

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CRIMINAL DEFENSE  
LAWYERS,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

Civ. A. No. 18-2399 KBJ

**ANSWER**

Defendants, the Federal Bureau of Prisons (“BOP”) and United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) (“Defendants”), by and through counsel, hereby respond to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint in this Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) action as follows:

**RESPONSES TO NUMBERED PARAGRAPHS**

Defendants respond to the separately numbered paragraphs and prayer for relief contained in the Amended Complaint below. To the extent that any allegation is not admitted herein, it is denied. Moreover, to the extent that the Amended Complaint refers to or quotes from external documents, statutes, or other sources, Defendants may refer to such materials for their accurate and complete contents; however, Defendants’ references are not intended to be, and should not be construed to be, an admission that the cited materials: (a) are correctly cited or quoted by Plaintiff; (b) are relevant to this, or any other, action; or (c) are admissible in this, or any other, action.

Wherefore, Defendants answer as follows to the specifically numbered paragraphs of the Amended Complaint:

1. The first sentence of Paragraph 1 contains Plaintiff's characterization of its action, not allegations of fact, to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed required, Defendants deny; Defendants respectfully refer the Court to the cited FOIA requests for a complete and accurate statement of the contents. Defendants admit the second sentence of Paragraph 1 in that Plaintiff submitted three different FOIA requests to five components of DOJ, specifically one to BOP (the "BOP Request"); a different one to the Criminal Division, the Office of Information Policy ("OIP"), and the Office of Legal Counsel ("OLC") (collectively, the "Main Justice Request"); and the third to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys ("EOUSA") (the "EOUSA Request").

2. Defendants admit that NACDL requested various documents and a waiver of fees, but respectfully refer the Court to the relevant FOIA request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

3. Defendants admit the first sentence of Paragraph 3 and deny the remaining allegations. The Trust Fund Limited Inmate Computer System (TRULINCS) provides inmates a computer system that does not jeopardize the safety, security, orderly operation of the correctional facility, or the protection of the public or staff. Inmates do not have access to the Internet. (4500.12 14.1). Public Messaging is one service available via TRULINCS. Additionally, inmates may only communicate with approved persons on their contact lists for the purpose of postal mail, TRUFONE, Public Messaging, and/or any person to whom they want to send funds. (4500.12 14.10 c.) An inmate may be permitted to correspond via Public Messaging and postal mail with an inmate confined in any Bureau facility in accordance with the Program Statement Correspondence. (4500.12 14.10.c(3)(d)). Finally, only approved Contacts can access messages using Corrlinks.com. (4500.12 14.10 c.).

4. Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 4.

5. Paragraph 5 is Plaintiff's characterization and opinion of TRULINCS and purpose regarding its FOIA requests, therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny and direct the Court to the published opinion in *United States v. Fumo*, 655 F.3d 288 (3d Cir. 2011), and the pleadings and exhibits filed in that matter for the facts underlying that matter.

6. Paragraph 6 is Plaintiff's characterization and opinion of communication by inmates and purpose regarding its FOIA requests, therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

7. Paragraph 7 is Plaintiff's characterization and opinion of policies and purpose regarding its FOIA requests, therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

8. Defendants deny.

9. Paragraph 9 is Plaintiff's characterization and opinion of policies and purpose regarding its FOIA requests, therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

10. Paragraph 10 is Plaintiff's characterization of the instant FOIA action and purpose regarding its FOIA requests, therefore no response is required.

11. Defendants lack knowledge to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 11.

12. Defendants admit only that DOJ is a federal agency of the United States of America and that BOP, the Criminal Division, OIP, OLC, and EOUSA and are components of the Department of Justice.

13. Defendants admit the first sentence of Paragraph 13 and deny the second sentence.

14. This paragraph contains Plaintiff's conclusions of law, to which no response is required.

15. This paragraph contains Plaintiff's conclusions of law, to which no response is required.

16. Defendants admit, and respectfully refer the Court to the BOP Request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

17. Defendants admit that NACDL requested a waiver of fees, but respectfully refer the Court to the relevant FOIA request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

18. Defendants admit.

19. Defendants admit only that BOP has not issued a final response (including documents) to Plaintiff's request. Defendants deny Plaintiff's characterization of the passing of a deadline.

20. Defendants admit, and respectfully refer the Court to the Main Justice Request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

21. Defendants admit that NACDL requested a waiver of fees, but respectfully refer the Court to the relevant FOIA request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

22. Defendant admits the first two sentences. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge as to the last sentence.

23. Defendants admit only that Criminal Division has not issued a final response (including documents) to Plaintiff's request. Defendants deny Plaintiff's characterization of the passing of a deadline.

24. Defendants admit.

25. Defendants admit only that OIP has not produced any records or issued a final determination to Plaintiff's FOIA request. Defendants deny Plaintiff's characterization of the passing of a deadline.

26. Defendants admit.

27. Defendants admit only that OLC has not issued a final response to Plaintiff's request. Defendants deny Plaintiff's characterization of the passing of a deadline.

28. Defendants admit, and respectfully refer the Court to the EOUSA Request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

29. Defendants admit that NACDL requested a waiver of document search, review and duplication fees. Defendants deny the remaining allegations. Defendants respectfully refer the Court to the relevant FOIA request for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

30. Defendants admit that EOUSA sent a letter to the Plaintiff on September 17, 2018, and respectfully refer the Court to this letter for a complete and accurate statement of the contents. Defendants, however, also aver that EOUSA subsequently agreed to conduct a search.

31. Defendants admit.

32. Defendants admit.

33. Defendants admit that OIP has not completed its adjudication of Plaintiff's appeal of EOUSA's determination of its FOIA request.

34. Defendants admit only that EOUSA has not issued a final response to Plaintiff's request. On February 6, 2019, EOUSA resent Plaintiff an acknowledgment letter, stating that it was now searching the U.S. Attorneys' Offices for any responsive records per Plaintiff's FOIA request. Defendants respectfully refer the Court to this letter for a complete and accurate statement of the contents.

35. No further response is required to the referenced paragraphs.

36-39. Paragraphs 36-39 represents Plaintiff's legal analysis and conclusion to which no response required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

40-43. Paragraphs 40-43 represents Plaintiff's legal analysis and conclusion to which no response required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

44-47. Paragraphs 44-47 represents Plaintiff's legal analysis and conclusion to which no response required. To the extent that a response is required, Defendants deny.

Respectfully submitted,

JESSIE K. LIU, DC Bar #472845  
United States Attorney

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

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
W. MARK NEBEKER, DC Bar #396739  
Assistant United States Attorney  
555 4th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 252-2536  
mark.nebeker@usdoj.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that service of the foregoing Answer has been made through the Court's electronic transmission facilities on this 11th day of February 2019.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
W. MARK NEBEKER, DC Bar #396739  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Civil Division  
555 4th street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530  
(202) 252-2536