CHARCE RHATES

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
3	UNITED CHARLE OF AMERICA
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) Plaintiff, )
5	Vs. ) H-85-50
6	VICTOR GERENA, et al., )
7	Defendants. )
8	February 19, 1987
9	10:00 A.M.
10	
11	BEFORE: HONORABLE T. EMMET CLARIE, U.S.D.J.
12	APPEARANCES
13	For the Plaintiff:
14	OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY
15	450 Main Street
16	Hartford, Connecticut 06103 BY: ALBERT S. DABROWSKI, ESQUIRE
17	JOHN A. DANAHER, ESQUIRE 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
	CAPITOL COURT REPORTERS
24	P.O. Box 1532
25	Hartford, Connecticut 06101

1	For the Defendant Norman Ramirez-Talavera:
	JUAN R. ACEVEDO, ESQUIRE
2	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	
8	For the Defendant Elias Castro-Ramos:
0	DIANE POLAN, ESQUIRE
9	265 Church Street Suite 808
10	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
11	For the Defendant Carlos Ayes-Suarez:
12	SHIPMAN & GOODWIN
13	799 Main Street
13	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
14	BY: JAMES BERGEN, ESQUIRE
15	For the Defendant Isaac Camacho-Negron:
16	BIOURDD DEBUTE ECOUIDE
10 .	RICHARD REEVE, ESQUIRE Assistant Public Defender
17	234 Church Street
	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
18	·
19	For the Defendant Juan E. Segarra-Palmer:
20	LEONARD I. WEINGLASS, ESQUIRE
	6 W. 2oth Street
21	New York, New York 10011
22	For the Defendant Filiberto Ojeda-Rios:
23	
	WILLIAM N. KUNSTLER, ESQUIRE
24	13 Gay Street New York, New York 10014
25	

. J

	·
1	For the Defendant Jorge Farinacci-Garcia:
2	AVERY & FRIEDMAN
ĺ	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
İ	343 S. Dearborn
11	Chicago, Illinois 60604
12	For the Defendant Hilton Fernandez-Diamante:
•	
13	JOHN WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE
14	51 Elm Street
	New Haven, Connecticut 06510
15	
16	For the Defendant Luis Alfredo Colon-Osorio:
	RONALD L. KUBY, ESQUIRE
17	13 Gay Street
18	New York, New York 10014
19	For the Defendant Luz Maria Berrios-Berrios:
20	BLUME, ELBAUM & SEIDMAN, ESQUIRE
21	50 Columbus Bouldward
21	Hartford, Connecticut 06103
22	BY: JACOB WIESELMAN, ESQ.
23	For the Defendant Paul Weinberg:
24	BUCKLEY & SANTOS
	51 Russ Street
25	Hartford, Connecticut 06106
	BY: F. MAC BUCKLEY. ESOUIRE

L

## INDEX

witnesses:	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROS
JOHN WILL	AMSON	12	61	129
J. HOMERO	RIVERA 149	204	205	
JAMES R. I	YONS 207		•.	
EXHIBITS:	DESCR	IPTION		PAGE
GOVERNMENT	7:		· (a) an an ad (ii) an at (ii) (ii) (ii) an an ar	
29 .	DOCUMENT			114
30	DOCUMENT			114
31	DOCUMENT			114
32	NEWSPAPER A	RTICLE		11
33	BIRTH CERTI	FICATE		114
34	DEATH CERTI	FICATE		114
35	ORGANIZATIO	N RULES		11
42	RED TEE SHI	RT		119
28	BLACK CLOTH	WITH TWO	HOLES	11:
41	THREE DOCUM	ENTS		12
	, <del>(</del> ;			
DEFENDANT:	5 1			
110	SAVINGS PAS	SBOOK		26
111	SAVINGS PAS	SBOOK		28
127	PHOTOGRAPH			35
115	PARKING TIC	KET RECEI	PTS	39
116	PARKING TIC	KET RECEI	PTS	39
121	BAIL CERTIF	CATE		42
131	PHOTOGRAPH			48
132	PHOTOGRAPH			48
134	MEMORANDUM,	11/17/76	5	54
139	POEM			14
140	BANK DOCUME			14
141	APPLICATION	-DEATH BE	ENEFITS	14

1	THE COURT: Would you call the
2	role, please?
3	THE CLERK: Yes. Diane Polan?
4	MS. POLAN: Here.
5	THE CLERK: John Williams?
6	MR. WILLIAMS: Here.
7	THE CLERK: James Bergen?
8	MR. BERGEN: Here.
9	THE CLERK: Juan Acevedo?
10	MR. ACEVEDO: Here.
11	THE CLERK: Ronald Kuby?
12	MR. KUBY: Here.
13	THE CLERK: F. Mac Buckley? Jacob
14	Wieselman? Michael Avery?
15	MR. AVERY: Here.
16	THE CLERK: Margaret Levy?
17	MS. LEVY: Here.
18	THE CLERK: Leonard Weinglass?
19	MR. ACEVEDO: Mr. Weinglass called
20	me this morning, Judge, that he won't be able to
21	be in until this afternoon. He asked me to stand
22	in for him.
23	THE COURT: Okay.
24	THE CLERK: Linda Backiel?
25	MS. BACKIEL: Here.

l	
1	THE CLERK: Richard Reeve?
2	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm filling in for
3	Mr. Reeve.
4	THE CLERK: Michael Deutsch?
5	MR. DEUTSCH: Here.
6	THE CLERK: Harold Meyerson?
7	MR. ANGLADA-LOPEZ: Good morning,
8	for Mr. Meyerson.
9	THE CLERK: William Kunstler?
10	MR. KUBY: Covering for Mr.
11	Kunstler.
12	THE CLERK: And Roberto Maldonado?
13	And defendant, Antonio Camacho-Negron?
14	MS. BACKIEL: He's in Puerto Rico.
15	THE CLERK: Norman
16	Ramiriz-Talavera?
17	MR. ACEVEDO: He's in Puerto Rico
18	pursuant to a waiver.
19	THE CLERK: Ivonne
20	Melendez-Carrion?
21	MS. MELENDEZ-CARRION: Good
22	morning, here.
23	THE CLERK: Elias Castro-Ramos?
24	MR. CASTRO-RAMOS: Si.
25	THE CLERK: Carlos Suarez? Isaac

1	Camacho-Negron? Juan Segarra-Palmer?
2	MR. SEGARRA-PALMER: Good morning.
3	THE CLERK: Filiberto Ojeda-Rios?
4	MR. OJEDA-RIOS: Here.
5	THE CLERK: Jorge Farinacci-Garcia?
6	MR. FARINACCI-GARCIA: Here.
7	THE CLERK: Angel Diaz-Ruiz?
8	MS. LEVY: He's at home in Puerto
9	Rico pursuant to a waiver.
10	THE CLERK: Orlando
11	Gonzalez-Claudio?
12	MR. DEUTSCH: He's in Puerto Rico.
13	THE CLERK: Hilton
14	Fernandez-Diamante?
15	MR. WILLIAMS: He's in Puerto Rico
16	pursuant to a waiver.
. 17	THE CLERK: Luis Colon-Osorio?
18	MR. KUBY: Puerto Rico pursuant to
19	a waiver.
20	THE CLERK: Luz Berrios-Berrios?
21	MR. DEUTSCH: She's in Puerto Rico.
22	THE CLERK: Roberto
23	Maldonado-Rivera? And Paul Weinberg?
24	MR. BERGEN: If I could just add
25	that Carlos Ayes is in Puerto Rico on a waiver.

MR. ACEVEDO: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Good morning,

Counsellor.

MR. ACEVEDO: I have to raise some matters. One, according to all scheduling, my client, Ramirez-Talavera, was supposed to be here yesterday for his hearing. His hearing has been postponed, and we just want the record to reflect that he will be here in Hartford when his hearing commences which is now scheduled for March 3rd.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. ACEVDO: The second matter is

I'm standing in --

THE COURT: Do both counsel agree on that that? Does the prosecutor agree to that?

MR. DABROWSKI: As of this minute, yes, Your Honor. However, what is obviously going to happen twice, that Weinglass and I, first individually and then collectively with everyone, are going to have to sit down again and readjust the schedule. We did that last week but we already have problems with it. So as soon as Mr. Weinglass gets here, we'll do it again.

THE COURT: I'll leave that up to counsel.

MR. ACEVEDO: Second matter. Mr. Segarra has informed me this morning of a situation at the jail where they're being kept. We would like Your Honor to investigate this matter. He claims that his legal materials, which include some very confidential papers that he's working on for his counsel and for other attorneys, were taken away from him by the prison officials this morning for over half an hour.

Usually the procedure is that when they're going out to Court, the materials are checked in their presence for contraband, and they keep it. This morning, they took those away, and they kept his legal materials for over thirty minutes.

As you can understand, I think this is very improper and he had -- the materials were out of his sight. He could not see them. He doesn't know where they were.

THE COURT: What were they anyway?

A pad of paper and what --

MR. ACEVEDO: No, sir. He had some pleadings.

THE COURT: Pleadings?

MR. ACEVEDO: And he had some notes

1	and a memo from Mr. Jack Wieselman on the
2	electronic surveillance.
3	THE COURT: Were they in an
4	envelope or
5	MR. ACEVEDO: No, papers like this.
6	They were inside maybe we can show the Court.
7	(Indicating)
8	MR. ACEVEDO: That is his legal
9	materials. And we would request that the
10	marshals and prison officials be instructed that
11	this doesn't happen any more.
12	THE COURT: He'd like them
13	inspected in his presence.
14	MR. ACEVEDO: Yes, sir. I think
15	that's the proper way.
16	THE COURT: Very well. All right.
17	Ms. Polan, are you ready to proceed?
18	The witness, Mr. Williamson, was sworn yesterday,
19	and his testimony will continue to be under oath.
20	MS. POLAN: Good morning, Your
21	Honor.
22	THE COURT: Good morning,
23	Counsellor.
24	MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I have left
25	an additional copy of a subinventory for the

1 witness to look at. I know Your Honor also has a copy, and I haven't had it marked. It's just an 2 3 extra copy, so I won't have to give him mine all the the time. Is there any objection? MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 5 THE COURT: Has it been marked by the clerk? 7 8 MS. POLAN: No, Your Honor, that's 9 what I was asking. 10 THE COURT: Why don't you bring it over and offer it? 11 12 MS. POLAN: Do you want it marked? THE COURT: If that's what you 13 want. 14 MS. POLAN: I don't need it to be 15 marked, and I don't think Mr. Dabrowski has any 16 problem with it being up here. That's what I was . 17 asking. 18 MR. DABROWSKI: We're talking, 19 number one, about the copy being made available 20 21 for the witness' convenience. Number two, I understand Ms. Polan has submitted a copy for the 22 Court. 23 24 MS. POLAN: I have. MR. DEUTSCH: But it is going to be 25

. 

 considered part of files and records of the case.

MS. POLAN: Right. Because there is a copy on file, yours. And there is also one attached to my motion that I filed originally, my Motion to Suppress.

## JOHN WILLIAMSON

CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. POLAN

Q. Now, Agent Williamson, when you were testifying yesterday, you recall that I asked you about certain documents, why you took them. And in a number of instances your answer was that something was an identification document.

Can you tell me what your definition of an identification document is?

- A. I don't know if I can give you a specific definition. It would be a practical application. In this case it's a terrorism investigation so it would be that type of a document which would identify an individual or that could be used to identify an individual.
  - Q. Now, isn't an identification document,

. 17

.18

person by their name, their physical characteristics, their age, things -- their residence, things of that sort?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection.

Generally speaking it is irrelevant to this case.

The witness has particularized and indicated what the term means to him in the context of this particular proceeding.

yesterday, Counsellor, the Court is going to go over these lists and is going to determine whether a reasonably trained, equipped, intelligent agent would find this particular item, whatever it is, within the purview of the search warrant. Pirst, having determined whether or not the search warrant itself was too broad in its scope and too general. That would be the first thing. And the second thing would be to determine whether or not the particular items, if it were found proper, were within the scope of it and were reasonably considered to be within what he had actually done.

And then act on it accordingly. Now, that's the thing I'm going to focus on. I'm

from --

telling you ahead of time.

MS. POLAN: I agree with that

method of your proceeding, Your Honor. I'm just

trying to ascertain if there really is, for

example, with any particular language in the

warrant, if it isn't clear, what the language

means. And that's all I was trying to ascertain

THE COURT: The Court is going to have to determine whether the language is clear. That's going to be the Court's job.

Q: (BY MS. POLAN) Well, Agent
Williamson, let me just ask you one other
question. Is your understanding of an
identification document generally something that
identifies a person in some way other than just
by putting their name down?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your

Honor. Asked and answered, and it's irrelevant

THE COURT: Well, the Court will let him answer it. Let's get on with it.

THE WITNESS: You're just asking in general, not in specific relation to this case?

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Uhm-hmm, did you

understand the question?

A. Could you repeat the question, please?

MS. POLAN: Could it be read back,
please?

(Record read as requested)

. 17

THE WITNESS: Generally, that's correct.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, you just testified a minute ago that that idea, that definition of an identification document had a different meaning in this case, is that correct?
- A. I believe I testified that there were -- the way I interpreted it was specifically as to the documents in this case, yes.
- Q. So it's correct, is it not, that in this case you were looking for documents that would identify the associations of the defendants?
- A. No, I was looking for identification documents.
- Q. Well, are those documents that would identify, for example, other people they were associated with?

