whether or not it had evidentiary value?

- A. As I said before, what would assist me would be, number one, the title. And if I could not determine by the title, then I'd have to read the -- part of the content of the material.
- Q. Well, for example, if you saw a document and the title of it was "State and Revolution", would such a document have evidentiary value?
  - A. It might or it might not.
- Q. Well, can you tell me what it would have evidentiary value of, what crime?
- A. I'd have to see the particular document.
- Q. Well, if there was a document that had a title on it that said, "The State and Revolution", can you tell me which of the crimes on the second page of Addendum 2 it might have evidentiary value to?
- A. My determination was based on whether that document would fall specifically within

Addendum 2.

- Q. So that was regardless of whether it had evidentiary value to any of the enumerated crimes here?
- A. It is my understanding that those specific items that were listed in Addendum 2 did have evidentiary value for the crimes listed at the end of the addendum.
- Q. So you didn't use that last paragraph on the addendum to help you make the decisions as to what would be seized?
- A: Yes, I did. At the time that we made the search of Mr. Castro-Ramos' house, I was familiar with those sections of Title 18, United States Code.
- Q. Well, what I'm asking you is if you made a decision that a document entitled, "State and Revolution" had evidentiary value, can you tell me what crime on the second page here it had evidentiary value to?

## A. What --

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. This is apparently a hypothetical. We're not talking about a document that was seized in this case. If we are, she should produce it, and

we can talk about it. Otherwise we can sit here forever and talk about it.

THE COURT: We could go on for a week just doing nothing.

MS. POLAN: I hope not, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I won't be any better

equipped to make a decision from this

presentation than I did before. That's -- the

preface is to help the judge make a decision.

When everybody goes home, he has to make a

decision.

MS. POLAN: What I'm trying to find out is if this agent believed that the title of an article itself gave it some evidentiary value, and if so, to what crime.

THE COURT: But you get into a philosophic discussion, Counsellor, which could go on endlessly. And I don't want to frustrate your purpose, but it has to be helpful to the Court. Otherwise, it's purposeless.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, on a number of occasions you have, I believe, exhibited a slight sense of frustration with the pace that we're moving on in connection with our presentation to you of our scheduling of these

. 

various matters. The way the Government schedules these matters is to take them one at a time, schedule them seriatim and assign to them a certain number of days.

knowledge as to what you will permit in terms of cross examination. And in effect what's happening here is, if you are going to permit this kind of wide ranging cross examination -- which the Government strongly urges you not to do -- if you are going to permit that, we are going to be here for a week. We are going to be here for several weeks on each of these matters. And we are going to have a schedule that projects well into the summer and beyond.

There are numerous searches to go
through. There are numerous statements to go
through. There is substantial electronic
surveillance. There are a number of electronic
surveillance motions that need to be attended to.
In order to get to them in a timely fashion, we
urge the Court to force the issue here. Make
sure that the parties --

THE COURT: In a civil case, I'd have no problem. I'd say, "Ms. Polan, you have

. 

an hour and a half. Present your case. And when you've -- whatever you got, put it in in that time. If you don't, your time is up. Bang, your time is up."

But in a criminal case, one has to be more careful because there must be more leeway.

But I don't want to go overboard either and waste the Court's time and all the other attorneys' time, too. Because I just want counsel to be mindful of that. If we get to the heart of this, it will help the Court make a decision. That's why I'm here. If it won't, it's purposeless.

Let's leave the philosophy about the abstract and get down to the specifics.

MR. DABROWSKI: The Court ought to be more sensitive in a criminal case. But you can set time limits. The Court of Appeals does in hearing criminal appeals. Other courts do, and if you should do that or if you should set limitations, the only requirement is that they be reasonable. What we have here are unreasonable inquiries that are being made. Although the Government is urging --

THE COURT: I'm going along with this procedure until I find that I have to set

particular presentation. And if that time comes, then I will do it and let the Court of Appeals review it, if it ever gets there. Let them review it, see if the Court was reasonable. That's the only way I can do it.

Proceed.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, showing you Defendant's Exhibit 47 for identification, this is item L 17 C 112 D 1. Do you have that item?
  - A: The original of it?
  - Q. Yes?
  - A. I'd have to look for it.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I asked Mr.

Dabrowski to make all these items available so
they could be put into evidence. So I assume he
has them here. I want the documents he seized to
go into evidence, not my copies.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the particular documents that are on the Government's exhibit list are in the possession of Ms. Polan. The non-relevant material was brought in here and is in the courtroom, was brought here by Agent Williamson. There are a couple of exceptions.

1 There was some material, including, for example, 2 the masks, which are being sent up by the F B I lab and may be in the possession of Agent Reilly. 3 But the particular item she wants, I don't know what it is. 5 THE COURT: Do you have it; is it 6 7 available? MS. POLAN: I asked Mr. Dabrowski 8 9 if he would supply Agent Williamson with the box. MR. DABROWSKI: There is a box. 10 fact, there are two boxes. 11 MS. POLAN: He's got to make them 12 13 available to his witness. THE COURT: Do you need to step 14 down and get that box, Agent Williamson? 15 THE WITNESS: Your Honor, there are 16 two boxes with the items of non-relevant 17 evidence, and I'd have to look through those to 18 19 get at that item. MS. POLAN: Your Honor, so the 20 Court --21 22 THE COURT: Is there a specific 23 document you want him to find?

24

25

begin with.

MS. POLAN: Yes, this document to

3

2

4

5

7

6

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: What is that document? MS. POLAN: This is Defendant's Exhibit 47 for identification. It's a photocopy of part of a book entitled -- I'm translating, Your Honor. It's by Lenin called, "The State and Revolution". And it's item L 17 C 11-2 D 1. think that's how the agent will find it because he's got them marked by the inventory numbers.

> This is your copy. THE COURT:

MR. DABROWSKI: Is there a problem using the copy, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Instead of rummaging through the box to find it, is there any objection to having it marked as a full exhibit? MR. DABROWSKI: No objection, Your

It was already marked for identification.

MS. POLAN: There are certain things -- I don't have the document. All they gave me is the face sheet for -- I can't read it. I would like to see what this looks like, the original of it. There are certain things that my copies are fine.

THE COURT: Will you find the original for her, please?

MS. POLAN: I don't know what this

•

**2** 

one looks like. There are certain --

THE COURT: Will it take you long to find it?

THE WITNESS: I don't know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Make an effort, we'll try one, see how long it takes. Otherwise we'll proceed with the copies.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, for the record, I told Mr. Dabrowski yesterday on the phone this is what I wanted. I wanted these items available for evidence, and he said --

THE COURT:

MS. POLAN: Not every one. I had given him a letter about some of them last week. But my understanding is that the agent would have these in sequential order, and he could reach for them in a folder.

The specific exhibit?

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, Ms.

Polan called me on the phone and asked me if I,
in effect, would take dictation from her several
days ago and take down a long list of items. I
told her I would not. She then did hand deliver
to me at the last session of court a list of
documents. And then she gave me a supplemental

•

list of documents. Her understanding that these would be placed in sequential order for her is her own understanding.

MS. POLAN: That's my --

THE COURT: Let's not talk about it. It's a waste of time. It makes a lot of copy, and it has to be paid for.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, all I'm trying to express to the Court is I didn't realize their evidence was not in any kind of order, and it would be this difficult to find something.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I would suggest this is what we do. Proceed by way of examination using this particular examination.

And then over the lunch break, I'll make all those exhibits available to Ms. Polan. She can go through them and she can't have them. But she can at least segregate and identify those originals she wants to use.

MS. POLAN: I have no problem with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. The witness will resume the stand.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson,

Α.

Yes.

- Q. That's by Lenin, is it not?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. This document is forty-three pages long, is it not?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. It appears to be a photocopy of forty-three pages of a book, doesn't it?
  - A. Yes, it does.
  - Q. Can you tell me why you seized it?
  - A. I don't recall.
- Q. Well, can you look at Addendum 2, and tell me if there is any language in Addendum 2 that authorizes that seizure?
- A. Looking at Addendum 2 and at my inventory, C 11, that was my description of the items when I seized them which was a large brown folder with revolutionary materials.
- Q. Well, let me ask you this Agent
  Williamson: When you seized item C ll, a large
  brown folder about revolutionary materials, had
  you looked through the particular items in it
  before you seized it?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. So you were aware that that document was in the folder before it was seized?

- A. I don't recall if I read every single document within the folder.
- Q. So could it be the case that certain items were seized without having been examined?
- A. Without having been examined by me, that's correct.
- Q. All right. Well, when you made that description of C ll, "Large brown folder with revolutionary materials", those are your words, aren't they?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q: What did you base that description on?
- A. C 11 was one of those instances where a number of documents were seized together. When I looked through the documents, if it appeared to me that all of the documents in a group, such as this folder C 11, were specifically listed on Addendum 2 so that they could be seized, I would seize the entire folder rather than taking items out.

THE COURT: The number on your list is what?

THE WITNESS: C 11.

THE COURT: C 11?

THE WITNESS: Yes. On page 3 of

the inventory.

 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) So is it your testimony that certain items in this brown folder C 11 were seized without having been examined individually?

A. Yes. My testimony is that the folder itself may have had significance; that occurred on several occasions.

- Q. What do you mean by the folder itself?
- A. I don't recall specifically on C 11 but for example what we discussed --
- Q. Let's just talk about C ll. Can you tell me what you mean by the folder itself would have had significance?
- A. If there were numerous documents in there concerning the Machetero terrorist organization and other documents concerning the group and it appeared that this folder, the majority of those documents were placed in that folder for that purpose, we would have seized the folder.
- Q. So your testimony is if C 11 was a brown accordian folder and there were documents in there that you believed pertained to the Macheteros, you believed you were authorized to take the rest of the documents in that folder as

well?

