PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

AUTHORITY:	Title 10 USC Section 301; Title 5 USC Section 2951; E.O. 9397 dated November 22, 1943 (SSN).
PRINCIPAL PURPOSE:	To provide commanders and law enforcement officials with means by which information may be accurately identified.
ROUTINE USES:	Your social security number is used as an additional/alternate means of identification to facilitate filing and retrieval.
DISCLOSURE:	Disclosure of your social security number is voluntary.

1. LOCATION	2. DATE (YYYYMMDD)	3. TIME	4. FILE NUMBER
Metro Park Springfield, VA	2004/05/24	1845	

5. LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, MIDDLE NAME	6. SSN	7. GRADE/STATUS
[redacted]	[redacted]	E6

8. ORGANIZATION OR ADDRESS
CI Detachment Zama, 500th MI Group, APO AP 96338

I, [redacted], WANT TO MAKE THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT UNDER OATH:

I arrived at Abu Ghraib (AG) on 21 October and was assigned as as the Chief of the Terrorist, Foreign Fighters and Extremist element of the JIDC. At various times I had the following personnel assigned to my team, but not all at the same time: [redacted] went through a 2 to 3 day newcomers' orientation and tour of the facility immediately after my arrival, as did all newly arriving personnel. [redacted] and [redacted] did the IROE portion of the orientation. The IROEs were in line with current doctrine and training and also reflected what I had experienced in previous assignments. Incoming personnel had to acknowledge in writing they had been informed of and understood the IROEs. I did not have any concerns over the IROE and was pleased to see that certain procedures, especially sleep deprivation, had to be approved by LTG Sanchez. Sleep management technique and process was being developed as I was leaving GTMO and I had wondered how it was worked out and put into practice. It was good to see that a higher approval authority (LTG Sanchez) was required. The IROEs were posted in numerous places and were quite conspicuous. I do not recall if the in processing involved reading the 12 October Memorandum signed by LTG Sanchez. We were aware of the techniques and procedures that required approvals, especially those that required approval by the CG. Interrogators and first line supervisors knew to ask if they were uncertain on any of the approval levels. My duties called for me to participate directly in interrogations as well as observe the interrogations conducted by personnel in my section. I did not observe or hear about any violations of the IROEs. On one occasion I did hear some dogs barking and asked about it and was told they were being used for an interrogation. I had been told by [redacted] about the general procedures for dogs: they had to be requested and approved with an IROE exception to policy memo prior to use, could not be in the booth, only present in the area and the dogs could not touch the detainees. [redacted] used the dogs, said he had requested approval. I did not see the approval, but knew that the SOP was that [redacted] would not have given the go ahead if she had not received the proper authority. At one time I had requested approval to use sleep management and to use the MP dogs but did not employ either as the approval was not received in a timely manner. It was not until 6 weeks after I requested it that the approval came through. I did not see the written approval but was informed that it had been approved. The process for obtaining approvals was that the interrogation team had to request it in writing in accordance with the interrogation plan and submit it to the section leader who sent it to [redacted] who would in turn forward it thru the Deputy Commander to C2/JTF-7. As far as I know there was no tracking system at the section level - I put the request in the distribution box and checked later to see if it was gone. If it was no longer there, I assumed that ops had forwarded it, since it was not returned to me. We were transitioning from a paper/hard copy system to an automated system had been put in place for recording and tracking the detainees. The maneuver element was supposed to send the detainee with a capture tag and preliminary screening info when the detainee was forwarded to us. Detainees of intelligence interest were put on "MI Hold" as soon as they were identified as such. Our screeners would take the paperwork that came with the detainee and prepare a screening review which was forwarded to the magistrate, who in turn passed the packet to [redacted] and the operations folks. There the info (identifying info, capture data, location, etc) was entered into the computer system by the AG Number, the ISN Number and cross referenced to name. The hard copy dossier was then passed to the Section leaders who parceled them out to the teams. Most of the time we cross checked the hard copy with the data base to make sure the info had been entered. The interrogators entered follow up data from the interrogation process as they progressed. I am not sure if the data base can be assessed from outside Iraq. A civilian woman named [redacted] who traveled to the various units training them on the system would be the best person to contact about that accessing the Biometric Automated Tool (BAT) data base. Higher priority MI hold detainees would be interrogated as soon as possible. Other MI hold detainees could conceivably be held for up to two months before being interrogated. During Oct and Nov the pace was very hectic at AG - in fact it was "crazy". 14 to 18 hours days were the norm. We had constant mortar attacks and other types of harassing fire and the maneuver elements were literally flooding us with new detainees. As we finished interrogations and felt we had exhausted intelligence value we forwarded the packets to the Detainee Assessment Branch for processing and consideration for release. The DAB memo would be filled out and put into [redacted] box for review and processing. I could check the data base from my section and see if the memo had been accepted by the DAB [redacted]

10. EXHIBIT | 11. INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT [redacted] | PAGE 1 OF 3 PAGES

ADDITIONAL PAGES MUST CONTAIN THE HEADING "STATEMENT _____ TAKEN AT _____ DATED _____"

THE BOTTOM OF EACH ADDITIONAL PAGE MUST BEAR THE INITIALS OF THE PERSON MAKING THE STATEMENT, AND PAGE NUMBER MUST BE BE INDICATED.