- A. That would be one of the reasons that I was looking for identification documents.
- Q. All right. And you testified, I think, when we first started this cross examination, that prior to August 30th you weren't involved in this investigation or prior to August of 1985 you weren't involved in the Macheteros investigation?
  - A. That's correct. Prior to the time that I was given an assignment.
  - Q. And I think you told me you were assigned to organized crime investigations?
    - A: That's correct.
  - Q. But when you started attending these briefings, you were briefed about the Government's allegations against the Macheteros?
    - A. That's correct.
  - Q. All right. And it was your understanding at these briefings that one of the purposes of the search was to determine who the different defendants were associated with?
    - A. I don't recall that specifically.
  - Q. Well, that's why you were looking for all telephone numbers, wasn't it?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection. He doesn't recall it, Your Honor. Also this whole

area has been previously covered.

have to review it and determine.

3

agent involved with what they might be looking for. He was supposed to do certain things. And whether he did it intelligently or not or within the scope of the warrant, the Court is going to

6 7

5

MS. POLAN: I agree with that.

9

8

THE COURT: Now, if you can help me

Judge, all I'm trying

You're familiar with

10

in any way on that issue, fine. But --

MS. POLAN:

11

to ascertain is if he went to briefing sessions,

12

for example, if they had any discussions about

14

telephone numbers, which is a fairly broad

THE COURT:

15

category.

there.

16

all those cases, the Leon case, the case down in

18

17

the District of Columbia, where they searched the

19

scientology headquarters, three or four other

20

cases, the same category. That's all laid out

21

22

Q. (BY MS. POLAN:) When you went to

23

these briefings, was there any discussion about

24

why you were looking for all telephone numbers at

25

any of the briefings?

1 I don't recall specifically a Α. 2 discussion about telephone numbers. Was there any discussion about why you 3 would be looking for all membership lists? I don't recall a specific discussion 5 about membership lists. 7 Any general discussion about why you would be looking for all the membership lists, all the telephone numbers, all the distribution 10 lists, in someone's house? 11 I don't recall a specific discussion 12 concerning that. 13 I think you told me, when I first asked 14 you, at one of these briefings there was a legal advisor there? 15 16 Α. That's correct. Q. Was Mr. Held there at any of these 17 briefings, the agent in charge? 18 Yes, he was. 19 20 Q. Did he conduct any of these briefings 21 on the search? 22 Α. He was present for the briefings. 23 Q. All right. More than once was he 24 present?

25

Α.

I recall him being present at one

briefing, a --

2

Q. Do you know if Mr. Held was involved in drafting addendum 2, Government Exhibit 23?

4

3

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your

5

Honor. It's been established --

6

THE COURT: Sustained. It doesn't

7

matter whether he did it or not.

8

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I'm not

9

sure I understand the basis of your ruling.

10

asked him if he knew if the special agent in

11

charge was involved in drafting the warrant.

12

THE COURT: It doesn't matter. The

13

warrant speaks for itself. Whatever he did,

14

right or wrong, there it is. We've got to

15

examine it.

16

MS. POLAN: Well, Your Honor, I

17

think the warrant does speak for itself. But one

18

of the issues with respect to that, Your Honor

19

has to determine whether the warrant itself was

20

overbroad. The cases generally hold that one of

21

the ways the Court -- one of the factors the

22

Court has to consider in looking at a warrant

23

that appears to be overbroad is the circumstances

24

under which the agents were working who drafted

25

it.

•

For example, did they do it in the middle of night, the day before and/or did they have a fair amount of time to put it together.

That's one of the factors that's set out in the case law that the Court has to consider.

THE COURT: I think we may assume they had a fair amount of time.

MS. POLAN: If we can stipulate to that, I don't think we would have to inquire that they spent a fair amount of time drafting Addendum 2. Can we stipulate to that?

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the Man in the Moon could have drafted that addendum. The addendum speaks for itself. The language is contained within the four corners of the document. It's either intelligible or not.

In addition to, Your Honor, in connection with the actual execution of the search warrant, whether that was overbroad which is the issue here, it hasn't been established whether or not Special Agent in charge Held was at the premises. Until she can put him there, his participation is irrelevant in connection with this hearing and the issue of overbreadth in terms of the execution.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I'm not sure that I made my point clearly. When you're deciding whether the warrant itself was overbroad, you have to -- one of the factors, for example, that the Court -- the Government may want you to consider is the circumstances under which the agents were working who drafted it. So if we're going to assume for the sake of this hearing that they had plenty of time to draft it and they weren't in a hurry, I'm satisfied with that. But I'm not sure the Government is willing to concede that point.

THE COURT: Is Mr. Held going to be a witness? I don't know.

MR. DABROWSKI: Not this morning,
Your Honor. This hearing is directed to the
question of whether or not the execution of the
search warrant was overbroad. That's what this
witness is --

THE COURT: Simple question. Do you know who drew the warrant? Was it Mr. Held?

Do you know of your own knowledge?

THE WITNESS: I know that George Clow signed the affidavit, Your Honor. But as to who wrote the addendum, I don't know.

1 THE COURT: You don't know? THE WITNESS: No. 2 THE COURT: So you weren't there? 3 THE WITNESS: No. Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: How long he took to do 5 it, you don't know either? 6 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 7 THE COURT: How much time he had, 8 you don't know? 9 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 10 THE COURT: All right. Please 11 12 proceed. (BY MS. POLAN) But these briefings 13 were at least a week before you executed the 14 search warrant? 15 As I have testified, there were Α. 16 briefings that continued up until -- there was 17 one briefing in the morning right before the 18 search warrant. 19 Yes, but earlier on you had had 20 briefings at which Addendum 2 was discussed? 21 That's correct. 22 Α. 23 All right. Now, yesterday when you were testifying, I believe you testified that in 24 25 certain instances you took things that were in

containers in the closet in room C, is that correct?

A. That's correct.

- Q. And when I mean containers, sometimes the container was a black attache case, sometimes it was a brown folder, right?
- A. Well, not sometimes, those were the three instances, yes.
- Q. All right. And I believe your testimony was that if there were -- in those instances because there were -- things in those containers that you believed could be seized, you took the whole contents?
- A. I believe my testimony was that after reviewing the documents individually and the documents as a whole or the -- in the case of the briefcase, the other terrorist items in there, I made the determination that the item itself had value to be maintained as a whole. And I seized it as such.
- Q. Let's go back to the shoe box.

  Remember I asked you a lot of questions yesterday about why you seized particular personal items and you --

1 THE COURT: We've gone all over that, Counsellor. I don't want to go over it 2 again. 3 MS. POLAN: I don't either, Your 5 Honor. 6 THE COURT: Let's go to something 7 else then. MS. POLAN: All right. 8 9  $\Omega$ . (BY MS. POLAN) Now, directing your 10 attention to your inventory C 9, I think it's right in front of you, it's Government Exhibit 11 12 25. 13 MS. POLAN: Judge, it's the third page of the subinventory you have. That's the 14 inventory. 15 (BY MS. POLAN) C 9, do you see that? Q. 16 Yes. 17 Α. 18 Q. Now, that's something that was also taken out of Mr. Castro's bedroom, was it not? 19 That's correct. Α. 20 21 Q. And what does that say? It's says, "First Federal savings 22 Α. 23 books, (Two)". 24 Q. They were in the dresser, weren't they? 25 Α. That's correct.

seize it because it was in a shoe box, did you?

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, could you look at this Exhibit, Defendant's Exhibit 110. Just tell me, when you seized that document, was there anything in that, in the contents of it that indicated to you any criminal activity?

A. No. When I made my decision it was based on the fact that this was a bankbook and that we were looking for financial records on the addendum to the warrant.

- Q. So it's correct, is it not, that you didn't review this savings passbook in any way with respect to its relationship to any of the crimes enumerated in the warrant?
  - A. I don't recall making any such review.
- Q. All right. To save time, directing your attention to the Defendant's Exhibit 111 for identification, that's another savings passbook that was seized in the same location, is that correct?
- A. That's correct. This is a copy of the subinventory number L 17, C-9-3.
- Q. Is it also correct to say that, here again, you didn't make any determination of its evidentiary value before you seized it?
  - A. That's correct.

1 Q. All right. MS. POLAN: I would offer this 2 also. 3 MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 5 THE COURT: Mark it. 6 (Defendant's Exhibit 111 7 offered and marked into evidence) 0. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, yesterday when you 10 were testifying, Agent Williamson, when we were 11 talking about all the personal records that were 12 in C 12, the shoe box, and you testified that you 13 seized that shoe box and the records in it because they were financial records. 15 Now, could you please look at the 16 subinventory, the pages that itemize the things 17 within C 12? (Handing) 19 Do you have that place where the C 12 20 items start? 21 22 Α. Yes.

25 MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the

on for four or five pages on --

23

24

How, it's true, isn't it, that it goes

1 document speaks for itself. We don't need to go into this. This agent didn't prepare that 2 document. 3 0. (BY MS. POLAN) It's correct, is it not, that there are approximately one or two 5 items within C 12 on the subinventory; is that 6 correct? 7 Α. Yes. 8 0. All right. And it's also true that a 9 number of those items have up to ninety-two pages 10 within them; for example, 16 A 1 to 16 A 92? 11 Α. Could you repeat the number? 12 16 A 1 to 16 A 92. 13 Q. THE COURT: What do you want to 14 know about it, Counsellor? 15 (BY MS. POLAN) There were, in fact, 16 hundreds and hundreds of pages of documents 17 within C 12, according to this subinventory? 18 There were numerous documents in C 12. Α. 19 Right. But there were hundreds of Q. 20 pages of documents. 21 THE COURT: Hundreds of pages. Did 22 23 you review every page? THE WITNESS: No, I didn't, Your 24

Honor.

1 All right. Let's qet THE COURT: on with it. 2 MS. POLAN: That's not my question. 3 THE COURT: He could go through it 5 page by page. 6 MS. POLAN: I don't want to do 7 that, Your Honor. (BY MS. POLAN) Is it a fact that of 8 those 102 separately itemized subinventory items 9 10 in C 12, you said you took C 12 because it was financial records; isn't it true that of those 11 12 102 items, 84 of the subinventory items are not financial or bank records? 13 MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, unless 14 15 the agent is going to sit there and go through every single one of these entries, we're going to 16 be here for an hour while he does that. 17 document speaks for itself. 18 19 THE COURT: Would you read the question back so I'll solve it. 20 21 22 (Record read as requested) 23 24 If he knows. Can you THE COURT: 25 answer that? Without auditing all of them, do

you have a general knowledge so you could -that's appears to be about right or --

Honor. First of all, I did not testify that I seized all these records because they were financial records. When we went over them item by item, there were numerous identification documents and that would have been my reason for seizing certain of the documents.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) But it's correct, is it not, that of those 102 items, more than two thirds of them are not financial records?
  - A. I can't answer that. I'm sorry.
- Q. Now, let me go back to C ll for a few minutes. You were testifying yesterday or the day before that C ll is an item that you seized from the bedroom closet in Mr. Castro's room, is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And at the beginning of your cross examination you recall I was asking you about particular political articles, parts of books that you took out of C 11; do you remember that testimony?
  - A. That's correct.

Q. All right. And I believe it was your testimony that you took everything in C 11 because when you examined it you saw some documents that you believed to be Macheteros documents, is that correct?

- A. I believe my reason for seizing C 11 was that after reviewing the documents individually and as a whole, I thought that the entire package had significance, yes.
- Q. Now, let me just ask you a few questions so we can clarify the situation with C 11 for the Judge.

If you could look at the subinventory for a minute, it's true, is it not, that within C ll there were a number of different folders and envelopes within that brown accordian file, there were a number of different envelopes; for example, isn't C ll sub 2 a folder?

- A. Yes. It's --
- Q. Yes, it says it's a folder, right?

MR. DABROWSKI: It doesn't say that, Your Honor. It says it's a folder with Limitar handwritten on the front cover containing the following, and subinventoried in detail. The Court has the document right in front of it. It

T

has not been prepared by this witness. witness prepared the inventory, not the subinventory. He's not familiar with the document. We're going to be here all day reviewing a document he knows nothing about. THE COURT: Are you familiar with these subinventories? THE WITNESS: No. Your Honor. did not prepare the document. Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Who did? Α. I don't know. contained different things.

1

2

7

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. POLAN: Well, Your Honor, I think the witness can testify to the Court if he knows whether, in fact, within C 11 there were a number of discrete folders and envelopes that

THE COURT: Do you recall now at the present moment?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall separate envelopes, Your Honor, other than the fact that the defense counsel presented me with certain documents yesterday.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) So your testimony is that within C 11 you at no time remember any separate envelopes containing documents; that it

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Defendant's Exhibit 127 offered and marked into evidence)

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Showing you Defendant's Exhibit 127 and also Defendant's Exhibit 38, is that the book -- do you know if that's the bookcase where those documents were taken from?

  (Handing)
  - A. I don't know.
  - Q. All right.
- A. It is -- the photograph depicts a bookcase in bedroom C.
- Q. All right. And it's true, is it not, that a great number of things in that bookcase were examined but were not taken?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And showing you Defendant's Exhibit 39, which shows that bookcase again, it appears from that photograph, does it not, that a great many things were taken out of that bookcase from the photograph?