- A. My testimony is that I don't recall reading every document in that -- in C 11 and that this may have been one of those occasions where, based on a reading of several of the documents, I thought that they were all within the purview of the warrant.
- Q. So if you read several items in C 11 and you believe those items were within the scope of the warrant, you believed you were authorized to take the rest of the items in the folder, is that correct?
- A. That's correct with -- may I add that it's a combination of my reading of the items in there and the agent who located the documents.
- Q. Well, it's true, is it not, that C 11 was found by Dan Reilly?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Who you testified doesn't read Spanish?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. So he wouldn't have known what these documents were about, would he?
- A. As I stated before, there are certain instances where a non-Spanish speaker can identify documents.

- •

- Q. But it is your testimony, isn't it, that you were the person who made the ultimate decision as to what would be seized?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. It's also your testimony that if C 11 contained twenty odd items that you were justified in taking certain of those items regardless of their content if a large majority of the documents in that file were within the warrant?
  - A. My testimony is that that's what I did.
- Q. That is what you did. Did anybody give you instructions prior to the search about what you were authorized to take?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Who was that?
- A. We had, in addition to my meetings with the agents on my team, we also had team leader meetings.
- Q. Did anybody give you instructions as to what you were authorized to take?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Who was that?
- A. Well, at those meetings we had our legal advisor, principal legal advisor for the

office.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Who was that?
- A. Larry Likar at the time.

THE COURT: Larry who?

THE WITNESS: Likar, L I K A R.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Did he attend the meetings of the search team leaders?
  - A. Some of them, yes.
  - Q. Was Addendum 2 discussed with him?
- A. I don't recall specifically what was discussed.
- Q. Do you ever remember being instructed yourself by the legal advisor or anyone else who was your superior that you were authorized to take every document in a folder because certain documents were within the scope of the warrant?
  - A. No.
- Q. Did you ever receive any training as an F B I agent that that was permissible?
  - A. I'm also a legal advisor.
- Q. My question is did you ever receive any training as an F B I agent that that was permissible?
  - A. I would say yes.
  - Q. So you were trained as an F B I agent

--

that if you came upon a folder that contained a number of documents and that if certain of the documents were within the scope of the warrant you were entitled to take the rest of them; is that your testimony?

- A. No. My testimony is that there are certain cases where the fact that certain items, not restricted to just documents, are found together may itself have significance.
- Q. I'm talking about documents now. Did you ever receive any training that permitted you to take certain documents that were in a folder with other documents because those other documents were within the scope of the warrant?
- A. No, I don't recall any specific training to that effect.
- Q. With respect to the item on your inventory that's called C 11, it's your testimony today that there were a number of items seized from within that folder?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. That were not within the scope of the warrant?
  - A. No, that's not my testimony.
  - Q. Well, is it your testimony that this

document falls within the scope of the warrant, the one we've been looking at, "The State and Revolution"?

- A. If you're asking me why I seized that document, I don't know. I don't recall my -- why I seized that document. It appears that it has -- may have some theories of international terrorism in it.
- Q. So your testimony is that this part of a book by Lenin is connected to international terrorism?
  - A: I don't know.
  - Q. You don't know. Did you know then?
  - A. I may have.
- Q. Well, could you look at it and tell me if you believe it does?
  - A. It does not appear to.
  - Q. Do you know who Lenin was?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Is he alive?
- A. No.
- Q. Now, showing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 48 for identification, which is also marked as L 17 C 11-1 A, does that -- was that document seized from Mr. Castro's house?

## (Handing)

A. It appears to -- it has our subinventory numbers on it.

- Q. From that subinventory number, that was also taken out of the folder marked C 11, was it not?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Is it correct from that exhibit there are five -- there are six copies of the same paper?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q: And they're marked sequentially C 11
  1 A, 1 B, 1 C, 1 D, 1 E and -- so there are five
  copies of same thing?
  - A. That's correct.

MS. POLAN: I'd offer this as a full exhibit.

MR. DABROWSKI: No objection.

THE COURT: Full exhibit. May I see that, please?

MS. POLAN: Yes, Your Honor.

(Handing)

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I don't have a translation for you because the Government didn't give me one.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I thought the Court paid for the translation of all these documents by the defense.

MS. POLAN: It's a non-relevant document.

THE COURT: Do you have a translation?

MS. POLAN: I don't think so. No.

It's a non-relevant document, Your Honor. But I could get you a copy of it in English, I believe.

MR. DABROWSKI: It's my understanding -- I was under the assumption that the Court had authorized a complete translation of the documents for both relevant and non-relevant pieces of evidence.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Directing your attention --

MR. DABROWSKI: Is that the case, Your Honor?

THE COURT: That's my understanding, yes.

MR. DABROWSKI: It seems to me we ought to have the translation provided.

THE COURT: I'll leave it up to counsel to provide it.

23

24

25

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Directing your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 48, can you tell me what this is?

## (Handing)

- A. They seem to be little sayings or paragraphs written by an author, Pedro Albizu-Campos.
- Q. Do you know who Pedro Albizu-Campos was?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Can you tell me why you seized that document?
- A. I don't recall. I can tell you why we probably seized it today.
  - Q. Well, can you read the document?
  - A. The --
  - Q. Can you read it to yourself?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. It's a quotation?
- A. Yes, it's a -- it's a general statement of philosophy about life.
- Ω. A general statement of philosophy about life. It's correct, is it not, that that exhibit appears to be a photocopy of something from a book or a pamphlet; it's a photocopy of some

3

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

printed material, something that was printed somewhere?

- Yes. There are five photocopies.
- Right. Now, can you tell me why you Q. seized all five of them?
- My -- that this could be a distribution. As I recall there were a number of individuals in Mr. Castro-Ramos' cell who he distributed various documents to.
- So your testimony is that you seized Ω. these five documents of statements of philosophy about life because you believed that was a distribution list?
- My testimony is that I don't recall why Α. I seized this particular document. That may be the reason why I seized all five copies of it.
- So it's your testimony that the phrase in the warrant that authorized the seizure of distribution lists would authorize the seizure of those five copies of that statement of philosophy?
- As I testified before, this was part of a group of documents which made up C 11 which we seized in total. I made a determination at the time on August 30th, 1985, to seize that entire

group of documents.

- Q. So it really did not matter what a particular document was; if it was inside C 11 you took it?
- A. In this case I took everything in that folder.
- Q. Regardless of whether the particular item was authorized in the warrant, is that correct?
- A. On August 30th my determination was that everything in that folder could be seized under the warrant.
- Q. Including these five copies of the statement of philosophy by Pedro Albizu-Campos?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, Agent Williamson, is it the case that you didn't have time to read or examine the items in C 11 to determine if even one of them should be seized?
- A. I don't recall whether I read every item in there or not.
- Q. Well, were you under some time pressure; is that why you didn't do it?
- A. I don't recall a time pressure other than that there were voluminous documents in Mr.

Castro-Ramos' residence.

- Q. And so if you found something like C 11
  that contained some documents you believed were
  Macheteros documents, then your decision was just
  to take the whole folder?
- A. As I testified before, I would look through the documents. But I can't testify as to whether I read each individual document or not.
- Q. And it is fair to say, is it not, that you didn't make an individualized determination with respect to each of the items within C 11?
- A: I repeat my testimony again. I don't recall whether or not I read each of these documents.
- Q. All right. Now, directing your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 49 for identification which is also marked C 11-2 F 1 through 41, can you identify that document?

  (Handing)
- A. Yes. Again, this appears to have our subinventory number on it, C 11-2 F.
- Q. So that was taken Mr. From Castro's house?
  - A. Yes.

MS. POLAN: I would offer this.

MR. DABROWSKI: No objection.

2

THE COURT: Full exhibit. It's now

3

1:00, Counsellor. How long will you take this

4

afternoon?

5

I think I'm going to MS. POLAN:

6

take most of the afternoon, Your Honor.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Defendant's Exhibit 48 offered and marked into evidence)

THE COURT: Did counsel both plan on her having the whole afternoon today?

MR. DABROWSKI: If she's going to go through individual items, item by item, yes, Your Honor. Can I point out right now so we can all think about it over the lunch, a very practical problem here. What we have there is the C ll item that was seized is part of a brown folder. Taken from that folder are the Government's trial exhibits which are segregated out and numbered sequentially as the Court has ordered.

Missing from this folder, might -- in this case it might not be the case -- there might be a document relevant to another matter that

 might be at the F B I lab. To reconstruct this

is going to be time consuming. And number two,

to file all these original exhibits as part of

the records is going to impose upon the Clerk an

extremely cumbersome process.

So I think we should all, over the course of the lunch, address a procedure whereby we can satisfy everyone's need for the record and statement and eliminate the burden on the Court in keeping track of what will be the Government's exhibits not only in this case but in perhaps others:

THE COURT: Well, if you've got a copy, the simplest thing would be to offer the copy and have the Clerk make copies for you of those you thought relevant to have copies made of, it seems to me. But I'll leave that up to you.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I just want to say before we leave that the defendants didn't conduct these searches and they didn't take everything out of these houses. It's the F B I who did this.

And I think the Court is entitled to understand what the Government actually took out

of these defendants' houses and make a determination of the legality of these searches. That's why we're here. If it's too much work to produce these documents, maybe they shouldn't have taken all these documents to begin with.

MR. DABROWSKI: That's not the objection, Your Honor. The documents are right here in the Court and some of them are in my hand right now. I understood that defense counsel had asked and obtained permission from the Government to file with the Court a detailed subinventory which particularizes these items. And all I'm doing is raising -- directing everyone's attention to the fact that there may be an easier way to do this.

THE COURT: See if you can work out an easier and quicker way to do this. That's my suggestion, if it's possible to do so.

MR. DABROWSKI: For example, the subinventory. I think if you want a subinventory of the C 11 items, list them.

THE COURT: Theoretically, in other words -- I can see this possibility. In other words, theoretically, you could take whatever numbered items there may be, suppose there is

600. And you went through the 600 one by one.

We might as well be here for a week going through them.

MS. POLAN: I don't intend to do that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It would be an awful waste of time.

MR. DABROWSKI: For example, Your Honor, if there were a hundred items in this envelope, I'm sure Ms. Polan will select out those that she'll want to direct your attention to. The Government selected out its exhibits.

