

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

	) <b>Civil Action Nos.</b> ) <b>02-CV-0299 (CKK), 02-CV-0828 (CKK),</b> ) <b>02-CV-1130 (CKK), 04-CV-1135 (ESH),</b> ) <b>04-CV-1136 (JDB), 04-CV-1137 (RMC),</b> <i>In re Guantánamo Detainee Cases</i> ) <b>04-CV-1142 (RJL), 04-CV-1144 (RWR),</b> ) <b>04-CV-1164 (RBW), 04-CV-1166 (RJL),</b> ) <b>04-CV-1194 (HHK), 04-CV-1227 (RBW)</b> ) <b>04-CV-1254 (HHK), 04-CV-1519 (JR)</b> )
--	---

**PETITIONERS’ NOTICE OF DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS BROUGHT AGAINST  
RESPONDENTS NAMED IN THEIR INDIVIDUAL CAPACITIES OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, MOTION TO DISMISS THOSE CLAIMS WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1), Petitioners represented by the undersigned counsel hereby file notice that they voluntarily dismiss, without prejudice to renew, (1) any habeas claims brought against the individual Respondents in their individual capacities; (2) any claims for damages brought against the individual Respondents in their individual capacities under either the Alien Tort Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1350, or the United States Constitution, *see Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971); and (3) any claims for equitable relief brought against individual Respondents in their individual capacities.

Proceeding by notice of dismissal is proper where, as here, notice is filed “before service by the adverse party of an answer or of a motion for summary judgment, whichever first occurs.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1). Respondents have filed a “Motion to Dismiss or for Judgment as Matter of Law” and an “Individual Respondents’ Motion to Dismiss.” Neither of these filings is an answer or a motion for summary judgment. As a result, Respondents’ filings have not terminated Petitioners’ unconditional right to a voluntary dismissal without prejudice of the claims enumerated in the first paragraph, *supra*. *See Carter v. United States*, 547 F.2d 258 (5th

Cir. 1977) (holding that Rule 41(a)(1) applied where the defendant had filed a motion to dismiss but had not filed an answer or a motion for summary judgment); *Chambers v. Gesell*, 120 F.R.D. 1, 2 n.4 (D.D.C. 1988) (“[A]lthough defendant has presented several grounds for dismissal of this suit, only defendant’s motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim [which was converted into a motion for summary judgment because it relied upon matters outside of the pleadings] defeats plaintiff’s right to voluntary dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1).”); Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice & Procedure* § 2363 (“A motion to dismiss is neither an answer nor, unless accompanied by affidavits discussing matters outside the pleadings that are not excluded by the court, a motion for summary judgment; thus, unless formally converted into a motion for summary judgment under Rule 56, a motion to dismiss under Rule 12 does not terminate the right of dismissal by notice.”).

In the event this Court deems Rule 41(a) inapplicable in the present circumstances, Petitioners in the alternative move under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2) for an order dismissing, without prejudice to renew, the claims enumerated in the first paragraph, *supra*. Counsel for Petitioners discussed the instant motion with counsel for Respondents, as required under Loc. Civ. R. 7.1(m). Respondents’ counsel stated that Respondents do not oppose the motion.

Dismissals without prejudice pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2) “are generally granted in the federal courts unless the defendant would suffer prejudice other than the prospect of a second lawsuit or some tactical disadvantage.” *Conafay v. Wyeth Labs.*, 793 F.2d 350, 353 (D.C. Cir. 1986). This standard was recently addressed by this Court in *Hisler v. Gallaudet University*:

A court applying Rule 41(a)(2) . . . must consider whether the plaintiff seeks the motion for voluntary dismissal in good faith, and whether the dismissal would cause the defendant “legal prejudice” based on factors such as the defendant’s trial preparation efforts, any excessive delay or lack of diligence by the plaintiff in prosecuting the action, an insufficient explanation by the plaintiff for

taking nonsuit, and the filing of motions for summary judgment by the defendant.