## (Handing)

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Does it appear to you that Exhibit 38 is a before-the-search photograph and 39 is an

1 after-the-search photograph; I know you didn't take them? 2 A. That's what it would appear to be. 3 Q. All right. Now, within these few items 5 that you took from the bookcase, directing your attention to what's marked L 17 C-17 sub 2, can 6 7 you tell me what that is? 8 (Handing) This is a pamphlet put out by First Α. 10 Federal Savings Bank containing a handwritten notation with some numbers on it. 11 Q: All right. What is the bank pamphlet 12 about; can you read it? 13 It's about how to -- who's eligible for Α. 14 -- to open a retirement account, about retirement 15 16 accounts. So can you tell me why you seized that 17 document from the bookcase? 18 Probably because of the numbers written 19 on the front of this document. 20 Q. Is that a telephone number written on the front of it? 22 I don't know. 23 Α.

Well, how many numbers is it?

24

25

Q.

Α.

Seven.

talks somewhat about terrorism.

2

3

Q. Did you read it at the time before you seized it?

5

A. I don't recall reading it, no. That's what I would have done. I would have taken a brief look at it like that.

6

Q. Did any of the other agents read it?

8

A. Not that I know of. I don't know.

9

10

Q. All right. So your testimony is for the record that you would have flipped through it and then made a determination to seize it?

11

A: That's correct.

13

Q. Based on its content?

14

A. That's correct.

15

Q. Now, returning for a minute to C 12 and showing you Defendant's 115 and 116, can you identify those two documents?

17

(Handing)

19

18

A. These are more documents from that shoe box C 12 which are subinventory numbers L 17 C 1260 A.

21

20

Q. That's for defendant's 115, yes?

23

22

A. And L 17 C 1260 B.

24

MS. POLAN: Judge, these are both on the Government's Exhibit list, these two

1 The first -- 115, Defendant's Exhibit 115, is Government Exhibit 1009, and Defendant's 2 Exhibit 116 is Government Exhibit 1010. I would 3 move to admit both of these as full exhibits. 4 5 MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 6 7 (Defendant's Exhibit 115 offered and marked into evidence) 8 9 (Defendant's Exhibit 116 10 offered and marked into evidence) 11 12 13 (BY MS. POLAN) How, directing your Q. 14 attention to exhibits 115 and 116, these are 15 receipts for the payment of parking tickets, 16 17 aren't they? (Handing) 18 That's correct. 19 Was there any particular reason that 20 you seized them other than that they were in C 12 21 at the time? 22 I can tell you why I would seize those 23 24 now.

 $\Omega$  •

25

I'm just trying to find out what you

- A. Those contain automobile license information which is listed on the inventory.
- Q. All right. Now, directing your attention for a moment to Exhibit 116 which is also Government Exhibit 1010, can you tell me where that contains license and registration information?
- A. There is a section in the lower half where it's marked L I C E N C I A. There is a number after that.
- Q: So that indicates the driver's license of the person who got the parking ticket?
  - A. Apparently.
- Q. Both of those documents have Mr. Castro's name on them, don't they?
  - A. Yes.

- Q. So there is no question that he is the person who received the parking ticket, is there?
- A. What I can tell from this document is that the person who had that license number received this ticket. That would be the conclusion that I would draw.
- Q. Well, let me ask you this: Based on your own experience as an F B I agent and a

driver of a car, have you ever gotten a parking ticket? Α. Yes. Don't they put your name on the parking ticket when you show them your license? Α. Yes. So it's fair to conclude that Mr.  $Q_{\bullet}$ Castro is the person who got the parking tickets, isn't it? Or someone that had his license in Α. their possession. All right. Showing you Defendant's Exhibit --Is there any question THE COURT: about that being within the search warrant? MS. POLAN: Yes, Your Honor. have a question about whether a parking ticket is within the scope of the search warrant, yes. THE COURT: All right. MS. POLAN: I don't believe it's an automobile registration, a parking ticket. (BY MS. POLAN) Showing you Defendant's 22 23

١

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

Exhibit 121 for identification, is that a copy of a document that you took from Mr. Castro's house?

This is subinventory L 17 Α. Yes.

1 C 12-94. MS. POLAN: I would offer this. 2 MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 3 (Defendant's Exhibit 121 offered and marked into evidence) 7 MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would 8 point out that this is also item 1013 on the 9 Government's Exhibit list. 10 THE COURT: 1013? 11 MS. POLAN: Yes, and it's 12 13 Defendant's Exhibit 121 now. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, that item that 14 appears was also taken from the shoe box in C 12 15 in the closet, is that right? 16 That's correct. 17 All right. And that is a bail Q. 18 certificate, is it not? 19 Α. Yes. 20 That bail certificate indicates, does 21 it not, that Mr. Castro posted bail in the amount 22 23 of \$15,000 in May of 1977? 24 That's correct. Α. 25 All right. Can you tell me why you  $\Omega$ .

seized that document?

- A. I don't recall this document specifically, no.
- Q. All right. Thank you. Now, Agent Williamson, you also received some items from a room identified as J which I believe is a hall closet?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
  - Q. Is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. It's correct, is it not, that at the end of the day yesterday those political posters
  I showed you were from that hall closet, J?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. It's correct, is it not that room J contained a lot of books, that closet; do you recall that?
- A. As I recall there were a lot of books, yes.
- Q. All right. Now, showing you photographs that have been marked 128 and 129 for identification, are those photographs of the hall closet, J, room J?

(Handing)

MR. DABROWSKI: Excuse me, could I

1 have the numbers? MS. POLAN: The identification 2 3 numbers? MR. DABROWSKI: Just the photos. 4 MS. POLAN: Just a second. 5 THE WITNESS: On the one photograph 6 I see our label J. The other photograph -- I 7 can't tell from the photograph if that's J or not. Ω. (BY MS. POLAN) All right. Well, we 10 can wait for that. You can identify 128? 11 Α. Yes. 12 All right. Now, in addition to seizing 13 the political posters in that closet, you also 14 seized, I believe, a welding torch that was in a 15 box with some instructions? 16 That's correct. Α. 17 All right. Do you have that here in 18  $\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}$ court? 19 Α. Yes, we do. 20 21 All right. Can you tell me, while Q. Mr. --22 23 MS. POLAM: Are you going to find 24 the welding torch or should the witness? Do you have it? 25

1 MR. DABROWSKI: We have it. THE WITNESS: It would be in the 2 largest box. 3 (BY MS. POLAN) Can you tell me why you Q. seized the welding torch while we're looking for 5 it? Yes. Α. 7 Why is that? 8 Q. 9 Α. The first paragraph of the addendum refers to explosive devices or their component 10 parts. 11 So your testimony is a welding torch is Q. 12 a component part of an explosive device? 13 The kit contained two gas cartridges. 14 It's a welding -- you defined it as a 15 welding torch, is that what it is? 16 That's correct. Α. 17 And it's your testimony that that Q. 18 welding torch is a component of an explosive 19 device? 20 That's correct. Α. 21 Q • All right. Now -- strike that. 22 By the way, you didn't find anything in 23 Mr. Castro's house, anything, any actual 24

explosive devices, did you?

1	Α.	Do you mean other than the welding
2	torch?	
3	Q.	Yes, other than the welding torch?
4	Α.	No, I don't recall.
5	Ω.	No blasting caps?
6	Α.	No.
,	Ω.	No explosive materials?
8	Α.	None other than welding torch.
9	Q.	No timing devices?
10	Α.	No.
11	Ω.	No pocket watches?
12	A.	No.
13	Ω.	You didn't find any weapons in his
14	house eith	er, did you?
15	Α.	No.
16	Ω.	Is this I think I better get this
17	marked.	
18		THE COURT: What is it, Counsellor,
19	I'm curiou	S.
20		MS. POLAN: I was going to get it
21	marked, Yo	ur Honor. This is the welding torch in
22	its box.	That's what I thought you'd want to
23	see what i	t looked like.
24		THE COURT: It isn't a very big
25	one.	

MS. POLAN: No, that's why I thought we should look at it.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Showing you Defendant's Exhibit 130 for identification, can you identify that object?

### (Handing)

- A. Yes, this is the L 17 J 2 with subinventory letters A through A 6.
- Q. Could you let the Court look at that

## (Handing)

THE COURT: Thank you.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Agent Williamson, it's true, is it not that in Mr. Castro's house in the garage there were a number of other tools that you didn't take?
  - A. I don't recall specifically.
- Q. All right. Showing you Defendant's **Exhibit** 131 and 132 for identification which are **two** photographs, are those photographs of Mr. Castro's garage, if you know?

### (Handing)

A. Yes. They're labeled room A, which was the carport of the house.

MS. POLAN: I would offer both of

1 those these. MR. DABROWSKI: No objection. 2 3 (Defendant's Exhibit 131 offered and marked into evidence) 5 6 (Defendant's Exhibit 132 7 offered and marked into evidence) 8 10 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, turning your 11 attention back to the inventory to item C 16, do 12 you have that? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Now, C 16 was also taken from the Q. 15 bookcase in Mr. Castro's bedroom, right? 16 That's correct. 17 Q. And it's fair to say, is it not, that 18 most of the things in that bookcase were examined 19 but not seized, is that correct? 20 21 Α. That's correct. 22 All right. But C 16 you did seize, 0. 23 right? 24 Α. Yes. 25 Ω. All right. And showing you what's been

1 marked defendant's 133 for identification? (Handing) 2 This is C 16 subinventory number 1 A. 3 through 4. All right. You describe C 16 on your 5 inventory as two revolutionary pamphlets, is that 6 correct? 7 That's correct. Α. All right. Could you take out those 9 documents and just look them over and -- there is 10 actually four, according to the subinventory. 11 There is four different photocopies of different 12 articles in there, is that right, C 16? 13 Α. Yes. 14 All right. They're marked C 161, 15 C 162, C 163 and C 164, right? 16 Α. That's correct. 17 Q. Now, directing your attention to --18 well, let me ask you this question: Were these 19 things all in the bookcase when they were seized, 20 do you know? 21 I don't know. Α. 22 Were they brought to you together? 23

Capitol Court Reporters

them one inventory number.

Α.

24

25

I would say they were because I gave

A. I don't recall this article

to seize that article?

specifically.

Ŧ

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. But you seized it, didn't you?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And how about C 16 sub 3, what's that article about?
- A. These are liberal conceptions and Marxist conceptions of war of the classes.
- Q. That's "La Lucha De" or "The Class Struggle" perhaps?
  - A. Yes, it could be that also.
- Q. All of these are photocopies of what appear to be pages from books, don't they?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Does this one, 16-3 have an author, can you tell who wrote it from looking at the top of the page; the words V I Lenin on the top of the page?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell me why you seized that one?
- A. No, I don't recall this document specifically.
- Q. All right. And directing your attention now to C 16 sub 4, that's the last thing from this group; what's this one about?

24

25

- A. The title, my translation of the title would be "Critical Notes about the National Problem".
- Q. Right. That also is a photocopied excerpt from a book, isn't it, or it appears to be?
  - A. Yes, by V I Lenin, parts of the book.
- Q. All right. And can you tell me why you seized that document?
- A. Once again, I have no specific recollection of the document.
- Q. All right. I'm correct, am I not from reading your inventory, that the items marked C 14, 15, 16 and 17 are the only things that were taken from the bookcase in Mr. Castro's bedroom, is that right?
- A. Let me look at the rest of the inventory. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. So this wasn't a situation where you just took everything that was there?

THE COURT: What is the Exhibit Number on those papers?

THE WITNESS: Defendant's Exhibit 133, Your Monor.

9

10

6

7

8

11 12

> 13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

MS. POLAN: Maybe we should put these back so they don't get lost here. these back in C 16. Those are the four things. All right.

(BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, directing your attention again to your inventory, item C 22, that says -- do you have -- are you following me?

Α. Yes.

That says it was seized from a shoe box in the closet in room C also?

Α That's correct.

Okay. I take it that that was a different shoe box because it's not part of C 12 and it's not part of C 8 and -- is that correct?

I don't know but I would assume that also.

You would assume it came from a Q. different location than --

1.

Α. Yes.

All right. Directing your attention to Q. what's been marked Defendant's Exhibit 134 for identification, can you identify that document; or where it was taken from, I think would help? (Handing)

responsible for national political education about an internal -- an internal review, circulation of the internal review.

Q. Review, that means magazine, doesn't it?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

6

1

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. It's from 1976, right?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. So at the time you seized this document, did you read it before you seized it?
- A. I don't recall specifically. Since it was only a one-page document, I would have looked at it.
  - Q. Did you --
- A. The agent that presented it to me is also a Spanish speaker. So he would have read it.
  - Q. That was Homero Rivera?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. But you've testified previously in this hearing that you're the person who made the seizure decisions, is that right?
  - A. That's correct.
  - Q. Did you seize that document because it

says Puerto Rican Socialist Party on it?

- A. I don't recall why I seized it. I would have seized it based upon my review of the document, my knowledge of the warrant and my discussion with the agent who found the document.
- Q. Well, what in the warrant authorized you to take that document?
- A. This document talks of the Revista, some sort of an internal magazine which would only be accessible to militants of this organization. And the -- I could have equated militants with terrorists.

MS. POLAN: Excuse me one minute.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Was there anything that you recall having read in the search warrant affidavit or been told that had to do with the commission of crimes in 1976?
  - A. I don't recall anything about that, no.
- Q. Now, Agent Williamson, it's true, is it not, that you seized a number of video tapes and a video cassette recorder from the living room in it. Castro's home. I think that's room H?
  - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. It's correct, is it not, that If 1 is six video cassette tapes?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And some of those cassette tapes had labels on them, didn't they?
  - A. I don't recall specifically.
- Q. All right. Well, when you seized them, did you watch them or did you just take them?
  - A. I did not watch any of the tapes.
  - Q. You didn't?
  - A. No.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You just seized them?
- A. That's correct.
- Q: And were they watched -- if you know, did anybody look at them, the content, later?
  - A. I don't know.
- Q. All right. But you just seized them all?
- A. Pursuant to my inventory, I see that I seized six video cassette tapes.
- Q. Do you know if that was all the video cassette tapes in the house?
  - A. I don't recall.
- O. All right. And you also seized a number of audio tapes?
- A. According to my inventory, H 2, I seized three sound tapes.