We can direct the Court's attention to it. Then it's simple. The agent testified he examined the folder generally, determined that there were items there he felt ought to be seized. He took the entire folder.

THE COURT: That's a question the Court has to decide, whether there is sort of an overkill here on -- of the search.

MS. POLAN: That is the question, Your Honor. I'm glad that we agree on that.

THE COURT: Counsellor, you had something to add before we recess?

MR. KUBY: Yes, Judge. I have a

1 bail matter pending that will probably take about five minutes. If I could have five minutes at 2 the beginning of the session at 2:00, it would 3 give your clerk an opportunity to pull the motion 4 for you. 5 THE COURT: What bail matter is 6 that? 7 MR. KUBY: With respect to Luis 8 Alfredo Colon-Osorio, I've proposed two 9 modifications of his bail conditions; one of 10 which the Government as agreed to, the other of 11 which there is some opposition. 12 THE COURT: Well, talk with Mr. 13 Dabrowski during noontime. Maybe you can come to 14 an agreement. 15 MR. KUBY: We've tried that 16 already. 17 THE COURT: I will take it up at 18 2:00. 19 MR. KUBY: Thank you. 20 21 22 23 (Luncheon recess) 24 25

2 Counsellor.

MR. KUBY: I promised my colleague, Ms. Polan, I would keep to five minutes or under. And I'll endeavor to do that.

THE COURT: Good afternoon,

Colon-Osorio's bail in two respects. With one we do have agreement and have secured agreement.

And that is the provision permitting Mr.

Colon-Osorio to occasionally spend nights with his mother at his mother's residence -- which has been the residence posted for bond -- under the same conditions as he currently spends the evening at his own residence, observance of the nine p.m., six a.m. curfew, et cetera and adequate notice though Pretrial Service.

Where we have been unable to reach agreement is with respect to defendant's desire to engage in the Constitutionally-protected activity of attending meetings, participating in meetings of the Caguas Chapter of the Committee of Families and Friends of Those Arrested on August 30th, 1985 which is a nationwide organization with chapters in many cities throughout Puerto Rico.

The Government has agreed to permit him to attend one meeting until midnight, but they refuse to consent to weekly meetings. Simply stated, Judge, given the restrictions that we have suggested, that he provide the address of where he's going to be, provide proper notice to Pretrial Services and proceeds by the most direct route to his home at the conclusion of these meetings, I would think monitoring it is as simple there as it would be in any other place. I don't think Pretrial Services has any objection. And I would be happy —

THE COURT: Have you talked with them?

MR. KUBY: He indicated he spoke with them. They would have no objection if the Court has no objection. But I have not spoken directly with Pretrial Services, no, Judge.

activity. It's a very important activity to the defendant, to the defense and to the country.

And I'd urge you to consider it. I'd be happy to supply any additional information that the Court might need. But the meetings are held in one place at this professor's house. I think the

**2** 

defendant is as easy to monitor there as he is at Calle Esmeralda number 50.

THE COURT: Why couldn't they move them up an hour?

MR. KUBY: I think that would be a good idea. He has put in a bid to have the meetings changed to his residence where he could stay as long as he wants, and he has to stay until six a.m. But at this point that has not been possible to do. We are hoping to accomplish that in the next few weeks.

MR. DABROWSKI: Mr. Kuby accurately stated the Government's position, Your Honor. We object to a modification of the bond to permit Mr. Colon-Osorio to stay out until midnight at least once a week. We do object to that. Otherwise, Mr. Kuby did correctly state the Government's position.

THE COURT: Suppose it were limited to ten o'clock, and they moved their meeting up from seven to -- wouldn't that accomplish the same purpose?

MR. DABROWSKI: I gather that what's developing here is the possibility that the meetings will be moved to Mr. Colon-Osorio's

house.

THE COURT: I simply asked that question. I don't know whether they want to meet at seven rather than eight but it's an easy solution to a problem.

MR. DABROWSKI: Change the times, change the location of the meeting and they're within or they would be within the conditions of his bond. In fact, if that's what's going to occur -- I did tell Mr. Kuby if this were one instance, that is if this were to occur on one time and for the specific purpose --

MR. DABROWSKI: Well, no. If, for example, this next Tuesday there was a meeting at a specific time for a specific purpose, I would not object to that. And did not object to the one meeting. What Mr. Kuby seeks here is a modification of the bond that's applicable to every Tuesday night. We just find that unacceptable.

THE COURT: Each Tuesday night?

MR. KUBY: Judge, of course it's in everybody's interest to try to get the organization to change the time and location of its meeting. And I'm -- I hope we can do that in

a month or month and a half to come. But the basic point is, Judge, you know, right now they're meeting at this place and at this time. And he would desire and, in fact, I think has a right to participate in these meetings.

And to the extent that it can be accommodated within the strict supervision that the Court has imposed, and I believe it can, the Government hasn't really offered any reason why they object except they don't like the idea. I just don't think that's sufficient.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Polan, can we finish by 4:00?

MS. POLAN: I don't know, Your

THE COURT: Do your best.

MS. POLAN: I'm going to try my

best.

Honor.

Your Honor, during the lunch break we have looked in the boxes of documents, the originals, and we have found some of, although not all of the items. And I -- there may be some of the these documents -- I would like the Court to see the document rather than the Xerox. But I want to ask the agent to look at this first

before I do that.

Mr. Dabrowski and I have agreed that

after the Court has looked at these originals,

then at some point the Government may substitute
a copy in a translation. But what I want is for
the Court to be able to see what was seized.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, what we have proposed is this: First of all, there is a real need to maintain tight control over the -- this evidence. Whether it's relevant to the case or whether it has been deemed not relevant to this case. In that regard, it is essential that we, that is the United States, and specifically the F B I, maintain custody of these documents as a general matter.

What I was going to propose is that we can use the subinventory as a particularized method of itemizing these documents. In addition we will have, to the extent it's physically possible, all of the actual original documents and items here in the Court and available for you during the cross examination. But what we propose is that any counsel who uses an item make arrangements to place both a copy of the original and a translation of that item into the record

following the proceedings at some reasonable time.

Not that the Government would do that.

But for example, Ms. Polan has before her

L 17 C 11-2. She intends to use that in its

original form, the actual document seized, to

question this agent. What we propose is that the

Government take back that document. And we'll

keep and maintain it in that form.

at some reasonable time, Ms. Polan files, for purposes of the record of this hearing, a copy of the document she's used here plus a translation.

And that's what we're proposing so the record will be complete. There is no problem with her using that document, but the record should be complete. And the party offering the document should submit to the Court for the record the -- a copy of it and a translation.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, that's not what I agreed to. It's objectionable and impossible for two reason. The first reason is, as Mr. Dabrowski well knows, there are a number of documents in here. The reason I need these documents, they've never given me --

•

THE COURT: Very simple procedure.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I don't

have documents --

THE COURT: Very simple procedure.

Will you listen? Maybe we'll all learn

something.

If you want to use the original, you may, number one. Number two, after it's been offered into evidence, the Clerk will make a Xerox copy of the particular document and return the original back to the Government, and it will be marked properly by her. And then everybody is protected.

MS. POLAN: That's fine, Your Honor. I think that's the best procedure.

MR. DABROWSKI: We need a translation, Your Honor, because they're in Spanish.

THE COURT: We'll see if we can get that if no other way, through the Clerk's office. He must know of the existence of the copies of the translation on these particular items.

MR. DABROWSKI: Fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He arranged for them so he must know about their existence.

MR. DABROWSKI: Thank you.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: If the Clerk will keep those originals separate so that they may be appropriately copied and Xerox copies substituted for the originals, and the originals returned.

> THE CLERK: Yes, Your Honor.

(BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, Q. showing you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 50 for identification, can you identify this item?

## (Handing)

- Α. It's marked C 11 from location L 17. This came from Mr. Castro-Ramos' house. This was part of the folder C 11.
- So for the record, this is a manila Q. file folder that has a number of documents and papers in it, is that correct?
  - That's correct. Α.
  - By this notation C 11 --Q.

THE COURT: So it will help me, Counsellor, do I understand that this is the document we're talking about, L 17 C 11. then it's started 9-9-1, subsequent ones the same number, but it has numbers to the right which individualize the contents of the particular

1 folder. MS. POLAN: What this means, Your 2 Honor, and for the record the Court is pointing 3 to the Government's Exhibit list, that everything here was taken from the folder marked C 11. Then 5 it has a more specific number. 6 THE COURT: That's my 7 understanding. 8 MS. POLAN: These are things on the 9 exhibit list. 10 THE COURT: Very well. 11 Q: (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, 12 it's correct, is it not, in looking through this 13 folder that you found the document which was a 14 copy of what was marked earlier as evidence 15 called "The State and Revolution"? 16 Yes, that's correct. 17  $\Omega$ . That item is C 11-2 D 1, is that 18 correct? 19 That's correct. Α. 20 MS. POLAN: I would offer this as a 21 full exhibit. 22 23 THE COURT: Without objection, full

The identification, Madam Clerk, is?

24

25

exhibit.

(Defendant's Exhibit 50 offered and marked into evidence)

-

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, before lunch we were talking about how you made the decision to seize particular documents.

Looking at Government -- Defendant's Exhibit 50, can you tell me if you, yourself, examined all the different documents in there before those

- A. By looking quickly at these documents right now, it doesn't refresh my recollection as to whether I actually read each of these documents.
- Q. When I asked you this morning why you seized the excerpt from "The State and Revolution", I think your testimony was you didn't recall?
  - A. That's right.

items were seized?