No. 99-2387, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20996, at \*15 (D.D.C. Oct. 21, 2004) (quoting *In re Vitamins Antitrust Litigation*, 198 F.R.D. 296, 304 (D.D.C.2000)). Petitioners seek dismissal of the above-stated claims in good faith and Respondents will suffer no legal prejudice if dismissal without prejudice is granted.

For the reasons stated above, Petitioners ask that their notice of dismissal be accepted by the Court or that, in the alternative, the Court grant their motion to dismiss the enumerated claims without prejudice to renew at a later date.

Dated: November 5, 2004  
Washington, D.C.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
David H. Remes  
Marc D. Falkoff  
Covington & Burling  
1201 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004  
Counsel for Abdah, *et al.*, 04-C V-1254 (HKK)

Richard J. Wilson  
Muneer I. Ahmad  
International Human Rights Law Clinic  
Washington College of Law  
American University  
4801 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20016  
Counsel for OK, *et al.*, 04-C V-1136 (JDB)

Pamela Rogers Chepiga  
Allen & Overy LLP  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020

Counsel for Suhail Abdu Anam, *et al.*, 04-CV-1194  
(HHK)

Thomas B. Wilner (D.C. Bar #173807)  
Neil H. Koslowe (D.C. Bar #361792)  
Kristine A. Huskey (D.C. Bar #462979)  
Jared A. Goldstein (D.C. Bar #478572)  
SHEARMAN & STERLING LLP  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 508-8000  
Facsimile: (202) 508-8100  
Counsel for Al Odah, *et al.*, 02-CV-0828 (CKK)

Baher Azmy  
Seton Hall Law School Center for Social Justice  
Seton Hall University School of Law  
One Newark Center  
Newark, NJ 07102  
Counsel for Murat Kurnaz, *et al.*, 04-C V-1135  
(ESH)

Gitanjali S. Gutierrez  
Gibbons, Del Deo, Dolan, Griffinger &  
Vecchione, P.C.  
One Riverfront Plaza  
Newark, NJ 07102  
Tel: (973) 596-4500  
Fax: (973) 639-6243  
Counsel for Begg, *et al.*, 04-CV-1137 (RMC)

Stephen H. Oleskey  
Robert C. Kirsch  
Melissa A. Hoffer  
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Counsel for Boumediene, *et al.*, 04-C V-1166 (RJL)

George Brent Mickum IV (D.C. Bar No. 396142)  
Douglas J. Behr (D.C. Bar No.163998)  
Keller and Heckman LLP  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Suite 500W  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 434-4100

Fax: (202) 434-4646  
Counsel for El-Banna, *et al.*, 04-CV-01144 (RWR)

Joseph Margulies  
Margulies & Richman,  
2520 Park Avenue, South  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
(612) 872-4900  
(612) 872-4967  
Counsel for Habib, *et al.*, 02-CV-1130 (CKK)

Stewart D. Aaron  
Joshua Colangelo-Bryan  
Dorsey & Whitney LLP  
250 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10177  
Counsel for Almurbati, *et al.*, 04-CV-1227 (RBW)

Wesley R. Powell  
Clifford Chance US LLP  
31 West 52nd Street  
New York, NY 10019  
Tel: (212) 878-8000  
Fax: (212) 878-8375  
Counsel for Khalid, No. 1:04-cv-1142 (RJL)

Andrew A. Jacobson  
David E. Walters  
Hillary A. Victor  
Andrew W. Vail  
(*pro hac vice* pending)  
Jenner & Block LLP  
One IBM Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60611  
(312) 222-9350

Leon Friedman, Esq.  
District Bar No. NY0028  
148 East 78th Street  
New York, New York 10021  
(212) 737-0400

Major Michel D. Mori, U.S. Marine Corps  
(*pro hac vice* pending)  
Office of Military Commissions  
Office of the Chief Defense Counsel

1931 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 103  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 607-1521, ext. 193

Joshua L. Dratel, Esq  
Attorney Registration No. 1795954  
Joshua L. Dratel, P.C.  
Civilian Defense Counsel  
14 Wall Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10005  
(212) 732-0707  
Attorneys for Hicks, 02-CV-0299 (CKK)