- Q. All right. And I'm correct, am I not, in my -- in understanding that you believe that you were authorized to seize any and all video tapes by the language of that warrant?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And that was regardless of the content of the video tapes, is that correct?
- A. I testified I did not review them for content.
- Q. Right. I'm just trying to find out just to make sure I understand and the Judge understands that you believed you were authorized to take any video tapes regardless of the content?
- A. My testimony was that I didn't review any of them for content. So my understanding was that I could seize them without reviewing them.
- Q. Fine. Do you recall if any of those -- question withdrawn.
- MS. POLAN: If I could just have a minute.
- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) So you did not read that warrant as limiting the seizure of video tapes to video tapes that were related to the allegations in the warrant affidavit or the

crimes listed in the warrant itself?

A. The way I read the warrant in this addendum was that if I located video tapes I could seize them.

### Q. Fine.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, there are a number of financial records that I would like to have in evidence so the Court can review them but I don't need the witness' testimony. I would like the Court to have the documents, not just the inventory. But I don't need to take the witness' time.

THE COURT: Are they part of the exhibits here on the floor?

MS. POLAN: Yes. Well, they're my copies of things that are particular -- just examples of things that are in the subinventory that -- I want the Court to be able to see the documents but I don't need --

THE COURT: I'm sure you and counsel could agree upon them. If they've been taken in Government custody, they won't hesitate to have them marked.

MS. POLAN: The point is I just want Your Honor to be able to see what you're

1 reading on inventory. So when it says something, where I perhaps think the description is 2 inaccurate, you'll be able to see the actual 3 thing they took. THE COURT: Very well. 5 MS. POLAN: Is there any problem 6 with that, Mr. Dabrowski? 7 MR. DABROWSKI: No, there is not. 8 MS. POLAN: I think I'm finished 9 with this witness. If I could have one minute. 10 MS. POLAN: I have nothing further 11 of Agent Williamson. 12 Thank you. THE COURT: 13 Counsellor? Is there anything new, 14 Counsellor, that hasn't been covered? 15 MR. DABROWSKI: Yes, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: On this subject? 17 MR. DABROWSKI: There is, Your 18 Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. Those are 20 your notes there, all right. Very well. 21 MR. DABROWSKI: I'm not taking a 22 peek at Ms. Polan's notes, nor would she permit me, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Very well. 25

# REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DABROWSKI

Q. Agent Williamson, with regard to Ms. Polan's remarks yesterday about some of your responses, specifically that you don't recall many of the instances or specifics concerning this particular search, this was not the only search in connection with the case in which you were the search team leader, is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. In fact, after you finished this search, you yourself, along with your search team, went to the residence of Jorge Farinacci-Garcia and participated in the search at that location?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And similarly you have other -- many other duties and responsibilities as a special agent of the F B I, is that correct?
  - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, with regard to the search warrant affidavit itself, you testified that you had read

that entire affidavit, is that correct?

A. Yes, that's correct.

- Q. And would it be fair to say that you're familiarity with that affidavit was much greater on August 30th 1985 than it is today?
  - A. Yes, much greater.
- Q. And similarly, in that affidavit and in the addendum, there is reference made to specific criminal statutes of the United States?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you read those statutes or were you familiar with them at the time?
- A. Yes. I had read them, and I was familiar.
- Q. Did you read the specific statutes that were cited in that affidavit to familiarize yourself with those statutes in the context of your duties and responsibilities in connection with this search?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Now, you have before you Defendant's Exhibit 130 which is the welding torch, is that correct?
  - A. Yes.
  - Q. You also have Defendant's Exhibit 128

3

5

6 7

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which is a photograph of a closet from which that torch was seized, is that correct?

- Yes, that's correct.
- Would you show that photograph to the Q. Court, please.

Now, is it fair to say that this welding torch is not a large four-foot huge container; it's a small item, a very small torch?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I object on two bases. One, Mr. Dabrowski is cross examining this witness. This is supposed to be redirect. Your Honor has seen the welding torch. We've all seen this. This is a classic example of, "the item speaks for itself" and this is argumentative, it's cross examination. I haven't objected to the first five questions, but I have the same objection to them. If this is redirect, it should be focused on things I asked about.

MR. DABROWSKI: She focused on a welding torch. As a matter of fact, she submitted the very exhibit I'm using.

THE COURT: I've seen the welding Is there something about it that isn't obvious on its face?

> MR. DABROWSKI: I'm There sure is.

about to point it out. That's what concerns Ms.

Polan because she knows exactly where I'm going.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would ask the Court to instruct Mr. Dabrowski to ask questions that are not leading and that are not cross examination questions to his own witness.

THE COURT: Well, he's cross examining the witness. The Court will allow some latitude. Proceed.

MS. POLAN: He's not cross examining. It's his witness. This is redirect, Your Honor.

right. He did put him on. All right. Let him continue, Counsellor, without framing the question for him.

MR. DABROWSKI: If I get to a critical area, Your Honor, I'll attempt not to lead the witness. I'm simply trying to expedite things here.

MS. POLAN: He's simply trying to testify, Your Honor. Mr. Dabrowski knows how to testify. He's very good at it.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Now, you yourself

1 were not the explosives expert, is that correct? That's correct. A. 2 Q. That was Agent Lyons? 3 That's correct. Α. And he was -- $\Omega$  . 5 MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor. 6 This is well beyond the scope of my cross 7 8 examination of this witness. We're going to have Agent Lyons. We can ask Agent Lyons what he 9 found. 10 THE COURT: Did Agent Lyons bring 11 it to you, do you know? 12 13 MR. DABROWSKI: He did not, Your Honor. I can cut right through that. 14 MS. POLAN: This is ridiculous. 15 THE COURT: Proceed with your 16 questioning. Please don't interrupt him further 17 unless there is reason for it. 18 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Did Agent Reilly 19 bring it to you? 20 Yes, he did. Α. 21 Q. He's the one who found it in the 22 closet? 23 24 A . That's correct.

25

Q.

Neither you nor Agent Reilly are an

22

23

24

25

explosives expert, is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. In fact, from your perspective, is it fair to say that you, yourself --

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Did you have a question as to whether or not you could seize the item prior to speaking to Agent Lyons?
  - A. Yes, I did.
  - Q. Did you discuss it with Agent Lyons?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q: You at that time, of course, had read page 8 of the affidavit?

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Which states a search uncovered four plastic containers filled with gasoline and one butane tank.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I object to these questions.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I should be permitted to finish my questions.

THE COURT: Why don't you approach it a different way.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, these are completely leading questions.

THE COURT: The young lady can't take your talking and mine at the same time. And you aren't going to impress anybody.

Now, the question is was there a special reason for selecting this particular item. You were there. Tell us about it. What was the reason; why did you take it?

THE WITNESS: I had a discussion with Agent Lyons who was our explosives expert. And he told me that these, the gas tanks within this box, could be used as an accelerant, an explosive device, and that, in fact, the FALN had used such tanks in an explosive device in the past.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) On May 30th of 1982 --
  - MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.
- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) As part of the affidavit --

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Wait until he finishes the question and then object.

MS. POLAN: The problem with my waiting until he finishes the question -- he is asking a leading question by reading out of the

affidavit. And if we wait until it's over, the problem with the leading question is that it's already been asked. That's why I'm interrupting, Your Honor. Mr. Dabrowski is reading from the affidavit and that's improper. And you know it and he knows it. And I don't know how to stop it without --

THE COURT: It's whether I know it or not.

Proceed with your question, and then state your objection after he's completed his question.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) The affidavit in support of the search warrant you read particularized at page 8, a bomb, an incident concerning a bomb that was planted on May 30th of 1982 at the Caribe Hilton Hotel in Puerto Rico which did not detonate, is that correct?

MS. POLAN: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I read the affidavit.

Yes, sir.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) That particular incendiary device involved four containers filled with gasoline and a butane tank as well as other

component parts.

THE COURT: Ask him what it contained; or are you telling him?

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, he read the affidavit and it's at page 8.

THE COURT: Page 8, all right.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Is that correct?

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Now, when you referred to the fact that you seized this item as an explosive device or component part, are you referring to all the language contained at paragraph one of the addendum?

MS. POLAN: Objection, leading.

THE COURT: Same ruling. Proceed.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Did you, in fact, make the decision to seize this device after a discussion with your explosives expert, Agent Lyons?

A. Yes, I did.

MS. POLAN: Objection.

THE COURT: Proceed.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) After that -
MR. DABROWSKI: I'm sorry. I'm

sorry, Your Honor, I did not hear the Court's

ruling on the objection.

THE COURT: Proceed.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) It was after that conversation with Agent Lyons that you made the decision to seize this particular welding torch.

THE COURT: Rather than putting it in the affirmative -- I know it's pressing it -- but why don't you ask him in question form rather than stating the affirmative aspect of it, Counsellor. Let him continue. He's intelligent enough to respond.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Agent Williamson, can you tell us why you seized that welding torch; why at the time you decided to seize it, you thought it to be an explosive device or a component part of an explosive device?
- A. I seized it based upon my knowledge of the affidavit, the warrant, the addendum and my discussions with Special Agent Lyons.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, it's now 11:30. I can continue but --

THE COURT: How much longer?

•

MR. DABROWSKI: I'll be approximately a half hour, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Take our recess.

(Recess)

THE COURT: You may proceed, Counsellor.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Agent Williamson, two days ago you were asked a question by Ms.

  Polan in connection with why it was you took photographs of individuals, one of whom in fact, turned out to be an attorney who had arrived at the scene of the search; do you recall that?
  - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Do you recall that you testified that those photographs were taken with your knowledge because of a concern for your safety?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. And you noted that the log, the search log at that time reflected that a car had arrived with a Puerto Rican male and a female. And a license number was taken down and their photographs were taken at approximately 7:35

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. That's correct.

Q. Did you have a concern for your safety t that time?

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

That was -- he answered the question when I asked him. I don't know --

THE COURT: He did testify previously he had concern for his safety.

MR. DABROWSKI: And it has been asked and answered. So I'll ask a different question.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Why did you have a concern for your safety?

MS. POLAN: Objection, Your Honor.

I don't think that it is particularly relevant.

I asked him why he took the pictures.

THE COURT: To the extent it's relevant, we'll allow it.

MR. DABROWSKI: If it wasn't relevant --

THE COURT: The Court isn't going to be impressed one way or the other.

MS. POLAN: I'm just trying to save some time. I thought this was going over the

things I had asked about, the overbreadth of the search.

THE COURT: That's what it's for.

THE WITNESS: At the time I was aware of the violent nature of this terrorist group, the fact that they were responsible for deaths of certain individuals and the fact that there were numerous numbers of them that were going to be arrested that day.

In addition, prior to our arrest of Mr. Castro-Ramos, I had heard radio traffic to the effect that there had been a shooting of an agent at one of the other locations.

- Q. Now, there was reference made by Ms.

  Polan to Agents Held and Clow; it's a fact that
  they were not present at any time during the
  execution of this search, is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Now, C 11, C 12 and C 13 are what; could you say what those are once again?
- A. C 11 was a folder that contained documents. C 12 was a shoe box that contained documents, passports. And C 13 was the black satchel or briefcase that contained the hoods, money and other terrorist items.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

And when you prepared the evidence 0. inventory at the scene, your Evidence Inventory Form, you simply described that as a -- C 11, as a large brown folder with revolutionary materials, is that correct?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this is another case of "the document speaks for itself." Mr. Dabrowski objected when I asked him what did he write down, saying we all could read what he wrote down.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'll rephrase the question. The Evidence Inventory Form --

The inventory form THE COURT: itself. I have it before me, what it reads.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) The Evidence Inventory Form, which is in evidence and the Court has before it, reflects that C 21 is a large brown folder with revolutionary materials. All of the C ll sub items that Ms. Polan showed you and she talked about during the direct -excuse me, her cross examination were taken from that brown folder, is that correct?
  - Α. That's correct.
- Q Evidence Inventory Form item C 12 is noted in the form which the Judge has before him

. 17

as a shoe box with passports, bankbooks,

financial records and receipts; and all of the

items that you've testified about with the

subcategory C 12 sub something came from that

shoe box, is that correct?

A. Yes, that's correct.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this has been asked and answered a number of times. I remember Mr. Dabrowski objecting this morning, when I started to ask, saying he's already answered that. So I don't know why we need more testimony. I think it's absolutely clear to the Court.

THE COURT: What is there new that I'm going to learn from this now? It says just what you said here. So I haven't learned anything new at this time.

MR. DABROWSKI: They're foundation questions, Your Honor, to the introduction of what I hope to be Government Exhibit 26, which is a photograph of the closet clearly depicting two of those items, actually they'd be C 11 and C 13, prior to the seizure.

The purpose is simply to demonstrate to the Court they're from amongst all of the items

in that closet. Those were the two items that were taken. All of the documents that you heard about were contained in the two items, in C ll and C l3, are right in this photograph and they're right here.