- Q. That's in this folder, isn't it?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. That's item C 11-2 D 1?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, referring to you the next item in

1 that folder which is marked C 11-2 F 1, what's the title of that document? 2 Estrategia Militar China. 3 I think the reporter would like to you Q. 4 spell that for her. 5 6 E S T R A T E G I A, next word is 7 MILITAR, China. Could you translate what that title 8 Q. means? 9 Military Strategy, China. Α. 10 This document looks to be a photocopy 11 Q. of a book or an article, doesn't it? 12 13 Α. Yes. Q. Can you tell me why you seized that? 14 I'll take a look at it. I would say at Α. 15 this time this appears to me right now to be some 16 sort of a training manual for military -- could 17 be used for armed terrorism. 18 So you seizeed this because it was a Q. 19 military training manual? 20 I say right now that's -- if I were 21 reviewing this to seize it, to make a 22 determination right now whether to seize it, this 23

appears to me to be a training manual that could

be used by terrorists.

24

THE COURT: May I see that?
THE WITNESS: Yes.

(Handing)

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this is another copy of this document which was previously marked as Defendant's Exhibit 49, before we found the original.

(Handing)

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Well, on August 30th of 1985, what was the reason you seized it then?
- A. I don't recall. I can tell you at that time I had some reason to seize it.
  - Q. But you don't know what it is?
- A. No. At this time it appears to me to be a training manual --
- Q. So you think that that document which is C 11-2 F is within the definition of training manuals or literature of the type which instruct individuals in the use of firearms, incendiary devices, explosives, hand grenades, LAW rockets, intelligence and counterintelligence techniques. That paragraph on the second page of Addendum 2, that's what authorizes the seizure of this document, that paragraph?
  - A. Based on the very brief look that I

1 just had at that document. Well, did you look at it --Q. 2 Which would have been -- that would A. 3 approximate the time that I would have looked at 4 the document on August 30th. 5 So the review you just made of that 6 document, of looking it over for a few seconds, 7 is the kind of review you made on August 30th 8 9 before you decided to take it? 10 Α. Generally. THE COURT: What does it say on the 11 outside? 12 THE WITHESS: Military Strategy for 13 China. 14 (BY MS. POLAN) Do you consider China Q. 15 to be a terrorist country? 16 Α. No. 17 Q. All right. Now, directing your 18 attention to the next item in this folder which 19 is entitled C 11-2 H 1; can you tell me what that 20 document is? 21 22 Α. That's another document by Lenin, Lucha Armada, L U C H A, A R M A D A. 23 THE COURT: What does that mean, 24

Lucha?

THE WITNESS: To fight, to

struggle.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) What is the title of that pamphlet?
  - A. "The Arms Struggle".
- Q. Can you tell me now what your best recollection is of why you seized that on August 30th?
  - A. I don't know.
- Q. Well, is there any language in the search warrant -- excuse me, is there any language in the search warrant addendum, do you think, that authorizes the seizure of that document?
- A. I don't know. This is not a photocopy of the entire document. It starts on page 122 with guerilla warfare, some instructions on guerilla warfare.
- Q. So is it your testimony you that seized that because it was a training manual?
- A. I think I testified before the reason I seized C ll was after a review of all of the documents in that, not reading each of them cover to cover, it was my decision to seize the entire packet of documents. This particular document

right now, it looks like it could be used as some sort of a training manual for guerillas in guerilla warfare. That's the part of the document that's photocopied to be placed in this folder.

- Q. That wasn't the basis of your decision on August 30th?
- A. I don't recall what was the basis of seizing the documents at that time, but judging from my inventory, I made the decision to seize the entire packet of documents.

THE COURT: Today would you consider that same type of document to be within the purview of the search warrant?

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, if -- my decision would probably be based, if this document were found alone, not with other terrorist documents, I might not seize this document; however, if this were together with other documents that were obviously of the Macheteros terrorist group showing training for military insurrection or terrorist actions, I would say that this would be very pertinent.

THE COURT: This particular document was within the folder or file, is that

it?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I'd like to have this document separately marked so that the Clerk can make a copy of it.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, what the Government is going to propose, particularly in view of that last answer, is that the entire packet C ll be filed with the Court because obviously it has to be viewed as it was on that date together in tact. I think we can dispense with the individual markings.

THE COURT: Has the file been marked as one exhibit yet?

MR. DABROWSKI: It has not, Your Honor.

is that at the lunch break Mr. Dabrowski gave me

C 11, which is a brown folder. But all of the

contents of C 11 as they appear on the

subinventory are not here. The Government has

them in the lab in Washington, they have them all

over the western hemisphere. But they're not

here with us today. So I have no objection to

reconstructing everything that was in C 11 if it

5

. 

is, in fact, going to be everything that was in C 11 because we don't have it here.

MR. DABROWSKI: Certainly documents have been removed from C 11. They're on the Government's exhibit list and they're in court in the file folders. Other documents are, in fact, in the F B I lab. I'm informed they're on a plane. They will be arriving here at 3:30 today. To the extent there are some documents from either C 11 or other locations within L 17, which is this residence, they're on the way. They'll be here at 3:30.

the Court is to offer the full file as an exhibit. And then have the particular documents in that file, that counsel is going to bring out and call to the Court's attention, numbered whatever it is, Exhibit -- let's say it's 50, 50 A, B, C, D, so that we know it came from that file. And at the same time, we'll know that they're to be considered individually. Now would that be?

MR. DABROWSKI: That's fine, Your Honor. I don't see why it's superfluous.

MS. POLAN: I have no problem with

1 that, Your Honor. THE COURT: Why don't we do that. 2 MS. POLAN: We want to mark this 3 what number? 4 THE COURT: Fifty. Then the 5 6 individual papers would be given a separate 7 number, 50 A, 50 B, 50 C. I don't think you have 8 more than 26 of them. If you do, we can do 9 double A's. MS. POLAN: I just wanted to have 10 this one marked because I know I don't have a 11 copy of it to provide. "The Military Strategy in 12 China", a copy was already marked as an exhibit. 13 14 Your Honor, just with respect to Mr. Dabrowski's proposal, I think the Court should 15 have everything that was in that brown folder 16 C 11 and my -- the only point I want to make is 17 that it needs to be completed. 18 THE COURT: At the end of the day 19 20 you and he can do that and file it with the 21 Clerk. The Court will then review it. 22 MS. POLAN: That will be fine. 23 THE COURT: Has the Clerk marked 24 this now?

MS. POLAN: Yes. This is item 50

1 and --THE COURT: Bring it over to her 2 and make sure she's done as we have agreed. 3 This will be Defendant's Exhibit 51, 4 the contents will be similarly identified and 5 marked. 6 (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, Q. 7 I'm showing you what's been marked Defendant's 8 Exhibit 51 for identification; can you identify 9 10 this item? This is a folder marked C 5, L 17 C 5. 11 Α. Let me refer to my inventory. 12 All right. Contained in C 5 is a 13 number of documents? 14 Α. That's correct. 15 THE COURT: Is this on your list, 16 Counsellor? 17 MS. POLAN: No, there is nothing 18 from C 5 on that list. 19 THE COURT: Why isn't it? 20 MS. POLAN: This is not my list. 21 This is the Government's exhibit list, Your 22 Honor. I have no idea why they made their 23 choices. 24

THE COURT: I see.

1 MS. POLAN: I'd like to offer this as a full exhibit. 2 THE COURT: Without objection, full 3 exhibit. MR. DABROWSKI: No objection, Your 5 Honor. 6 7 (Defendant's Exhibit 51 8 offered and marked into evidence) 9 10 11 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) On your inventory, Agent Williamson, you identified C 5 as a brown 12 file with revolutionary literature, is that 13 correct? 14 Α. That's correct. 15 And what did you base that description 16 Q. on? 17 Α. That was just a description that I used 18 on August 30th. 19 Q. What was it based on; did you read 20 21 everything in it before you wrote that down or 22 not? 23 Α. That's a general description of the 24 types of documents that were contained within the folder. 25

- Q. All right. Here again did you make an individualized decision with respect to the seizure of each document in there?
- A. I'd have the same answer that I had on C 11, which was that I looked through the documents. I don't recall if I read each individual document, but I made the determination that the documents contained in this folder fell within the purview of the search warrant.
- Q. All right. Well, directing your attention to the document marked L 17 C-5-2, could you read the title of that document?

  (Handing)
  - A. Do you want me to read it in Spanish?
- Q. Well, read it to yourself and tell us what it says.
  - A. These are --
- Q. I just want you to read it, tell us what the title is. Can you read Spanish?
- A. Yes. These are, "Good Teaching Principals".
- Q. The title of that is "Principles Conducive to Good Teaching", is that a fair translation?
  - A. Yes.

Q. Can you tell me why you seized that document?

A. This was, as I said before, this was part of this folder. At the time I would have looked at the documents one by one. And if this looked to me like -- after looking at the documents, that these were terrorist, this was terrorist literature, and that that's what this folder contained and this was part of it, I would assume that this was also part of the terrorist literature.

Q: So it's your testimony that you believe that a document entitled, "Principals Conducive to Good Teaching" was part of terrorist literature because it was in this folder?

A. Essentially, yes.

MS. POLAN: Now, directing your attention to the document -- excuse me, Your Honor, would you like me to have this marked with a subnumber now?

THE COURT: If you want to call the Court's attention to it later.

MS. POLAN: Yes, I do. I would ask the Clerk to mark this document "Principles Conducive to Good Teaching."

## THE COURT: 51 A.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, have you had a chance to examine the next item which is C-5-3?
- A. I've just begun to, entitled in Spanish, "The Function of the Party" and it concerns the Puerto Rican Socialist Party.
- Q. You know that, don't you, because it uses the initials P S P?
- A. Correct. And also in the first sentence it identifies the Puerto Rican Socialist Party.
- Q: So can you tell me why you seized that document?
- A. First of all, my answer would be the same as I said before. Looking at the documents as a whole, I decided to seize this document as part of this folder together.
- Q. Do you think that that document comes within the definition in the warrant of literature regarding international terrorism and terrorist groups?
- A. I would say this document also contains various underlinings and highlights on it starting with -- in a sentence, that it is a revolutionary party. If I saw this document

 apart from these documents in the folder, I would probably not have seized this document.