DA FORM 2823, DEC 1998 | DA FORM 2823, JUL 72, IS OBSOLETE | USAPA V1.00

9. STATEMENT *(Continued)*

I observed or heard about some out of the ordinary procedures as explained below. One detainee in an unrecalled block (where the Iraqi Police were held when the round up was conducted) was handcuffed to the cell bar - he could move a short distance and could sit down but was handcuffed in such a manner that his movement was somewhat restricted. He was restrained in this manner because he had tried to attack one of the MPs who had been searching his cell for drugs. On another occasion I observed another detainee in Block 1B being put through a physical training session by the MPs by having to carry water jugs back and forth, up and down the hallway. Another occasion involved a high value detainee we knew was coming in for interrogation. He told us that he had cold water thrown on him and when we further questioned him on the details we found that he had been given a shower and all we had was cold water. This detainee, [redacted] has recently been quoted in the London Times about the cold water incident and said he had been beaten and hit in his mouth. We actually favored him and treated him quite well, with extra rations and cigarettes, etc to have him feel like he was being favored and to keep him talking. The mouth incident was actually a tooth infection and we had made sure he had dental care. This particular detainee had been in Kurdish control for some time before he was transferred to us. One of the results of the Red Cross visit was a stipulation that all detainees had to be dressed in orange jumpsuits. [redacted] made a comment that it did not stipulate how much of a jump suit so he reportedly cut off the sleeves and legs and made it into two pieces for the detainee to wear. At the time [redacted] was working a "special project" and reported directly to COL Pappas and did it to one particular detainee who was a suspected high level al Qaeda operative. On another occasion we experienced a slight problem when we returned a detainee to his cell from the wood site. This detainee was always hostile and arrogant. On this particular occasion he jumped up against the interrogator and right after jumped up and down in place (as would a small child throwing a tantrum). [redacted] said that because of this, the detainee would "have a new look" - the next morning his head was shaved.

I never saw any abuse or humiliation of prisoners by either Army personnel or OGA personnel. I do not know of any unauthorized use of guard dogs for interrogation. I never saw any unauthorized photos or videos of detainees. However, when [redacted] in processed, I was told he took a picture of the compound and that he was told to delete it, he was not allowed to take pictures. He immediately deleted the picture. Later, [redacted] was taking a picture of a departing female in the ops shop and I told him to delete the photo, which he did. I am confident that all my Soldiers or civilian/contract interrogators would have come to me to report any humiliation or abuse. I am sure that most of the other Soldiers and civilians/contractors would also come to me, as they had a sense of trust in me. I knew [redacted] from a previous assignment, but on this tour he was not assigned to me and we did not work together. I feel he is arrogant and cocky and he did not talk to me. I saw him in the booth on occasion, but did not really observe his work. I heard about his attitude from others but never heard any problems about his work. I did not work with [redacted] and did not hear anything adverse about his work. [redacted] was very confident, almost arrogant. He felt he should have been in charge and not have to work for a military interrogator and not have to listen to a SGT or SSG. I never heard any complaints about his work. [redacted] was very reliable and I would have believed him if he came to me about observing any abuse - he never did so. I expected that all my Soldiers would have done so. I saw them on a daily basis and held weekly section meetings. On one occasion [redacted] was walking a detainee from his cell and I was escorting them. [redacted] had hooded and cuffed him and turned him around to walk down the stairs. The detainee lost his balance and fell. I had already returned to the ICE but two soldiers saw this and immediately reported it to me. I immediately informed [redacted] that it was an accident and not deliberate. She immediately addressed [redacted] and the MP shift NCOIC about the matter. [redacted] was always bragging and stretching the truth. Toward the end of November he was working as an analyst and may have received an Article 15 for drinking. I do not know if he ever worked with [redacted]. He pal'd around with [redacted] Interrogators might not know what the MPs were doing or what they were supposed to do or not do. I always felt that the MPs had more leeway than we did, but the MPs should also know right from wrong. The interrogators should know what they are allowed to do and what they cannot do. Q: Is there anything else you would like to add? A: No [redacted]

//End of Statement//

NOTHING FOLLOWS [redacted]

INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT [redacted]

NOTHING FOLLOWS

[redacted]

AFFIDAVIT

I, [redacted], HAVE READ OR HAVE HAD READ TO ME THIS STATEMENT WHICH BEGINS ON PAGE 1, AND ENDS ON PAGE 3. I FULLY UNDERSTAND THE CONTENTS OF THE ENTIRE STATEMENT MADE BY ME. THE STATEMENT IS TRUE. I HAVE INITIALED ALL CORRECTIONS AND HAVE INITIALED THE BOTTOM OF EACH PAGE CONTAINING THE STATEMENT. I HAVE MADE THIS STATEMENT FREELY WITHOUT HOPE OF BENEFIT OR REWARD, WITHOUT THREAT OF PUNISHMENT, AND WITHOUT COERCION, UNLAWFUL INFLUENCE, OR UNLAWFUL INDUCEMENT.

[redacted]
(Signature of Person Making Statement)

WITNESSES:

ORGANIZATION OR ADDRESS

ORGANIZATION OR ADDRESS

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a person authorized by law to administer oaths, this 24 day of May 2004 at Springfield, VA

[redacted]
(Signature of Person Administering Oath)

[redacted]
(Typed Name of Person Administering Oath)

UCMJ, ARTICLE 136
(Authority To Administer Oaths)

INITIALS OF PERSON MAKING STATEMENT

[redacted]