And this photograph clearly speaks the so-called 10,000 words to the breadth of the search. That's what was taken, right up in the corner of that closet. And despite the fact that we spent two days going over it document by document, there they are up the corner of the closet that's essentially --

THE COURT: Have the witness identify the photograph. Show it to counsel. See if she has objection and --

MR. DABROWSKI: That's what I was doing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's do

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) The final one,
C 13, you described as a black zippered attache
containing the money, ledgers, phone books,
notes. And my copy of the Evidence Inventory
Form, it's not legible, but all of the C 13
subcategories that Ms. Polan showed you during

the cross examination, in fact, came from the black satchel, is that correct?

- A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Now, you did not further describe these on your Evidence Inventory Form at that time, is that correct?
  - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Was there any reason for that; why didn't you create a subinventory or why didn't you go through every single document?
- A. As I tried to explain to the Judge yesterday, we had set up a procedure when we would find numerous items that we were seizing together, that we would give them one inventory number. And then at a later time they would be subinventoried item by item.
- Q. Showing you Government Exhibit 26, can you identify that photograph?

## (Handing)

- A. That's the photograph of bedroom C which is the bedroom and closet from where items 11, 12 and 13 were taken.
- Q. In that particular photograph from the angle that it's taken, can you actually see items C 12 and C 13?

A. Yes.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'd move for the full admission of this photograph, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Was this picture taken before the search, if you know?

THE WITNESS: It was taken prior to those items being seized, Your Honor. I don't know if this photograph was taken before the --

THE COURT: Is there a time element stated on the back of it? Will counsel look at it, see if you have any objection to it.

MS. POLAN: I'd like to inquire,
Your Honor.

You didn't take this photograph, did you, Agent Williamson?

THE WITNESS: No, I did not.

MS. POLAN: Were you in the room when it was taken?

THE WITNESS: No, I was not.

MS. POLAN: You don't really know when it was taken during the search, do you?

THE WITNESS: Well, I can tell from the fact that the items that I seized are still in the closet that it was taken prior to their seizure.

Honor.

. 

THE COURT: Was this photograph,

did it depict the existence of the items in the

closet, whatever they were, prior to the time you

commenced your search? Do you know that? If you

don't know, just say "I don't know."

THE WITNESS: I don't know, Your

MS. POLAN: I would object on the basis he doesn't know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Some other witness can bring it in.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Were you in that room prior to the actual seizure of these items?
- A. At some point I would have walked through each room, yes.
- Q. But were you in that room, that is room C, before those items were taken from the shelves?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. And does that photograph accurately depict the location of C 11 and C 12 prior to their being removed from the closet and brought to you for a final determination as to seizure?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I object.

He already said he doesn't know.

2

answer.

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

THE COURT: If he knows, he can

THE WITNESS: It appears to, yes.

THE COURT: What's that?

THE WITNESS: It appears to.

(BY MR. DABROWSKI) In fact, was it 0. not part of the procedure that was employed that an item of significance that was to be seized was to be photographed prior to its removal from where it was first found?

> That's correct. Α.

MR. DABROWSKI: I move for the full introduction of that photograph, Your Honor.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I have the same objection. He's saying what he assumes and what the procedures were. But he doesn't have any personal knowledge of when the photograph was taken; for example, if other things had been taken out of that closet before it was taken.

THE COURT: The question was, though, does that portray the existence of the condition that he observed before the search was commenced. I understood him to say it appears to, yes.

MS. POLAN: But I don't think he

1 knows. I would like to inquire. MS. POLAN: Do you know for sure? 2 THE WITNESS: I don't know for a 3 certainty, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Bring it in through 5 somebody else if it's essential. We've taken up 6 so much time with this we might as well take up a 7 8 little more. 9 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Directing your attention to the shoe box items C 12, Ms. Polan 10 showed you her Exhibit 115; you have that before 11 you, do you not? 12 13 Α. Yes. Q. And that is a traffic ticket receipt? 14 Α. Yes. 15 Q. Does it reflect a license number? 16 Yes, it does. Α. 17 What's that license number? Q. 18 774289. That's -- it also has a --19 Α. That's the driver's license number, Q. 20 right? 21 Yes. And in addition it has a -- in 22 Spanish, it's Tablilla, T A B L I L L A, which 23 is -- that's a license plate, a license plate 24

25

number.

Q.

- - A. I can't read the notations on the --

Of any kind of particular car?

- Q. On that day -- what's the license number of that vehicle?
  - A. It appears to be 52 U 104.
- Q. On the same day you seized that item, had you read page 61 of the affidavit in support of this search warrant?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor -THE WITNESS: Yes, I read the
entire affidavit.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I just note for the record that page 61 reflects both the vehicle and the driver's license number.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I object to Mr. Dabrowski testifying about what's in the warrant, telling this witness what's in the warrant. If he wants to ask him, "What do you remember reading on page 61", I have no objection to that. Or if he wants to ask him if he remembers reading in it --

THE COURT: The Court will read it.

I don't think there is any problem with regard to the issue.

MS. POLAN: I don't think Mr.

3

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dabrowski has to read the affidavit.

(BY MR. DABROWSKI) I'm showing you Q. Government Exhibit, for this hearing, 27. is Government -- on the Government's Exhibit list as 1008. Do you recognize that document?

(Handing)

First of all, was it seized from the residence?

- Yes, this bears our subinventory number L 17 C 12-60.
- Is there a license number on that document?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, this exhibit is not in evidence. I don't believe it's proper for him to be testifying.

- (BY MR. DABROWSKI) First of all when Q. Ms. Polan showed you some of the items that were taken from C 12, she did not show you this item, is that correct?
  - That's correct.
- But that item was one of the items Q. found in the shoe box?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would object to him again asking the witness about a document that's not in evidence. It is not in evidence.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'm about to move it into evidence.

MS. POLAN: He's asking him if I showed it to him.

MR. DABROWSKI: I move for full admission of this exhibit.

MS. POLAN: I object to this. This is supposed to be about the overbreadth of the search. The point is not to put in evidence everything on the Government's Exhibit list. I didn't question -- if I didn't question him about something, it's either because I thought it wasn't important to bring to the Court's attention or perhaps I thought it was within the scope of the warrant. We're going to be here for a month if we go through everything on the exhibit list.

THE COURT: Well, I want to caution Mr. Dabrowski in the same fashion I did you.

Namely, I'm going to review all of these. Now, you noticed yesterday I said to the Government I would like a list of those that are on your exhibit list and what they are, so I'll know those that may become relevant, and those that

may never be used, non-relevant list, not on the exhibit list. So that I can look with special attention to those that they're claiming as relevant.

I expect to receive that in due course from the Government as I asked for it. I will review them all individually. And it will save an awful lot of time because I'm going to devote a lot of time to it. And I'm going to come to the right answer with respect to the issues before us.

this document is not relevant to the inquiry before us. And the inquiry is overbreadth. I'm not challenging the seizure of that document. And what I'm concerned about is that Hr. Dabrowski is going to take the next hour or two showing this witness things on the exhibit list which he believes they had a right to seize.

If I didn't bring that to the Court's attention, I'm not challenging it or I don't think it's important. And I don't think it's going to help the Court at all to determine the legal issues about the overbreadth of the warrant or the search. I don't see why that's -- I'd

like to have some, you know, something from the Government about what this is relevant to.

THE COURT: It seems to me the Government's brief is going to be on file concerning this issue. These can be itemized, the ones that have been unchallenged. And if they are relevant and very relevant to the Government's case, I don't know. But when the Court reviews them and reviews them on their merits --

MS. POLAN: But we don't need to have every exhibit on the exhibit list shown to the witness to say, "Why did you seize this?"

That's not going to help us.

THE COURT: The only ones we're concerned about are those that are challenged?

MR. DABROWSKI: Every item in the search, Your Honor, is challenged. Ms. Polan's position here is that the agents' conduct was so outrageous that it shocked the conscience of the Court and that it requires the suppression of all evidence in this case.

MS. POLAN: That's correct.

So first of all, the admissibility, the Government's ability to admit into evidence every

item in this search is an issue. I have a number of points to make. Number one, Ms. Polan took three days in a broad-ranging inquiry. For her to get up here and object to the Government taking one hour to clarify this record is ridiculous. Number two, the Court specifically invited this.

Now, you just tempered -- I am prepared, and I have all the Government's exhibits here with translations attached to them ready to submit to the Court. I assume you were not only inviting that but instructing the Government to do that yesterday.

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. DABROWSKI: Now, in view of the Court's remarks, I will incorporated the submissions into my brief. But it's also important to note this: This agent seized at this location, amongst other items, some very -- items he described as very significant, a case, a shoe box and a bag. And when he testified, he indicated that he made individual decisions but also made a decision to seize that item collectively to preserve that shoe box as it was, to preserve the bag, and to preserve the

case.

g

Now, what Ms. Polan has done here, Your Honor, is she has selected out items which she has chosen, which admittedly wouldn't be some which would be seized individually, but which the Government clearly would argue were appropriately seized under the circumstances.

She neglected to advise the Court that the license number and driver's license number, amongst the documents she put in, are at page 61 of the affidavit. She neglected to bring to the Court's attention the Mitzubishi, Exhibit 1008, which again is at page 61 of the affidavit. She neglected to put into evidence from C 123 the masks. She neglected to put into evidence a number of things.

Now, in order for the Government to be able to argue in this brief that this agent not only didn't engage in activity which shocked the conscience of the Court, but he engaged in appropriate action, he seized items he should have taken, that any responsible agent should have taken, meaning to show the Court at least some of the items that were in these containers, so that the Court can get a feel for what's this

bag, what's this case, what's this shoe box have in it as a whole; not only individually, but as a whole. Why did that agent take those documents.

A good many of the exhibits that are contested here came from C 11, C 12 and C 13.

And I not only have the right but the obligation to point out to the Court that there were a number of items in those containers that were properly -- not only properly, that had to be seized.

me, I want to get out of here faster than anybody. But -- and I will attempt to do that. But I have an obligation to make sure the Court understands what else was in those documents because you haven't seen them from Ms. Polan.

THE COURT: Let's proceed.

make one remark. The question of whether the Court is going to suppress all the evidence based on an argument that the search was so overbroad, that it's required, that determination doesn't depend on whether or not they seized anything they were entitled to seize. I could concede that they seized some things they were entitled

to seize. That's not the inquiry.

The inquiry is what about all the stuff they shouldn't have seized. And all I'm saying to the Court is that Mr. Dabrowski can make legal arguments and he can --in a brief he can address the Court's attention to whatever pages of the affidavit had whatever license plate numbers in it and that it's not helping to have this agent identify any automobile registration that he took from the house. It doesn't add anything to any argument.

MR. DABROWSKI: Well --

problem, Counsellor. The Court is going to review these and read them. We're going to have transcripts of them, presumably, from Spanish into English. And if they — reasonably prudent agents under all the existing circumstances would have acted as he did, then that's it. If on the other hand, contrary-wise, so be it. But the warrant itself also will be evaluated on its face of what's within it.

MR. DABROWSKI: Let me go to the heart of the matter. If we can agree on a procedure, I can sit down right here. For

from an evidentiary point of view here, which I can also do in my brief if the procedure is permissible, is to explain why it was that the video tapes had significance, why it was they were seized, why it was -- make specific reference to the black hood that is in C 13.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I would object to Mr. Dabrowski testifying about the evidentiary value of something that he himself didn't seize. That's objectionable.

THE COURT: You can put that in your brief, Counsellor. And I'll read it.

MR. DABROWSKI: You see, what we have here, Your Honor, is a black hood.

MS. POLAN: Could the record reflect that what we have here is a black cloth with two holes in it so the record is clear. It is a black cloth. And it has two holes in it.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. DABROWSKI: The record should reflect that I just handed the Clerk of the Court a black cloth with two holes in it. And I asked that it be marked for identification.

THE COURT: It may be marked.

in your brief?

rather than in a hearing.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, what
the Government would attempt to establish here,
for example, is that we would direct the Court's
attention to page 4 of the affidavit and page 7
of the affidavit which shows that hoods were used
in connection with a T V video tape that was
aired in Puerto Rico. And that, in fact, a black
hood with holes in it was recovered following a
Muniz Air Base assault. And if permitted to,
bring out at this hearing other evidence in
connection with other information about the
nature and extent of these hoods. For example ---

MR. DABROWSKI: I can, Your Honor.

And I would propose to do that. And that would

be perfectly permissible with the Government. I

assumed Ms. Polan objected to that. Apparently

now she would prefer that it be done that way

MS. POLAN: No, what I object to is, one, Mr. Dabrowski characterizing a black piece of cloth with two holes in it as a hood. Because we're going to have a printed record here of what's going on. I don't object to Mr.

Dabrowski making a legal argument in his brief

about -- that that particular item in front of

the agent was legally seized because it was an

auto registration form. I don't object to that.

I do object to Mr. Dabrowski trying to justify in a legal brief certain seizures based on no evidence in the record. The agent, for example, about the video tapes, testified very clearly less than an hour ago that he believed he was authorized to seize all the video tapes, that he didn't watch them and he didn't have to. We don't need any more testimony about that. Mr. Dabrowski wants to argue whatever he wants to about whether that's justified. I don't object.

But I don't think that Mr. Dabrowski has the right to argue in his brief about things in which there is no evidence.

MR. DABROWSKI: You see what we have here, Your Honor. We're at a crossroads. When the Government approached this hearing, I suggested that we use the detailed subinventory, that both sides be able to freely refer to it and that we could eliminate these days of hearing.