- Q. So it's because of its location with other documents that you seized it?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Not because of its independent evidentiary value?
- A. It would be based on the content of the document, but that read in conjunction with the location of the document with these other documents in the packet.
- Q. At the time you conducted this search, did you believe that it was a violation of criminal law to read documents about the Puerto Rican Socialist Party?
  - A. No.
- Q. Did you believe it was a violation of any federal statute to support the aims of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party?
  - A. No.
- Q. Now, directing your attention to L 17 C-5-5, can you look at that document and tell me what it is?
- A. It says, "Twenty-five Years of --" again it uses the Spanish word "Lucha".

1 Q. Which means struggle?

- A. It could be struggle, battle.
  - Q. That's a pamphlet, is it not?
  - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Is there a publication date on the outside?
- A. Well, there is a number here. I don't know if that refers to the date.
  - Q. Does it say 1955 on it?
  - A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Is that a pamphlet calling itself
  "Twenty-five Years of Struggle" which appears to
  have been printed in 1955; and could you look at
  that document and tell me what it's about, if you
  know?
- A. At the end of this it does have a date of when allegedly the article was originally written of April 23rd, 1955 with some copies of newspaper articles about the arrests of leaders of the Communist Party in the United States.
- Q. Now, have you -- did you look at that document before you seized it on August 30th of 1985?
  - A. I would have looked at it, yes.
  - Q. Well, were you aware that that document

1 was a recounting of the labor movement in Puerto Rico? 2 No, I'm not aware of that. 3 Q. Were you aware of that at the time you read it? 5 I don't recall. Α. 6 Again, was your decision to seize this 7 document based on its location in this folder? 8 9 Α. That would have been part of it, yes. 0. What was the other part of it? 10 Part of it would have been my reading Α. 11 of the document itself. 12 Well, can you look at the document and 13 tell me what about its content, if anything, 14 caused to you seize it? 15 I just looked at it. I don't see 16 anything -- I'm trying to read in the way I would 17 have read it on August 30th. I would have 18 flipped through it. It appears to be an article 19 talking about socialism and communism, nothing 20 21 else. That was the basis for the seizure? 22 Q • 23 If this were the only document Α. No. 24 that I had before me, I would not have seized

25

this document.

- Q. So the reason you seized it was its close proximity to other documents you wanted to seize?
- A. The content of it talking about -- again, I'm telling you why I would make the decision today. I don't recall why I did it on August 30th.
- Q. Well, I think what the Judge is interested in and I'm interested in is why you did it then, to the best of your recollection?
- A. To the best of my knowledge, which I've tried to state numerous times, is that looking at the number of documents as a whole, I looked through here and I found documents that I decided were associated with the terrorist group. And the -- this appeared to me to be a folder which Mr. Castro-Ramos used for his terrorist cell, so I seized the entire --
- Q. What was the basis of that conclusion on your part that Mr. Castro used these documents for his terrorist cell, as you called it; is that just your speculation or do you have any evidence to support that?
- A. That was my conclusion based upon reading through the documents.

Q. So you drew conclusions about what Mr. Castro did with these documents based on looking through them?

- A. I drew a conclusion as to whether I could seize these documents pursuant to the warrant.
- Q. Well, let me ask you this: If you're correct that Mr. Castro was using these documents or reading them in connection with some activities of his that you believed were illegal, was it your belief on August 30th that that gave you the right to seize those documents such as the one you're looking at right now; if, in fact, what your speculation is was true, would that have given you the right to seize the document?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. Because he was reading them?
- A. No, not because he was reading them,

  because of the fact that these were -- the

  location with the other documents which I made

  the determination at the time that these all fell

  within the purview of the warrant.
- Q. It's true, is it not, that C 5, which is that brown folder, was also found in the closet in the bedroom?

Yes, that's correct. Α.

2

In order to spare the Court's time,

3

it's fair to say that every document in here in

this file C 5 was seized for the same reason?

Yes. Α.

6

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And that it was your belief on August 30th that the warrant authorized the seizure of these documents?

That's correct.

And that's your belief today, isn't it? Q.

My belief today is I'd have to look through these documents again.

I'm not talking about documents, I'm talking about the warrant. On August 30th you believed you were entitled to take all of these documents because of where you found them and because of the conclusions you drew about them?

> That's correct. Α.

That's still your belief today, is it Q. not?

I'd have to review the documents to see if I would draw the same conclusion. On August 30th that was my opinion that those -- that the warrant allowed me to seize those documents.

> If you could, if you could look at the Q.

1 addendum, I think it's Exhibit 23, that's up here. Could you just tell me again which 2 language or which different language in the 3 warrant you believed authorized you to take all of those things in C 5? 5 Part of it would be on the second page 6 7 of the addendum, the third paragraph. About training manuals? 8 Q. 9 Training manuals and literature. Α. 10 Q. All right. Any other language in the warrant? 11 12 A: The fourth paragraph on the first page, communiques and documents. 13 So you believed that --Q. 14 Α. And --15 16 Q. Excuse me, go ahead. I think that was all. 17 Α. What about the language about Q. 18 literature regarding international terrorism; was 19 that --20 21 That was part of that paragraph. Α. 22 Q. Is that what you were referring to when 23 you said, "communiques and documents"? 24 Yes, that paragraph. 25 Directing your attention to one other  $Q_{\bullet}$ 

1 item in here, which is L 17 C 5-18 A and 18 B; can you identify those two documents? 2 This is a document that apparently was 3 published in Nicaragua which is entitled -- I'm giving you my translation which would be, I guess 5 it's, "Human Rights, The Defense of an Original 6 7 Revolution". Q. This is a magazine, isn't it? 8 Α. It doesn't --9 Or a pamphlet? 10 Q. It's some sort of a publication put out 11 in Manaqua in Nicaraqua. 12 Now, directing your attention back to 13 Q. the first page, that document has a year on it 14 and an issue number and a date, doesn't it? 15 Yes, it does. It says this is a Α. 16 special anniversary issue, July 1984. 17 So it's a periodical of some sort? 18 It's some sort of a document put out by 19 some group in Nicaragua. 20 THE COURT: What year? 21 THE WITNESS: July 1984, Your 22 Honor. 23 24 (BY MS. POLAN) It's correct, is it

not, that 18 B is just a photocopy of 18 A?

1 It appears to be, yes. Α. Now, going back to C 11 which is the Q. 2 other folder in which you took everything, 3 directing your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 52 for identification which is marked C 11-35-1, 5 can you identify what that document is? 6 (Handing) 7 Α. At the top the name of -- I guess it's 8 the name of this organization -- looks like 9 United Youth for Peace, and then the title of 10 this is -- I think it's, "The Work Plan". 11 Q: So that's a document that the heading 12 at the top is, "United Youth for Peace"? 13  $\mathbf{A}$  . Yes. 14 Q. It has an address somewhere? 15 Yes, it does. 16 Α. 17 Q. In Puerto Rico? That's correct. 18 Α. It's a work plan of some sort, or 19 Q. proposal? 20 21 Α. Yes, that's true. 22 MS. POLAN: I'd like to offer that. 23 THE COURT: Do you have any 24 objection? 25 MR. DABROWSKI: No, Your Honor.

1 The Exhibit number? THE COURT: THE CLERK: Fifty-two, Your Honor. 3 (Defendant's Exhibit 52 offered and marked into evidence) 5 6 7 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this item did come out of C 11, but I can't find the 8 original document so I gave it another number for 9 10 the time being. 0. (BY MS. POLAN) Can you tell me what 11 caused to you seize this document? 12 (Handing) 13 This document -- this doesn't appear to Α. 14 be a complete copy. This looks like a copy that 15 someone was working on. There are various 16 corrections. And there are telephone numbers 17 contained at the top of this document. 18 So your testimony is that the United Q. 19 Youth for Peace, their phone number at the top 20 caused to you seize it? 21 I don't recall why I seized this 22 23 document. 24 Q. Do you know --Α. But if the document contained telephone 25

numbers, I would have authorized its seizure.

- Q. So your testimony is that that

  document, which is a document apparently of a

  group calling itself United Youth for Peace, that

  has its address and telephone number on the top,

  that you were authorized to seize that because

  the warrant allowed the seizure of telephone

  numbers?
- A. That's correct. And these, for those telephone numbers.
- Q. Thank you. Did you consider the United
  Youth for Peace a terrorist organization?
- A. I don't recall that I've ever heard of the United Youth for Peace.
- Q. Agent Williamson, directing your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 53 for identification, can you identify that document?

  (Handing)
- A. According to the subinventory number, it's contained on the bottom of the document, this is number 39-17-6 from C 11.
  - Q. So that's something you took from C 11?
  - A. That's correct.

MS. POLAN: I would offer this.

THE COURT: Full exhibit without

1 objection. 2 (Defendant's Exhibit 53 3 offered and marked into evidence) - 4 5 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, why 6 did you seize this document; is this the entire 7 document? 8 Α. As far as I know. 9 I want to know why you seized that 10 Q. document; that's the document I have? 11 Α. Because it appears by the number that 12 this may be page seventeen of a seventeen-page 13 document or page six of a six-page document. 14 Q. Well, that document has a title at the 15 top of the page, doesn't it? 16 Yes, it does. Α. 17 Can you tell me looking at that  $\Omega$ . 18 document with your knowledge of Spanish -- it's a 19 document in Spanish -- why did you seize it? 20 These seem to be minutes of some type Α. 21 of a meeting. 22 Could you tell me what part of the Q. 23 warrant authorized to you seize minutes of some 24

part of a meeting?

A. If these are minutes of a Macheteros terrorist organization meeting. I would have seized it under the paragraph which begins "communiques and documents".

- Q. Can you tell me what particular language in that paragraph would have authorized you to seize this, if it were minutes of a meeting; what language in that paragraph?
- A. If there were minutes of a meeting of the Macheteros --
- Q. What language -- paragraph 4 is pretty large; are there any specific words in there that you're referring to?
- A. The fact that it says "Documents" at the beginning of it, "Documentation of past crimes and plans for future acts".
- Q. Is there anything in there about minutes of meetings?
- A. Well, just what I just said, the documents of the terrorist organization, the plans for past, present and future terrorist acts.
- $\Omega$ . So is it your testimony that that document, Exhibit 53, the reason you seized it, is because it contained plans for past, present

22

23

24

25

and future terrorist acts; the document, I'm asking why you seized the document, is that why you seized it?