If you go back and look at the record, you will see that in large measure everything

that Agent Willliamson said you can read right

off the subinventory. In addition, we could

submit the items of evidence we need, appropriate

for the Court to see, and avoid all of these

hearings.

Ms. Polan insisted upon not doing that and going forward with the hearing. And we have now established a procedure whereby we submit into evidence the documents that we want the Court to see. Now Ms. Polan comes up, and when she sees the Government sitting here with some of the items she doesn't want the Court see, she said, "Let's not do this." We have to do it one way or the other. What's good for them is good for the Government.

Now, she has put into evidence her items. I want the Court to see some of the documents that were in C 11 and C 12 and identify, get English translations of them here.

the COURT: I think if you have any claim of that kind, put it in your brief. And I'll read it, make my own comparison of the search warrant. And I'll make a comparison with the particular exhibit and draw a conclusion.

And I think that's a much better way of handling

it.

example, nobody has to bring a black cloth with some holes in front of it to swing me one way or the other. And nobody has to go down and pick up a bulletproof vest and hold it up in the court and try and convince me one way or the other. I don't need that sort of thing. Put it on paper, and I'll consider it. That's what the Court is for.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor --

Save a lot of time.

MR. DABROWSKI: If what you're saying is we may make reference to these exhibits; for example, Ms. Polan questioned the agent about a document that was captioned "actas" or "minutes" or whatever the testimony reflects. There is a portion of that document that makes specific reference to \$40,000 being drawn from an interest of the other bank. Ms. Polan did not point that out when they had that document before the agent. If I could do that --

THE COURT:

THE COURT: Would you put that in your brief because you can't ask this witness that question because he doesn't know anything

about the overall case. And you can't testify

for him and ask him, yes and no, if you knew

so-and-so would you be justified. That's beside

the point.

MR. DABROWSKI: No. But I think if you look at the English translation of the minutes, all you have to do is -- in one second, you can see that those minutes are relevant, Your Honor. And you were shown the Spanish, you weren't shown the English.

right to submit the English translation and I
want to see the English translation. I don't
propose to risk my fifty years ago of Spanish
today in translating. It's too far back. And my
vocabulary isn't that good.

So if you want your claims, and she could submit their claims in her brief. And the Court will evaluate them, save a lot of time and neither one of you will be any further ahead if you follow the other procedure.

MR. DABROWSKI: I agree. And I would prefer the procedure. I would --

THE COURT: This will be the procedure.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I just want to state something for the record which is about this procedure. I don't object to Mr. Dabrowski filing a brief in which he attempts to justify certain seizures of items on whatever legal theory he can come up with. However, I do object to him filing a brief in which he characterizes a piece of evidence, an item that is not in evidence as one way or the other where the Court has no basis on which to the make a determination.

If the documents are here, the documents are here. But if he's going to go -- but I think the descriptions on the subinventory are characterizations. And that's why I brought several items. I showed them to the agent.

Revolutionary literature, for example, that does not help the Court to say if something is seizeable or not.

And I specifically object to Mr.

Dabrowski being able to argue in his brief about things on which there is no evidence as to what something is. You saw that black briefcase, you've seen it. You know what it is. That's what you need to do. I think if Mr. Dabrowski

1<u>4</u>

. 

**2** 

wants to show you that black cloth, I have no objection to that. I do object to him characterizing something as a mask when it's not a mask. That's a conclusion of his.

THE COURT: The Court will have to make a determination. And the Court will. I think we've covered it pretty much, and I don't think much is to be gained by prolonging it.

MR. DABROWSKI: I would like to submit at this time, Your Honor, and I'll simply provide to the Court copies of each of the Government's exhibits along with translations where appropriate.

Exhibit 1004, it's L 17 C 139 sub 17-6. It has the Spanish defense exhibit now on the left. It has the Government's translation on the right. I would intend to do that with each -- with most of the Government's exhibits. And I will attach that as --

THE COURT: I presume your adversary will submit the English translations of hers.

HR. DABROWSKI: That brings us to that particular subject which I don't want to

weinglass to argue next week. But we are going to have to direct the Court's attention to the fact that a procedure to resolve disputes between translated -- between the Government's translations of documents of the defendants and even more timely, the conversations, that we have to set up the procedure now to resolve, to -- number one, determine whether there are questions concerning the accuracy of the Government's translations. If there are not, there is no problem. If there are, we have to set up a procedure to resolve those --

THE COURT: I think Mr. Williams has a motion on that at the present time pending.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'm not going to say any more. I have agreed with Mr. Weinglass that we are going to argue that next week.

THE COURT: It should be worked out by counsel. And Mr. Williams has a motion on it. He better be consulted on it, too.

MR. DABROWSKI: We can work out the schedule. We can work out some details. But we have agreed we have to argue other portions to

the Court. And I'll defer that to another day.

THE COURT: Very well. Are there
documents that need translating now, that the
Government wants to offer translation on, that
are already in existence, on file with the Clerk;
or are those translations in the case of Ms.
Polan?

MR. DABROWSKI: No. These, for example, with regard to the minutes, the translation that I have attached here is a translation that we provided to the defendants some time ago. It, however, is a translation which, if the defendants dispute, and I have reason to believe they are going to dispute a lot of translations, we have to address that fact and resolve it.

Now, it's my understanding that what the Court has -- is going to do, is force the parties together. And then if we cannot resolve our disputes, the Court -- the Court's own translators will intervene and be the final arbiters. All I want to do is establish, get a procedure in motion.

So for example, if they disagree with regard to these minutes, we can have their

. 

 translations which we should. We may agree that theirs are better than ours, and they may be in some instances. And then if not, if they disagree with this, then ultimately that's going to have to be resolved. And we'll submit it to the Court's translators. If that's the way --

THE COURT: Fine. Work that out between yourselves to the extent you can. And then the Court -- if you can't agree, the Court will determine it.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI): Now, Agent Williamson, with regard to the C 11, C 12 and C 13, is it fair to say that -- well, how did you make the decision as to whether or not to seize those particular items?
- A. Those items, C 11, C 12 and C 13, after the agents had seized them, had brought them to my attention, I made a review of the items individually, and after that review, made the determination that the item as a whole had significance and seized each of those items as a whole.

MR. DABROWSKI: Just so the record would be clear, Your Honor, I would like this agent to simply identify six exhibits, all of

1 which came from C 11, which the Government wants me to submit for purposes of record. 2 THE COURT: Is it marked for 3 identification? 4 MR. DABROWSKI: Yes, Your Honor. 5 I'm going to offer them as a full exhibit. 6 THE COURT: Has counsel seen them? 7 MR. DABROWSKI: Yes, Your Honor. 8 MS. POLAN: No I haven't, Your 10 Honor. MR. DABROWSKI: Counsel has not 11 seen this copy. However, I made these personally 12 two nights ago from the disclosure file that was 13 given Ms. Polan, so if they're in that file, she 14 has them. 15 MS. POLAN: I'd like to know which 16 exhibits they are, Your Honor? 17 MR. DABROWSKI: I'll identify that 18 for her. Government Exhibit 29 for this hearing, 19 is Exhibit 997 L 17 C 11-91. It has the 20 Government's translation attached to it. 21 THE COURT: Apparently these 22 23 numbers, sequential numbers are going to stand us 24 in good stead here in being able to keep track of

25

these.

numbers.

MR. DABROWSKI: The L numbers?
THE COURT: No, the sequential

MR. DABROWSKI: I don't know, Your Honor. I am to this day using the L 17 numbers to track my documents. I have always resisted and still am confused by Mr. Avery's system which has been imposed upon us by the Court. Exhibit 1004 now which I have in my hand is meaningless to me. L 17 tells me it came from Castro-Ramos, C says it came from the bedroom, 11 says it came from the file folder, 3917 sub 6 tells me which file it came from. So I know exactly where that document came from. If you tell me Exhibit 1004, I don't have a clue.

THE COURT: Very helpful to the Court.

MR. DABROWSKI: Well --

MR. AVERY: Enlightenment always goes hard with the bureaucracy, Your Honor.

MS. POLAN: If we can have one minute, Your Honor. Maybe we could --

MR. DABROWSKI: Ms. Polan has brought to my attention something I knew was a problem which I thought I just raised with the

1.4 1.5

Court. And that is that she may disagree with this translation. And I agree she has a right to disagree. And what I suggest is that she's had this document translated on her own. If she disagrees, so state and let's resolve it.

That's one less exhibit.

THE COURT: Mark them for identification and then she can translate it.

And maybe she'll agree with you, maybe she won't. And then we'll have somebody else translate them. And the Court will be guided by the Court appointed translator.

MR. DABROWSKI: I have to a make one other statement. It's very important. We cannot undertake a final printing as a Government exhibit until we resolve its accuracy. We've got documents on word processing or computer equipment or at least -- I'm not sure if we have this one. We're putting most of them on.

In the -- once the dispute is resolved as to the accuracy of this translation, then that machine can make the appropriate changes and print out the final product which the jury will see, should this be admitted into evidence. So this is an appropriate concern and it has to be

addressed.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. DABROWSKI: But for the moment, this is the translation we have.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I seldom do this, but I think at this point -- I think I would withdraw part of the objection I made before to a certain extent. I don't object if Mr. Dabrowski wants to show this document, Government Exhibit 29 for identification, the original in Spanish to the agent and ask him why he took it. I don't object to that question if he wants to do it.

I do object to the agent reading the English to decide why he took the document because what he had on August 30th was a Spanish document. And if he wants to present that to him and say, "Why did you take it?" I don't object to that.

But I am going to have an objection if the English which I have not -- and I don't know if I object to this translation -- if that's given to the agent. And it may be inaccurate since there was no English at the time.

THE COURT: All right. Proceed.

MR. DABROWSKI: First of all, Your Honor, the translation is being submitted for the convenience of the Court. This particular translation was given to Ms. Polan almost a year ago.

THE COURT: Show it to him in
Spanish. See if he can read it.

MR. DABROWSKI: He's already seen the document. It's already in as a full exhibit, as a defense exhibit.

MS. POLAN: This one isn't.

MR. DABROWSKI: Exhibit 1004 isn't?

MS. POLAN: I'm saying if you're going to go through these, I want him to see the Spanish.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Showing you

Government 29 for identification, and that's

Government sequentially numbered exhibit which is

number 997. Without looking at the English, do

you recognize the Spanish document; can you tell

us if that came from the search of Elias Castro's

residence?

A. Yes, it bears the subinventory number L 17 C 11-9-1 and 9-2.

Q. Is that one of the documents that was

3

5

7

6

8

10 11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

contained within the file folder that you relied upon in seizing the entire folder as well as the documents individually?

- Α. Yes, it was.
- I'm showing you Government Exhibit 30. Q. Government Exhibit sequential Exhibit Number 1004. Would you look only at the Spanish and tell us if you recognize that document?

Yes, I do. This is our subinventory

(Handing)

Α. number L 17 C 11-39-17-6.

MR. DABROWSKI: This, Your Honor, is a full exhibit as a defense exhibit.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Would you read the third paragraph from the bottom, in English for the Court; you're reading from the Spanish, will translate that, please?
- Α. You want me to translate it -- to my best ability would be it was -- discussed the application for the loan of the -- then there is the word L G O S. I would say that's -- that identifies some individuals who were applying.
- Ω. It's fair to say you don't know what that is, that is right?
  - Right. "It was approved the quantity Α.

of \$40,000 and that they would be given -- and that they would give to him the accumulated interest in the other bank."

- Q. I'm showing you Government Exhibit 31, the sequential number is 998. And I'm just showing you the Spanish. And just -- it's a long document, there is a English translation on the other side. Have you ever seen that before?
  - A. No. sir.
- Q. Well, you won't see it now. But look at the Spanish document.

## (Handing)

Do you recognize that document?

- A. Yes. This is our subinventory number L 17 C 11-14-2, up through page -- the first page is the only page of the document that was fully marked with the subinventory number.
- Q. All right. Do you recognize this exhibit as being one of the documents that you found in C and that you relied upon in seizing that entire file folder?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Showing you Government Exhibit 32, sequential number is 1001, if you'll just look at the Spanish version. That's the newspaper

1 article that Ms. Polan showed you, is that correct? 2 . Yes, that's correct. A. 3 You've previously testified about that? 0. 4 Yes, that's correct. Α. 5 You found that in C 11? 0. 6 Yes, I did. It has our subinventory 7 number L 17 C 11-17 A 1 through A 4. 8 The English translation you've never 9 seen, is that correct? 10 That's correct. Α. 11 MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, these 12 are Government Exhibits 33 and 34. They are the 13 sequential numbers 1002 and 1003. 14 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) I'll just ask if Q. 15 you can identify those documents as coming from 16 C 11 and as being documents you relied upon in 17 seizing that entire folder. 18 (Handing) 19 Yes. 1002 is L 17 C 11-21-5 and 1003 20 bears our subinventory number L 17 C 11-21-6. 21 Could you just briefly tell us what Q. 22 those documents are? 23 C 11 21-5 is a -- appears to be a birth 24

certificate.

- A. There is a stamp, a date stamp on the bottom right-hand corner of the document that reads July 29, 1985.
- Q. Did you rely -- in making the determination to seize C 11, did you rely upon these two documents contained therein?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know who this Edgardo Torres-Davila is?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Showing you Government Exhibit 35, just the Spanish, would you identify that document?

  (Handing)
  - A. Yes. This is L 17 C 11-34.
- Q. Could you just generally describe what that document is?
- A. To me this is a document concerning all the organization and certain rules of the Machetero terrorist organization.
- Q. In making the determination to seize C 11, did you rely upon what you saw this document?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I'd move for the full admission of, for purposes of

1<u>4</u>

this hearing, Exhibits 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35, subject to the examination of the translations and opportunity for defense to either submit their version, their own translation to the Court, or for both parties to resolve that issue.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I don't object in principal to what Mr. Dabrowski is saying. I have no problem with the Spanish language part of the exhibits going into the Court now. The problem with the English is this is part of a larger problem about how are we going to resolve disputes between defense translations and Government translations.

And I'm not in a position to say if I object to the translations of these three documents, that I think are on the exhibit list. There is a Government translation. There are two that are just birth and death certificates. And the last thing he's offering isn't on the exhibit list, so I don't think we got a translation from the Government.

THE COURT: Do you have a translation of the same thing?

MS. POLAN: I don't know. I

If

1 believe they've been done but I don't right now know what the translation says. 2 THE COURT: Was that done in East 3 Hartford? MS. POLAN: I believe they were. 5 don't have possession of all of these. I'm not 6 7 in a position to say if I object. So that's my 8 only procedural problem with this, that if there 9 is something in that translation that's objectionable. 10 THE COURT: You can see it. 11 it's different than this, the Court will receive 12 it. And if there is some conflict at the moment, 13 we'll have both of you iron it out. 14 MS. POLAN: I'm just pointing out 15 to the Court this is a larger problem. 16 going to have to get resolved pretrial. 17 THE COURT: That will be done. 18 MS. POLAN: 19

I wasn't prepared to resolve it on behalf of the all defense counsel.

20

21

23

24

25

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I want the record to reflect with regard to each document I'm submitting here that has a translation attached to it, with one exception where I am not, when I do it. I pulled the

translations in the copies from the control file
the Government maintained of documents that we
sent to the defendants. So everything being
submitted to the Court was sent to the defendants
almost a year ago. In other words, these
translations were provided to the defense and its
been clear --

THE COURT: It may be marked as a full exhibit subject to the condition the Court stated.

(Government's Exhibits 29-35 offered and marked into evidence)

THE COURT: Can you conclude, Counsellor?

MR. DABROWSKI: No, Your Honor. I have about four or five documents from C 13 that I want to submit in evidence and then a few brief remarks.

THE COURT: All right.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) I believe, Agent Williamson, in a response to a question asked by Mrs. Polan concerning C 13, the satchel, that you viewed that to be an extremely significant

container?

- A. That's correct.
  - Q. Could you tell us why?
- A. Looking at the items individually, it appeared to me that that was defendant,

  Castro-Ramos' little Machetero kit or whatever.

  He had his hoods in there. He had his list of his expenses with his code names of Machetero members and the amount of salary he was receiving as a member and whatnot. There was also Macheteros documents within the satchel.
- Q: Agent Williamson, when you refer to a hood, you're surely not referring to this black cloth, are you, as a hood?
  - A. Yes, that's one of them.
- Q. This is Government Exhibit 28. Why do you describe that as a hood as opposed to a black cloth?
- A. Because it has two holes cut in the cloth that would be the size and the position for eye holes.
- Q. You also read the -- in connection with your search of the residence of Jorge Farinacci-Garcia, you read the affidavit in support of his search warrant, did you not?

A. Yes, I did.

2

Q. Do you recall there were references to there being --

4

5

6

7

3

MS. POLAN: Objection. Objection,
Your Honor. If he wants to ask him about a
specific item, what he remembers, I just -- I
don't want to cut him off. But I don't really
want Mr. Dabrowski reading from the warrant into

8

the record any more.

10

MR. DABROWSKI: I won't, Your

11

Honor.

12

Q: (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Agent Williamson,

13

do you know of your own knowledge whether a black

1.4

15

hood like that one was seized from a briefcase in the possession of Jorge Farinacci-Garcia, one of

. 16

the defendants?

17

MR. AVERY: Objection, Your Honor.

18

MS. POLAN: Objection.

19

THE COURT: What's the objection,

20

Counsellor?

21

MR. AVERY: I don't think he was

22

present at any search of Mr. Farinacci in which

23

any such item was allegedly seized and,

24

therefore, I think the phrase, "Do you know of

25

your own knowledge" is thrown in there to -- in

. 

an attempt to mask a hearsay response that's being elicited from this witness. That's my objection.

THE COURT: Well, if he knows of his own knowledge; if he doesn't, he can say, "I don't know of my own knowledge."

MR. AVERY: I think the question is what does, "of your own knowledge" mean. Rule 101 restricts him to observations he made. So I think the point is was he ever present at a search of Mr. Farinacci where such a hood was found.

- Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Were you present during any such search of Mr. Farinacci's briefcase, and I am not referring to the search that you conducted on August 30th; did you ever personally participate in any other search of items allegedly belonging to Jorge Farinacci-Garcia other than the residence search on August 30th 1985?
  - A. No.
- Q. Showing you Government Exhibit 42, could you identify that?

(Handing)

A. I described both of these on my

inventory as masks.

not?

Q. That's really a child's shirt, is it

- A. As I testified on a question by the defense counsel, it's a red T shirt with, again, eye holes cut out of it and a thread holding the two holes together where it would fit over your nose. And then the T shirt is stiched across the top which would make this into a hood.
- Q. So on August 30th of 1985 you believed that that was actually a hood rather than a child's shirt?
  - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Now, was there -- you testified about some money. Refresh my recollection; where was the money that was found?

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, we've been over this seven times. He said seven times that the money was in the black attache case. There is no doubt about that.

THE COURT: I think we covered that it was in the black attache case.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, I'll move the full admission of the Government Exhibit 42 and Government Exhibit 28.

1 THE COURT: Without objection, full exhibit. 2 3 (Government's Exhibit 42 offered and marked into evidence) 5 6 (Government's Exhibit 28 7 offered and marked into evidence) 8 9 (BY MR. DABROWSKI) I'm showing you Q. 10 Government Exhibit 36, Government sequential 11 Exhibit number 1016. Do you recognize that 12 document? If so, tell us where it was found? 13 (Handing) 14 Yes, this was also found in the black Α. 15 satchel. The subinventory number is L 17 16 C 123 - 1.17 Just briefly describe that document? Q. 18 This is more -- well, it's a -- they're A. 19 rules of the Machetero terrorist organization 20 contained behind a cover that -- they put a cover 21 on the front with some high heeled shoes on it 22 and a copy -- some sort of advertisement. 23 24 Is it fair to say that the cover

appears to have no association to the contents?

3

7

10

11 12

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

25

24

- Α. That's correct.
- I show you Government Exhibit 37, ask Q. that you look at only the Spanish version of that document; do you recognize that?
  - This is L 17 C 13 G. Α. Yes.
  - Found in the black satchel? Q.
- This document was also found in Α. Yes. the black satchel.
- Showing you Government Exhibit 38, sequential number 1018, could you tell us what that document is?
- A : This is a document the -- it's L 17 C 13-G-D. And this has some notations on it about amounts of money next to various words about, looks like, salary, \$600, and some percentages and numbers.
- And showing you Government Exhibit 40, Q. sequential number 1021, could you identify that document?

## (Handing)

This is L 17 C 13-I 3-B, and this Α. Yes. is a list of telephone numbers and to the -- to the left of the telephone numbers, there are various locations. There are two copies of that list of numbers and locations. However, they're

a

not photocopies. They look like they were both handwritten.

Q. Now, Government Exhibits 36, 37, 38 and 40 were all seized from the black satchel C 13; and were they all relied upon by you in making your determination to seize that -- both those documents individually and the satchel as a whole?

A. Yes, they were.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, for the record, I marked as Government Exhibit 39,
Government sequential number 1019, it's a calendar, if I may describe it that way, a planning diary labeled L 17 C 13 I 1. Both Ms.
Polan and I believe that she has introduced that.

MR. DABROWSKI: L 17 C 13 I 1. And the only thing I will do is -- I'll check if in fact, it wasn't. I would like to offer it, but we both believe it has been offered.

THE COURT: L 17 what.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Showing you Government Exhibit 41 which is Government sequential exhibits 1022, 1023 and 1024, again only look at the Spanish; and can you identify that document and tell us if it came from the

1 satchel and if you relied upon it in seizing that satchel? 2 (Handing) 3 MS. POLAN:: Your Honor, before he 5 testifies about this exhibit, I would like to just inquire about the exhibit, if he knows, 6 7 before it goes in as one exhibit. THE COURT: I don't know what the 8 exhibit is. So, any objection to her inquiring? 10 MR. DABROWSKI: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 MS. POLAN: Agent Williamson, 13 referring you to Government Exhibit 41 for identification, this is three pieces of paper, is 14 it not? 15 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct. 17 MS. POLAN: And can you tell me if 18 those papers were all -- were they fastened together in any way when they were seized? 19 20 THE WITNESS: These are copies of the original. I'd have to look at the original 21 22 but I -- by looking at the copies, I don't recall. 23 24 MS. POLAN: My problem, Your Honor, 25 is that I don't know if these things are really

. 

three pieces of something that go together or if
they're three things that got stuck together.
That's my problem with it being one exhibit.
They appear to be on different typewriters,
things like that. They don't appear to me to
follow one from the other from my reading of the
document. And that's why I'm trying to inquire
if it's one document or three.

MR. DABROWSKI: The Spanish versions are clearly three separate pages. The translations, one incorporating the three pages, we take the position they flow together. And they were seized as 04, 05 and 06, that is in sequence in that folder. They were in the satchel as I understand it.

MS. POLAN: That's why I'm trying to ask the agent if he knows whether these were fastened together, or separate, and the Government chose to sequentially number them.

That's all I'm trying to find out.

THE COURT: He doesn't know?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

MS. POLAN: You don't know if they

were separate or together?

THE WITNESS: I don't recall, no.

Q. (BY MR. DABROWSKI) Did you rely on the Spanish version which is what you're looking at now for purposes of making the determination to seize both that document and the satchel as a whole?

## A. Yes, I did.

MR. DABROWSKI: I'd move for the full admission at the moment of the Spanish version, Your Honor. We'll straighten out the matter concerning the translation.

THE COURT: Without objection, full exhibit. It may be marked. If you will help our Clerk get them in proper sequence.

(Government's Exhibit 41 offered and marked into evidence)

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, in that

case, I have a specific objection to the

translation in that case because the translation

is made as if it's one document. And so I do

object to that translation because they appear to

me to be three different documents.

THE COURT: At 2:00 will you have the information as to whether or not it was one

document or three separate pieces of paper from the original?

MR. DABROWSKI: I have the information now, Your Honor. My feeling is there is going to be a dispute here. We're not going to be able to resolve this in an hour.

MS. POLAN: One way we can revolve part of the dispute is if the Government would redo their translation to put it on straight pages because it's just a run-on translation.

And then they could all be separated. That's part of the problem as I see it, that there is just one translation as if it's a whole document. And I don't believe it is.

THE COURT: Oh, three pages or not, if you want to read that, that's one issue. The Court will read the separate pages, draw its own conclusion.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, just for the record, because it's not part of C 11, 12 or 13, it being Government sequential number 1027, L 17 C 12-9-1, that being a passport with -- in another name with an obliterated face on it. In examining that passport last evening, I noticed it contained -- within the passport

itself were a series of photographs of Mr.

Castro-Ramos. I also noticed that in the

disclosure that was given to the defendants in

connection with this document that those

photographs were not copied.

And in effect the agents who copied the passport copied the passport but didn't copy the photographs. That's the document I referred about that was different. And I'm now handing counsel a copy of the eight photographs of Mr.

Castro-Ramos contained -- that were actually contained -- and I represent to be contained within that passport. I'm not offering that at this point, however. I have nothing further.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, I don't understand what Mr. Dabrowski's position is about this picture he just gave to me. Are you attempting to offer that?

MR. DABROWSKI: No, Your Honor. I thought we were free to make reference to certain documents in our briefs. I'll offer that right now.

MS. POLAN: I would like the original in evidence, Your Honor, because I don't agree that -- I don't agree with Mr. Dabrowski's

1	characterization of that exhibit at all.
2	THE COURT: Can you have the
3	original at 2:00?
4	MR. DABROWSKI: Yes, I can. I can
5	have it at 2:00, Your Honor.
6	MS. POLAN: I've never seen the
7	original, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: As long as the Court
9	sees it, there will be no problem.
10	MR. DABROWSKI: It's here right
11	now. But we'll do it at 2:00.
12	THE COURT: Are we about concluded
13	with this witness?
14	MR. DABROWSKI: I'm through with
15	the witness, Your Honor, with the exception of
16	that passport.
17	THE COURT: All right, two o'clock,
18	****
19	
20	
21	(Luncheon recess)
22	
23	MR. DABROWSKI: For the record,
24	Your Honor, I have no further questions.
25	THE COURT: Is there another

1	witness we're going to call?
2	MS. POLAN: As soon as we're done
3	with him, yes.
4	THE COURT: How many more witnesses
5	are there, do you know?
6	MS. POLAN: How many more
7	witnesses? There are three search agents. The
8	searching agents, I think, will be relatively
9	brief, the three who searched with him.
0	THE COURT: All right. Could you
1	finish up with him? I think we've run him out
2	pretty clear.
3	MS. POLAN: Your Honor, except for
A	a few things he said on that redirect that looked
5	like cross examination to me.
6	THE COURT: All right.
17	, •
8	
9	
20	
21	
22	
23	RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. POLAN
24	
25	Q. Now, Agent Willliamson, I think on your

redirect examination, Mr. Dabrowski was asking you about the seizure of this welding torch. Do you recall that testimony?