- I don't recall this document specifically.
- So that might have been a document that Q. you seized without reading it also?
  - It may have been. I don't recall.

THE COURT: I'll ask our stenographer one question: Do you want a recess?

(Recess)

- (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, Q. before the break I was asking you about Defendant's Exhibit 53 which is an item you said you seized from Mr. Castro's house and was in the folder marked C 11. And that has the word "Actas" at the top of the page, right?
  - That's correct. λ.
- Q. That means minutes -- what does that translate to, "Actas"?
  - I don't know. It could be acts.
- All right. And I think you testified Q. before in response to my question that if it had

been minutes of a meeting of the Macheteros, you believe that this warrant, addendum, authorized you to seize it?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Can you tell me where on that document, if anywhere, it identifies itself as a document of the Macheteros?
- A. I don't see that it uses the word Macheteros on the document.
- Q. It doesn't have any logo on it, does it?
  - A: No, it does not.
- Q. It doesn't have any kind of signature on it at the bottom, does it?
- A. No, it does not. As I mentioned before, this looks like it was part of a -- either a six-page or a seventeen-page document.
  - Q. But it --
  - A. I only have the first page.
- Q. It has a heading at the top of the page, doesn't it; it doesn't start in the middle of a sentence, does it?
  - A. No.
- Q. Now, going back to Exhibit 51, which is a folder marked C 5, for a moment, and showing

you what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 51 D, which is a document within a folder, can you tell me what this document is?

## (Handing)

- A. It's an article by Mario, I'll spell the last name, B E N E D E T T -- it looks like an I. And there are six photocopies of this page of the article. And this is from the -- it appears to be from the opinion pages of El Reportero, E L, R E P O R T E R O. This is a Puerto Rican newspaper.
- Q. That document was seized at Mr. Castro's home, wasn't it?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And can you tell me what the title of that article means in English?
- A. I can't translate that, an accurate translation.
  - Q. Well --
- A. Discrete Song of a -- I don't know what derrota is.
- Q. Well, can you tell me how you decided on August 30th that you would seize it if you can't even read the title?
  - A. If I could not understand the title, I

. 

would have read the document. Reading this
document, I don't know why I would have seized
this. This is an opinion. I see it just
glancing at paragraphs. It talks about various
revolutions, begins by a discussion of some
students under De Gaulle. I don't really know.

- Q. Are you having trouble reading it?
- A. The print is extremely small.
- Q. It's talking about the student movement in Paris in 1968, isn't it; in the first few paragraphs?
- A: Yes, that's what it says. That's how it begins.
  - Q. You don't know why you seized it?
  - A. No, I don't. I have no idea.
- Q. Well, directing your attention to what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 51 E, which also came out of the folder marked C 5 which is C 5-20, can you identify what that document is?

## (Handing)

- A. This looks like a teacher's unit pamphlet.
  - Q. Can you read the title of the pamphlet?
  - A. Once again, I couldn't give you a

184 1 translation of the word Encrucijada. Could you spell that for the court Q. 2 reporter? 3 ENCRUCIJADA. Α. 4 Can you read the rest of the title? 5 0. Yes, but it's -- "of a public worker". Α. 6 Q. All right. 7 But it's put out by the Federation of Α. 8 Teacher's of Puerto Rico. 9 Can you tell me why you seized that  $Q_{\bullet}$ 10 document? 11 No, I don't recall. 12 Is that something you you thought Mr. Q. 13 Castro was reading for his cell? 14 I doubt that. Α. 15 But it was in C 5, wasn't it? Q. 16 Yes. Α. 17 I believe your testimony previously has 18 been if it was in this folder then you believed 19 you were authorized to take it? 20 At the time that was a decision that I 21 made based upon my review of the documents, yes. 22 Q. And you did review this document, 23

> I don't recall specifically now Α.

24

25

didn't you?

reviewing that document.

3 4

2

5

6

7

8

9

11

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

Directing your attention to what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 51 F, which also comes out of the folder C 5 which is marked C 5-21, can you look at that document and tell me generally what it is?

## (Handing)

- This is a document about revolution in Α. El Salvador.
- Q. It's a copy of a magazine or a journal, isn't it?
  - A: Yes.
  - What's the name of the journal?
  - Α. At the top of this it's Polemica,
- POLEMICA, Internacional,
- INTERNACIONAL.
- Does it have a date on the inside page Q. of when was published?
- On the front page is February 1980 and El Salvador.
  - Why did you seize that document? 0.
- I don't know why this was seized at Α. this point, unless on a quick reading of this, I thought this could have been used as part of a training manual, because it does talk about

revolutionary strategy.

- **2**

- Q. Is there anything in there about military operations?
- A. Yes, but looking at it now, it appears more of an historical reporting of military operations in El Salvador.
  - Q. Historical report?
- A. It says -- there is a section in here on strategies in revolutions.
- Q. So it was your understanding on August 30th that that was seizeable because of the language in this warrant that authorized you to take training manuals and literature on the second page of the Addendum 2?
- A. I don't recall why I took this

  particular document, but that certainly -- if I

  had read that on August 30th, that's one reason

  why I may have taken this. I might have looked

  at the first few pages and read about the

  revolutionary strategies.
- O. So it was your understanding on August 30th that the language in the warrant on page 2 of Addendum 2 that authorized you to take training manuals authorized the seizure of a document that talked about revolutionary

strategies?

- A. If it were the type which instructed in the use of one of those listed, various categories there.
- Q. Well, did you believe that document, Polemica Internacional, fell within that category?
- A. Your Honor, I don't recall why I seized this document. That's -- I can speculate but that's -- it would be pure speculation.
- Q. Today you don't think that's a training manual of the kind described in the warrant, do you?
  - A. No, I don't.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, with respect to these items that are within 51, I haven't separately moved them into evidence because my understanding was the entire folder is in evidence. I just want to make sure the record is clear because the Clerk pointed out to me that -- I'm not sure I'm not confused about the procedure.

THE COURT: You're going to provide transcripts of the English?

MS. POLAN: If they exist, I'll be

1 glad to provide them, Your Honor. But all of these items that are within --2 THE COURT: I don't expect to be 3 able to read them. MS. POLAN: All of these items that 5 are within 51, I will assume are in evidence 7 because they're part of 51. THE COURT: Very well. 8 9 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Going back to folder C 11, can you identify this document which has 10 been marked Defendant's Exhibit 54 for 11 identification? 12 (Handing) 13 MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, could I 14 ask counsel for the number? 15 MS. POLAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I 16 apologize. This is L 17 C 11-15-1, 2, 3, 4, 5 17 and 6. 18 MR. DABROWSKI: Thank you. 19 (BY MS. POLAN) Is that a document that Q. 20 was taken from Mr. Castro's house? 21 Α. Yes. 22 That was in folder C 11?  $\Omega$ . 23 Α. That's correct. 24 Can you identify that particular 25 Ω.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

document, what it is?

It's a list of telephone numbers.

right-hand column is very difficult to read.

the top there is -- on the top left-hand side the

words are typed out in Spanish, it's "Prensa,

PRENSA, Asociada, ASOCIADA.

What does that mean? 0.

I quess Associated Press. And then on the -- I'm afraid on this photocopy I can't make out the right-hand column. But there are various addresses. And then on the right, there are other names and addresses. And then there is a name, El Reportero, E L, R E P O R T E R O.

- 0. Do you know what El Reportero is?
- Yes, that's a newspaper. Α.
- Is it fair to say that this document is Q. a list of different media in Puerto Rico, television and newsprints, other media with their addresses and phone numbers?
- There are -- there are letters which look like radio station letters.
- Q. So is it the list of the mass media with their addresses and phone number?
  - That's what it appears to be. Α.

MS. POLAN: I would offer this

24

document.

2 MR. DABROWSKI: No objection, Your

3 Honor.

(Defendant's Exhibit 54 offered and marked into evidence)

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, perhaps
this is a document that the Government could make
available the original, because I don't see it
over there in the collection of documents and it
is very difficult to read.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, can you tell me, Agent Williamson, why you seized that document?
- A. Once again, I have no specific recollection of what my -- went through my decision-making process at the time. I can tell you why I would seize this today.
- Q. Well, can you tell me what language of the warrant authorizes you to seize it?
  - A. It's a distribution list.
- Q. This is a distribution list, a list of television stations and radio stations and newspapers; that's your understanding that it falls within the meaning of the warrant for

distribution lists?

that document.

A. Yes, if that's -- that was in the possession of a member of the terrorist group.

In addition, there are many telephone numbers on

Q. It's correct, is it not -- I know this is a bad copy -- that the telephone numbers on this document are the telephone numbers of the newspapers in San Juan, El Mundo, El Nuevo Dia, The Star; aren't those the telephone numbers on the document?

- A: In addition, they're --
- Q. I'm just asking a question; is that what it is, and those phone numbers are on the front page of the newspapers in San Juan?
- A. On the first page, among other telephone numbers, there are telephone numbers next to the names of some of the newspapers.

  Those are among many telephone numbers that appear on this document.
- Q. Is it fair to say that all of the telephone numbers that appear on the document appear to be numbers of a particular newspaper or T V station or radio station from the document itself?

ŧ

. 

- A. No. They're names of individuals here with telephone numbers by them.
- Q. And around those names of individuals, underneath the name of a -- something that appears to be a television or radio station, with call letters W C I D?
- A. In some cases, yes. But for instance, in W C I D, there is the name of a Mr. Charlie Cordero, C O R D E R O, immediately underneath it. But then there is another paragraph after skipping a few spaces where there is a name of an individual, Mr. Francisco -- last name, I can't read the last letter but it appears to be C U I M. And his telephone number.
- Q. Is that the only instance on these pages where there is a telephone number that does not appear to be associated with the name of a -- excuse me, with a television station or radio station or newspaper?
- A. That would appear to be the other individuals who have telephone numbers underneath their names. Those names appear below letters which also appear to designate radio or television stations.
  - Q. So it's true, is it not, if you weren't

7

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

looking for evidence of a crime, you might look at this exhibit, and you would look at this and say, "This is a list of the names of contact people in various media in Puerto Rico and their phone numbers"?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. He was looking for evidence. This was found as part of a larger folder that contained other material. We know the telephone communiques were made with considerable frequency, many of which are set forth in the affidavit which he read and we're not dealing with a hypothetical that Ms. Polan has laid out here.