- A. Couldn't --
- O. Don't touch it?
- A. I wouldn't.
- Q. You think it's going to explode?
- A. I don't know what it will do.
- Q. Now, your testimony, I believe, was that you seized that after you had a discussion with Special Agent James Lyons?
  - A: That's correct.
- Q. Is it your testimony that Agent Lyons told you that these tanks in here, which appear to be about three inches long, were the same kind of tanks that were found at the Caribe Hilton Hotel in San Juan in 1982?
  - A. No. That is not my testimony.
  - Q. What is -- what did he tell you?
- A. Agent Lyons said that this, the tank, could be used as an accelerant for an explosive device.
- Q. Did he make any comparison between those particular gas canisters or fuel canisters and the ones that were actually found at the

Caribe Hilton Hotel in May of 1982?

A. No. I don't recall any such discussion.

Q. So it's just Mr. Dabrowski who suggested that to you, isn't it?

A. As I recall, the affidavit for the search warrant had language to that effect.

Q. But you don't now, today, recall any discussion with Agent Lyons in which Agent Lyons told you that these little fuel canisters were similar to the ones at the Caribe Hilton?

A: What the discussion concerned was whether or not this could be used as a component of an explosive device.

Q. I'm just trying to find out from you if he made any comparison to the Caribe Hilton, that's the question.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the witness should be permitted to repeat the answer. In addition, if this is recross examination, what she has attempted to recross on didn't come out. The conversation I brought out on redirect with regard to Lyons was related to a search of a FALN, F A L N residence, not with regard to the

Caribe Hilton.

. 

THE COURT: Let's get the answer to it. And get on with this answer to the question so we can finish and start with Mr. Avery.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: If I can continue to answer, Your Honor, the discussion with Agent Lyons concerned whether this could be used as a component for an explosive device. And he said yes, it could. And that, in fact, he was aware that gas canisters had been used as accelerants by the FALN terrorist group.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) All right. Did he make any reference to the May 1982 Caribe Hilton explosive devices?
  - A. Not that I recall.
- Q. All right. And you know, don't you, that the few canisters that were found at the Cariba Hilton were very large, approximately the size of fire extinguishers?
  - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Agent Lyons didn't tell you that, did he?
  - A. No, he did not.
- Q. All right. Now, it's true, is it not, that you didn't seize the gasoline in Mr.

1 Castro's car, did you? No, I don't believe that appears on the 2 inventory. 3 Right. And that could have been used Q. as an accelerant, couldn't it have? 5 I don't know. I'm not an expert. 6 Well, you don't know whether people can 7 0. 8 make explosive devices with gasoline? 9 THE COURT: Counsellor, you're 10 wasting time. (BY MS. POLAN) They can, can't they? Ω. 11 12 THE COURT: Any common ordinary 13 person that's not retarded knows that, Counsellor. Let's proceed. 14 MS. POLAN: I'm trying to find out 15 if this witness knows that, Your Honor. 16 THE WITNESS: I would assume that 17 gasoline could be used for an accelerant. 18 19 Q. (BY MS. POLAN) And is it your testimony that Agent Lyons told you that fuel, 20 21 such as the fuel in this three inch tank here, is 22 what had been found, had been used by the F A L M 23 in bombings; is that what he told you?

No. As I recall the discussion

concerned whether this particular canisters could

24

be used as components of an explosive device. He said that they could, and he used the term,

"accelerant." And he continued by saying that some sort of gas cans had been used in such a manner by the FALN terrorist group.

- Q. But he never told you that it was the fuel from a welding torch that had been used, did he?
  - A. I don't recall.
- Q. It's true, is it not, that a number of items that are normally found in people's homes can be used as accelerants if somebody so desires?

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor, irrelevant.

THE COURT: Sustained.

- Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Now, Agent Williamson, you testified several times and again on redirect that you seized all the contents of the black attache case which is known as item C 13 because, in your words, you considered it, "Mr. Castro's terrorist kit", is that right?
- A. I think that would be a fairly accurate description of what I said, yes.
  - Q. And you did testify also that you found

documents in that attache case that you identified as Macheteros documents, is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Now, referring you to Government Exhibit 36, which has an identification number of L 17 C 13 1, and it is listed as item 1016 on the Government's Exhibit list, Mr. Dabrowski asked you about this exhibit which is in Spanish. And I believe you testified that it was some kind of rules of the Macheteros terrorist organization, is that correct?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Can you review that document and tell me if the word Macheteros appears anywhere in it?

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, the document speaks for itself. It's a long document. And it's going to take him awhile just to do that. It's a waste of time. We can examine the document.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, if Mr.

Dabrowski wants to stipulate that the word

Macheteros does not appear in it, then he doesn't
have to read it.

MR. DABROWSKI: No. I don't want

1 to stipulate. The document speaks for itself. THE COURT: How long will it take 2 you to read it? How long is it? 3 MS. POLAN: I think he can skim it. THE WITNESS: Well, Your Honor, in 5 the first sentence it refers to machete, and it's 6 talking about the symbol of the group. And just 7 by reading that alone, that would lead me to believe that this document concerns the Machetero 9 terrorist organization. 10 THE COURT: That was the reason it 11 attracted your attention to pick it up; is that 12 it? 13 THE WITNESS: That would be one of 14 the reasons, Your Honor, yes. 15 THE COURT: All right. 16 (BY MS. POLAN) But it's correct, is it Q. 17 not, that the word "Macheteros" doesn't appear on 18 that document, does it? 19 I don't know without reading the entire 20 document. 21 Well, Agent Williamson, you're here 22 testifying that the reason you took everything 23 out of item C 13, all of its contents, even pens 24

and pencils and keys and other seemingly

. 

innocuous items, that you identified this
briefcase as containing Macheteros documents.

And I want to know what the basis is of that
testimony, how you knew this was a Macheteros
document; and your testimony is because the word
"machete" is in it?

- A. The fact that it describes their insignia, which contains a machete, that based upon that, I would --
- Q. Well, is that what you remember doing on August 30th with this document?
- A: I don't recall exactly what I did with that document.
- Q. Now, directing your attention to Government Exhibit 37 which is L 17 C 13-6, Exhibit 1017, that's also something that came out of C 123. That is a one-page document that's entitled, "Memo", is that right?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. Is there anything on that document that identifies it as being a Macheteros document?
- A. Based upon the content of the document, the location of the document --
- Q. Well, let's forget about the content and location, is there anything on the document

that identifies it as a Macheteros document?

- A. Without referring to the content of the document?
- Q. You can refer to the content. How is it identified as a Macheteros document?
- A. This refers to internal security, talking about how the members of this group should not go around carrying firearms or documents of the party unless they're absolutely necessary. It's a security document.
- Q. Well, is there any way from looking at that document to know whether that's a document, for example, of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party?

## A. I'm not aware --

MR. DABROWSKI: Objection, Your Honor. The document reads in part that, "No comrade should carry weapons or documents belonging to the party." And it goes on and speaks again about documents and weapons. The Court is going to get a translation of it. And that translation will speak for itself.

THE COURT: It should speak for itself.

MS. POLAN: Your Honor, my inquiry is he's saying that he seized a number of things

Macheteros documents. And I think -- I'm certainly entitled to inquire whether he had any basis or if that's a conclusion he drew.

THE COURT: After the Court reads it, the Court will determine whether there is any basis for it or not.

MR. DABROWSKI: Your Honor, for example, the document says that --

THE COURT: I don't think we need --

MR. DABROWSKI: Which the members have should be kept in hiding places in their homes or in the houses of co-collaborators. It's a document that's very short. It's one page in the Spanish version. You pick it up, look at it and within a matter of seconds, the relevance leaps out at you.

MS. POLAN: Can we ask Mr. Dabrowski to stop testifying?

THE COURT: The Court will read it, and that will end it. You can argue until you're black in the face. It won't do any good because I'm going to read it myself. And I'm going to decide what is said. I can understand English.

1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	And it's printed on some cloth?
3	Α.	Yes.
4	Ω.	That was in C 13, wasn't it?
5	Α.	That's correct.
6	Q.	All right.
7		MS. POLAN: I would offer this.
8		MR. DABROWSKI: No objection.
9		
0		(Defendant's Exhibit 139 offered and marked into
1		evidence)
2		
3		
4	٠, ۵	(BY MS. POLAN) All right. Directing
5	your atten	tion to Defendant's 140 for
6	identifica	tion, is that something that was taken
17	from Mr. C	Castro's house?
8	Α.	Yes. This would have been in L 17 C
9	13, bears	the subinventory number N.
20	Ω.	So that was in this black satchel, the
21	terrorist	kit?
22	A •	Yes.
23	Q.	Can you tell me what's what is that;
24	first, is	that can you describe what the
25	document	s voutre holding?

. 

A. It's an envelope from First Federal

Savings Bank in Santurce, S A N T U R C E, Puerto

Rico, addressed to Defendant Castro-Ramos.

- Q. Can you tell me what's inside of that; first of all, why don't we look at number one, first. What item is this?
  - A. That's L 17 C 13 N 1.
  - Q. What is that?

than go through seriatim, I'll permit the defendant through counsel to put in evidence without objection any document or item that's part of C 13. And she can just supplement it on the record, and it will speak for itself. And we can save the rest of the day. I have no objection to any item from C 13.

THE COURT: Why don't you have them marked, Counsellor. I'll review them.

MS. POLAN: That's fine, Your

Honor. I would just summarize for the record, if

Mr. Dabrowski doesn't object, that C 13 N sub 1

is a letter from the First Federal Savings Bank.

MR. DABROWSKI: I do object. The document is in evidence. It speaks for itself.

The Court can examine it. I just --

MS. POLAN: I'm going to ask him or say what it is from the inventory. You don't know what it is. You can't read it and this isn't helping anything. These things aren't translated.

MR. DABROWSKI: She can't read from it. And if it's not in evidence, if it goes in evidence --

THE COURT: Is it in Spanish?

MS. POLAN: Yes. And I can tell
the Court what it is. Or the agent --

THE COURT: Tell me what it is.

And I'll review it and see if what you told me is correct.

MS. POLAN: C 13 N - 1 is a letter to Mr. Castro from the First Federal Bank about the adjustment of his monthly mortgage payment, effective September 1, 1985.

MR. DABROWSKI: I agree, Your Honor.

MS. POLAN: 13 N 2 A, B, C are coupons, mortgage payment coupons. N 3 is a flyer from the bank about the mortgage and N 4 is a coupon to send the bank -- excuse me, mailing labels to send the bank -- send the mortgage

l	
1	payments to the bank.
2	MR. DABROWSKI: I agree, Your
3	Honor.
4	MS. POLAN: I would offer this as a
5	full exhibit.
6	MR. DABROWSKI: No objection, Your
7	Honor.
8	
9	(Defendant's Exhibit 140 offered and marked into
10	evidence)
11	
12	
13	THE COURT: The Exhibit number,
14	Counsellor?
15	MS. POLAN: Now, showing you
16	again
17	THE COURT: The Exhibit number,
18	Counsellor?
19	MS. POLAN: For this? That's
20	THE COURT: That's what I asked
21	for. It's been marked. I want to know what it
22	says.
23	MS. POLAN: It's 141 for
24	identification. I'm sorry, I hadn't quite gotten
25	to it.

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) Showing you again

Government Exhibits 33 and 34 which are also

marked on the Government's Exhibit list as 1002

and 1003, I think you testified these were copies

of birth and death certificates for an individual

named Edgardo Torres-Davila?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. And that they were taken from C 11?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. Now, you were aware, were you not, Agent Williamson, that Mr. Torres-Davila had been a member of the Federation of Teacher's with Mr. Castro and his wife?
  - A. No, I was not.
- Q. You were aware, were you not, when you found those items that they were found inside of an envelope that had other items in it, is that correct; do you want to look at the inventory?
- A. I don't recall. On C 11 my inventory only reflects a large brown folder.
- Q. Well, how about C 11-21, because these are C 11-21?
- A. According to the subinventory, C 11-21 was a large manila envelope.
  - Q. All right. Now, showing you what's

been marked Defendant's 141 for identification, can you tell me what -- is C 11-21 inside there?

- A. Yes.
- Q. That brown envelope. And according to the subinventory, it's correct, is it not, that these two exhibits, the birth and death certificate, are listed as being inside that manila envelope, C 11-21?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. And it's correct, is it not, that also in that same envelope with the birth and death certificate was C 11-21-2 A, is that right; now, can you look at this document and tell me if you can identify what it is from the top?
- A. It looks like the life insurance or an application for funeral benefits, death benefits.
- Q. So it's an application to collect on a life insurance policy?
  - A. That's what it appears to me to be.
- Q. Isn't that also the case with C 11-21-3?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And isn't it correct that also in that same envelope C 11-21-1 is a

statement of the funeral expenses for Mr. Torres-Davila?

A. Yes.

Q. So all of these items, the application for funeral -- reimbursement for funeral expenses, the funeral bill and the application to collect the life insurance benefits were in the same envelope with the birth and death certificate of Mr. Torres-Davila when you found them?

A. According to the subinventory form, yes.

MS. POLAN: I would offer this, Your Honor.

MR. DABROWSKI: No objection.

(Defendant's Exhibit 141 offered and marked into evidence)

Q. (BY MS. POLAN) You know, Agent
Williamson, don't you, in order to collect
benefits, you have to furnish the insurance
company with a copy of the death certificate?

A. Yes.