MS. POLAN: I'll withdraw that question.

- (BY MS. POLAN) Did you think that document has evidentiary value?
  - A. Yes, I did.
  - When you seized it? Q.
  - Yes. Α.
- $\Omega$ . What particular crime was it evidence of?
- To me -- when I say I'm very sure of it, because right now looking at this, I'd have

no doubt about seizing this document.

- Q. What particular crime do you think it constituted evidence of when you seized it; you can look on Addendum 2 and tell me which of those crimes this is evidence of?
- A. Right now I'm not familiar with the -- those sections of Title 18 specifically.
- Q. What federal crime do you believe this is evidence of?
  - A. This document itself?
  - Q. Uhm-hmm?
- A: This would have to be, you know, this is -- would have to be used together with other evidence.
- Q. What I want to know is what crime does this constitute evidence of; what violation of federal law is it to have a list of phone numbers and addresses of the media in Puerto Rico; that's what I'm asking you, what crime?
- A. Well, if Mr. Castro-Ramos used this list in --
- Q. I'm not asking you to hypothesize; I'm asking you what crime is this evidence of?

MR. DABROWSKI: That's exactly what she's asking him to do, Your Honor, is to guess

as to what this may reflect evidence of.

2

MS. POLAN: No, he said it had

3

evidentiary value to him.

4

THE COURT: Of course, obviously it doesn't indicate any crime.

6

5

7

to find out what its evidentiary value was when

8

he seized it.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. POLAN: That's why I'm trying

THE COURT: The only way it could have any evidence at all, as I look at it, seeing it from here, is if it had numbers or names on it of people who were in the same group with their telephone numbers on it. And taking that together with the affidavit of things they were alleged to have done, not the Wells Fargo case, but the broad aspect of alleged terrorist activity that they were apart of, some of that group.

Now, maybe they were all clergymen for all I know. I don't know whose numbers are on there. But I presume you'd have to take the whole picture together to evaluate it. I don't think we're going to get anywhere by asking him today what it means to him today. It doesn't mean to much, I don't think.

1	through D 4, et cetera.
2	THE COURT: What do they appear to
3	be?
4	THE WITNESS: They appear to be
5	copies of an article called, "Clandestine Battle
6	and Battle of the Masses."
7	THE COURT: Identical articles,
8	right?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Six copies of the same
11	thing?
12	A: Yes, about the Macheteros.
13	Q. That is a copy of an article that was
14	published in a magazine, isn't it?
15	A. It appears to be.
16	Q. What's the magazine?
17	A. I'll spell it, it's
18	PENSAMIENTO, the second word is
19	CRITICO.
20	MS. POLAN: I would offer this as a
21	full exhibit.
22	THE COURT: Full exhibit.
23	
24	(Defendant's Exhibit 55 offered and marked into
25	evidence)

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Why did you seize all these copies of this document?

(Handing)

- A. Well, this is a -- to me right now, looking at the addendum, this looks like a newspaper or a magazine clipping related to the Macheteros. Each one of those is a newspaper or magazine article about the Macheteros.
  - Q. That's why you seized it?
- A. That's why I would seize this document today.
  - Q. Why did you seize it then?
- A. I cannot specifically recall my reasons for it then.

THE COURT: Doesn't it say,

counsellor, in this document, "Newspaper,

magazine clippings related to the Macheteros and

other terrorist groups". He's authorized to pick

them up?

MS. POLAN: That's what he says, he was authorized to pick that up under that category.

THE COURT: Isn't that what the warrant says?

1 MS. POLAN: That's what the warrant 2 says. (BY MS. POLAN) Did you understand this 0. 3 to be a magazine clipping? That's what it appears to me now. 5 6 You're aware, are you not, that 7 Pensamiento Critico is a magazine published in Puerto Rico? 8 I've heard of it before. 9 I've never read it. 10 11 Q. But it is available; you can buy it in Puerto Rico? 12 I don't know what the distribution is 13 or how it's distributed. 14 Doesn't the F B I have copies of all Q. 15 the issues of Pensamiento Critico that have been 16 published in Puerto Rico? 17 Α. I'm not aware of that. 18 19 Q. So it was your understanding on August 30th that because this magazine article talked 20 21 about the Macheteros, that you were entitled to seize it? 22 23 Α. That would be the reason I would seize 24 this document today. I don't recall why I seized 25 this on August 30th. I have no specific

1 recollection looking at this group of articles. So you don't know why you seized it? 2 That's correct. 3 And you don't know why you seized all Q. the copies of it either? 5 Each of these copies is a copy of a 6 newspaper clipping. Each one would be seized for 7 the same reason. Well, for your purposes at the F B I, 9 would you have any need for more than one copy of 10 a document that was into somebody's house? 11 MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your 12 Honor. It's irrelevant. If one copy -- he's 13 permitted to seize one, he's permitted to seize 14 them all. For the record, Your Honor, I believe 15 there are seven copies there, not six. I lost 16 one -- I didn't lose it, apparently one got lost. 17 MS. POLAN: I would say, Your 18 Honor, this document does have an A version and 19 the A version of it is on the Government's 20 exhibit list. These are the six other copies. 21 Mr. Dabrowski is correct. 22 MR. DABROWSKI: I think she has 23

MR. DABROWSKI: I think she has seven copies before the witness.

24

25

THE COURT: Let's proceed. Whether

1 we've got seven or six or five, it doesn't make much difference. 2 MR. DABROWSKI: It makes a 3 difference. I'm trying to keep track. She said 5 six; I had seven. MS. POLAN: I think the document is 6 on the Government's exhibit list, same one, L 17 7 8 C 11-17 A one through four which I believe is this same document. 10 THE COURT: All right. Let's proceed to the next one. 11 12 Q: (BY MS. POLAN) Now --13 THE COURT: The exhibit number, Madam Clerk? 14 THE CLERK: Fifty-six, Your Honor. 15 (BY MS. POLAN) Directing your Q. 16 attention to Defendant's Exhibit 56 for 17 identification, was this document taken from Mr. 18 Castro's house? 19 (Handing) 20 21 MR. DABROWSKI: Could I have the L 22 number? 23 MS. POLAN: We're going to find out 24 in a second. 25 THE WITNESS: It contains the

1 L number L 17 C-16-1.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) So that was also taken from room C, was it not?
  - A. Yes, out of the bookcase in bedroom C.
- Q. And how did you describe that item on the inventory form?
  - A. As two revolutionary pamphlets.
- Q. So you consider this a revolutionary pamphlet?
  - A. Is this the entire document?
- Q. Well, I'm afraid that's all I've been given by the Government. I don't know if that's the whole pamphlet and the original doesn't appear to be here.

That's the first page of the document.

That's in English, isn't it?

- A. Yes.
- Q. What's it say?
- A. The Alienation of Leninist Group
  Therapy.
- Q. It's the international meeting of members of some organization called the New Jewel Movement and these are -- it says these are minutes recorded by an unidentified note-taker. This is an article or appears to be a copy of an

1 article that appeared in a magazine called Caribbean Review, is it not? 2 A. That's correct. 3 MS. POLAN: I would offer this. THE COURT: Full exhibit. 5 6 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would ask that the Government be asked to produce the 7 entire document, if it exists, because I was only 8 9 given one page of it. So the Court can review it. It's in English. 10 11 (Defendant's Exhibit 56 12 offered and marked into evidence) 13 14 MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, for the 15 record, I don't know whether Ms. Polan or I 16 have -- I don't know if she's looked for the 17 document amongst the originals that were laid out 18 on the floor here. I can't represent that it's 19 not here. It may very well be right here. 20 21 Apparently she can. 22 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, can you tell me 23 why you seized that document? 24 (Handing) 25 This article concerns Grenada and the Α.

1 Cubans -- I guess the Cuban revolutionaries that were in Grenada prior to the U. S. invasion. 2 Q. So what --3 Α. And --I'm sorry? 5 Since I don't have the rest of the 6 document, I cant make a determination just based 7 on this. R Well, if that was the only page of the 0. 9 document that was there, what language in the 10 warrant authorized you to seize it? 11 I would -- I think it would be based Α. 12 only on this. This would be an oral concerning 13 some international terrorism. 14 Q. So it's your testimony that that 15 article was seized because it's about 16 international terrorism? 17 I don't recall specifically why I 18 seized this. But if the gist of the article 19 continues talking about the Cuban insurrection 20 movement in Grenada, then I --21 Q. It's the North Americans who invaded 22 Grenada, right; isn't that who invaded Grenada in 23 1983? 24

25

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your

Honor.

MS. POLAN: Well, I'm trying to find out if he knows his facts. He's talking about a Cuban insurrection.

THE COURT: It's pretty clear from the record, you're wasting time, Counsellor.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, directing your attention to Defendant's Exhibit 57, would you look at that document and tell me if it was taken from Mr. Castro's home, those documents; well, can you tell from the document if it was taken from his home?
- A. Yes. This appears not to be taken from the home but from his automobile.
- Q. What's the notation on that -- those documents?
  - A. At the bottom it's L 17 Y Y I B.
- Q. Do the other documents have other numbers on them?
- A. This is Y Y 1 A and this just says L 17
  Y Y 1.
- Q. So these documents were taken from one of Mr. Castro's automobiles, is that right?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. All right. And that's on the inventory

1 listed as a Mazda? Yes, that's correct. 2 And on the inventory, these items are 0. 3 described as election flyers, is that correct, on 4 the inventory? 5 The way I described them were Α. No. 6 7 samples of photocopied documents. Well, on the subinventory somebody has 8 Q. described them as election flyers? 9 Α. Yes, election flyers and an election 10 cartoon. 11 All right. Q: 12 MS. POLAN: I would offer this as a 13 full exhibit. 14 MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 15 THE COURT: It may be marked. 16 17 . . (Defendant's Exhibit 57 18 offered and marked into evidence) 19 20 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, 21 could you just look over these documents and they 22 might be in the wrong order here, and tell me if 23 they appear to you to, in fact, be some kind of 24

election flyers and cartoons?

- A. This does concern some sort of election procedures.
- Q. Does it appear to you to be flyers for a labor union election?
- A. That's what it appears to be, something to do with labor relations.
- Q. Why was that document seized or those documents; why were they seized?
- A. As I recall, this was -- from reading my inventory form, these three pages were taken as a sample of the -- there were numerous documents, and as a sample of photocopied documents to be able to determine from which machine these were photocopied from.
- Q. So that these documents were taken so you could determine what photocopy machine they were taken from, made on, is that the --
  - A. As I recall, yes.
- Q. Now, can you tell me where in the warrant it authorizes you to take things to determine what photocopy machine they were made on?
- A. I think at the time that's how I interpreted the last paragraph on the first page of the addendum concerning document duplicating

equipment.

- Q. So your testimony is that the language on the warrant that authorized you to take document duplicating equipment also authorized you to take any photocopies you found of any paper to test to see what machine they were made on?
- A. I don't know about any paper. But this particular paper, as I recall, that's the reason that I seized these pieces of paper.
- Q. I just want to make sure I understand what you're saying. Is that the last paragraph on the first page of Addendum 2, which authorized the seizure of document duplicating equipment, copiers, computers, et cetera. You understood that to authorize you to take this paper so that you could check and try to figure out what photocopy machine it was made on?
- A. As I recall, that was the reason I took this, yes.
- Q. Were there any other pieces of paper that you took out of Mr. Castro's house on that basis?
  - A. No.
  - Q. Why this paper?

A. I think because of the quantity of these types of documents that were in the car.

- Q. Now, can you tell me, since my inventory doesn't tell me, what was in the trunk of that car; other than those three pieces of paper, what else did you take out of the trunk of that car?
- A. That was all that was taken out of the trunk of the car.
  - Q. These three pieces of paper?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q: Were there a number of other pieces of paper in the trunk of the car?
  - A. Yes, there were numerous other pieces.
- Q. Were there a lot of copies of those same things?
- A. As I recall, on my -- under the remarks column on my inventory form, I noted that there were numerous other copies not taken. So I'm assuming these were other copies of this same document.
- Q. Now, when you looked at that document and you saw that it was some kind of election for some kind of teacher's union, did that create some suspicion in your mind that you should check

. 17

where the photocopies were made?

- A. First of all, I didn't know that it was from a teacher's union.
  - Q. Did you read it before you took it?
- A. I looked at it. It looked like something about elections and there is some rules here and whether people in whatever organization this is can vote.
- Q. Well, what I'm trying to find out is if there is something that made you suspicious about the origin of those particular documents, that would want to make you check where they were photocopied?
  - A. Not that I recall.
- Q. So it was just an arbitrary decision to take those three pieces of paper and try to find out what photocopy machine produced them?
- A. At the time I thought that I could take these documents under the provisions of the warrant and the addendum.
- Q. I'm just trying to get at your decision to take these particular documents. It was an arbitrary decision, wasn't it?
- A. I wouldn't call it arbitrary. There were numerous copies of documents. We decided to

seize one of those numerous copies.

. 

Q. Well, the decision to seize this particular document, to look, to examine it, was it made based on anything in the document itself?

A. It was based on the fact that there were numerous photocopies of the document, and based upon the last paragraph of the first page of the addendum.

Q. You knew, did you not, that Mr.

Castro's wife was a teacher and a member of the teacher's union?

A. No, I did not.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, shall I continue or --

THE COURT: Did counsel contemplate a meeting tonight?

MS. POLAN: Yes, I believe so.

THE COURT: How are we progressing,

Counsellor? Should I allot a time for you tomorrow to complete your work in?

MS. POLAN: I'm just about done with these political documents, but I have to go through several other categories of documents with this agent. I don't think it will be as extensive as these documents.

1 THE COURT: How long do you think it will take? 2 MS. POLAN: At least part of the 3 morning. THE COURT: I assume that. 5 MS. POLAN: Maybe all the morning. THE COURT: What? 7 MS. POLAN: Perhaps all of the 8 morning, but at least half of the morning. 9 THE COURT: What was agreed to, 10 Counsellor, for tomorrow? 11 MS. POLAN: That we would finish. 12 MR. DABROWSKI: We agreed to 13 continue this search into tomorrow. And Jorge 14 Farinacci-Garcia, that is Mr. Avery, would be 15 ready to start upon the conclusion of this 16 hearing; however, there are approximately four or 17 five additional witnesses on this hearing, none 18 of them are going to be as extensive as this 19 agent because he's the person who made the 20 decision on the seizures. 21 THE COURT: Well, to expedite the 22 matter from the Court's point of view, I don't 23 24 have them before me at the moment, but I'd be

interested in knowing what specific exhibits you

have listed from this particular search and what the particular items are on those items.

MR. DABROWSKI: Are you talking about the Government's exhibit list, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I would like to see that list. And to see whether they conform to the search warrant.

MR. DABROWSKI: Number one, the list had been filed. Number two, it does include some items taken from C 11. It does not include items taken from C 5. And in addition, the Government intends to move for leave of the Court to supplement that list and include at least the black mask and some of those other items on the exhibit list.

So there is an exhibit list, it does include items from amongst C ll that you haven't seen, for example a fake passport and a fake death certificate amongst others that are in C ll, I believe.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would ask those remarks be stricken. It has nothing to do with anything.

THE COURT: There is no jury here.

Nobody has heard it except you. As the Court,

I'm interested, Counsellor, in this, whatever

list we're going to be talking about tomorrow. I

would like to have before me the Government's

list of exhibits that came from these particular

premises. I don't want to have to go out and

search for them.

MS. POLAN: I have given you that.

That list I gave you is the Government's list with respect to this location. This is the section of the Government's exhibit list that pertains to my client's house starting with 997.

That's why I've given it to you.

of the items I don't even know what they are except by notation. In other words, "one letter". Well, I don't know. It might be a letter to the King of England, for all I know.

MS. POLAN: It probably is.

THE COURT: The point is --

MR. DABROWSKI: I think it's a letter that discusses Roco, who is the defendant Antonio Camacho-Negron.

THE COURT: Whatever exhibits you've got listed, if it wouldn't be too difficult, I'd like to have before me tomorrow a

list of those things and what those -- what they are, what are they all about.

And then see from this witness so that I can ask him, if you or your adversary doesn't, where in the document which is before us in controversy, these particular items appear, because these are going to be the controversial ones.

The rest don't mean anything because you're not going to use it. I'm concerned and interested to know so as we go through it and ask questions, I'll try and be able to be intelligently informed what particular ones are going to be offered which might be questioned and challenged.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, let me just say for the record two things: One, certainly exhibits that I have shown to the witness are on the Government's exhibit list. Certainly things that I have shown to him, they are on that list. However, with respect to what Your Honor just said, I think that the inquiry is not just which of the exhibits on the exhibit list were outside the scope of the warrant --

THE COURT: I understand.

. 17

MS. POLAN: But which things,

period. Because one problem we have, Your Honor,

is that we don't know which of these items from

Mr. Castro's house, the Government may try to use
on rebuttal. And unless they're willing to

stipulate that nothing else is going to be used
at any time, then Your Honor is going to have to
decide which items were improperly seized, if not
all of them, and issue orders suppressing certain
items unless we have some kind of stipulation

that they don't intend to use them at all on

rebuttal. I don't think Mr. Dabrowski is willing
to do that. Nothing had been returned to my
client

THE COURT: In other words, in simple form, as I see it, unless the Court finds that the search was so broad that the process was abused completely and everything in the search should be suppressed --

MS. POLAN: That's our position.

THE COURT: That's your position.

Then the other alternative is because sometime after you've all gone home, I've got to sit down and look at this and make a decision. So I want to be able to have before me -- at least to be

able to grasp a handle and have answers to a list of these things that the Government's proposing to offer and be able to ask this gentleman, "Well, take this one here, or that one there, the seventh one or the tenth one or whatever one is on the list. Where did you get authority to go in and take this?" And let him answer if he can. And if he can't, why then that will be in the record, too.

MS. POLAN: That's fine, Your
Honor. What I was just trying to point out is
that, for example, with respect to this folder,
C 5, right now the Government says, "There is
nothing on the exhibit list from C 5." But that
doesn't end the inquiry because you have to make
a ruling about C 5 because they may come back
later and say now we want to use it on rebuttal,
and it has to be decided.

THE COURT: I asked that question previously trying to get agreement. I think it was on Mr. Bergen's client. And they said, "Well, Your Honor, we might use that on rebuttal."

MS. POLAN: That's the problem,
Your Honor. That's why I have to spend so much

1 of the Court's time going through these items because we are not restricted to those 2 thirty-three items on the exhibit list. They 3 want, you know, open season on rebuttal. THE COURT: But we have that 5 picture. And I want the Government's recitation 6 tomorrow so I'll get the other side of the 7 picture so when the questions are asked I'll be 8 able to focus in on them. 9 MS. POLAN: Fine. Thank you, Your 10 Honor. 11 THE COURT: That's all. Adjourn 12 13 court. 14 15 (Proceedings suspended at 4:00 p.m.) 16 17 . . 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

February 17, 1987

## CERTIFICATION

I, CHERYL A. BLATCHFORD, hereby certify that the foregoing pages were reported by me in stenotype and thereafter reduced to typewritten form by computer-assisted transcription under my supervision and represent a true, comlete and accurate transcript of the above proceedings, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto or their counsel and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said cause.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 23rd day of February 1987.

CHERYL A. BLATCHFORD