

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552 *et seq.*, for declaratory, injunctive, and other appropriate relief to compel the disclosure and release of documents to Muslim Advocates (“Plaintiff” or “Requestor”).

2. In a FOIA Request letter (“Request”), Requestor sought documents and information relating to the government’s border searches of electronic devices in the possession of persons from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by President Donald Trump’s January 27, 2017 Executive Order, in addition to its border searches of electronic devices in the possession of persons – including U.S. citizens – whom U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) agents perceived to be Muslim. As discussed widely in news reports, these searches – which may include the physical retention of an individual’s electronic devices and demand for their passwords – appear to have dramatically increased following the issuance of the Executive Order.¹

3. Despite Requestor timely exhausting its administrative remedies, DHS has failed to comply with its obligation under FOIA to promptly make the requested documents and information available. These documents and information are critical to Requestor understanding the scope of the Executive Order and the extent to which the government implemented – and may continue to implement – its policies in a discriminatory or unconstitutional manner.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §552(a)(4)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

¹ See, e.g., Kaveh Waddell, *A Stand Against Invasive Phone Searches at the U.S. Border*, The Atlantic, Feb. 21, 2017.

5. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B).

PARTIES

6. Muslim Advocates is a not-for-profit corporation that works to ensure the civil rights for Americans of all faiths through national legal advocacy, policy engagement, and civic education. Muslim Advocates is a “person” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2).

7. DHS is an “agency” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f)(1). DHS has possession and control over the requested records.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

8. On January 27, 2017, President Donald Trump issued an executive order, Executive Order 13769 (“Executive Order I”), barring persons from seven Muslim-majority countries – Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen – from entering the United States for 90 days, indefinitely blocking refugees from Syria from entering the United States, and prohibiting all refugees from entering the United States for 120 days.

9. Following the issuance of Executive Order I, numerous publications reported that CBP agents searched the electronic devices of individuals, including U.S. citizens, who were originally from the seven countries covered by Executive Order I, in addition to searching the electronic devices of others who arrived in the United States on international flights and whom CBP agents perceived to be Muslim. These publications further reported that CBP agents demanded travelers’ passwords and potentially seized their electronic devices either physically or through the electronic duplication of their contents.

10. On February 2, 2017, CBP issued a guidance document entitled “Q&A for Executive Order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States,” which states: “Keeping America safe and enforcing our nation’s laws in an increasingly digital world

depends on [the CBP's] ability to lawfully examine all materials entering the United States.” It also provides that “inspection [of international travelers arriving to the U.S.] may include electronic devices.”

11. On March 6, 2017, President Donald Trump issued another executive order (“Executive Order II”), scheduled to go into effect on March 16, 2017, that replaced Executive Order I and continued to generally bar persons from six Muslim-majority countries – Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen – from entering the United States on new visas for 90 days and reinstated the prohibition on all refugees entering the United States for 120 days.²

12. On March 7, 2017, Requestor submitted the Request to DHS and asked that DHS refer the Request to CBP as appropriate.³ Requestor sought expedited processing pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(e).

13. The Request seeks the following: 1) records created on or after January 24, 2017 related to CBP's search, review, retention, and dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices in the possession of individuals who are encountered by CBP at the border, functional equivalent of the border, or extended border; and 2) records created on or after February 27, 2017 that pertain to Executive Order II and are otherwise responsive to the first request.

² These provisions of Executive Order II have been preliminarily enjoined nationwide by the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii at the time of the filing of this Complaint. *State of Hawaii, et al. v. Trump, et al.*, No. 17-00050 DKW-KSC, 2017 WL 1167383 (D. Haw. Mar. 29, 2017); *see also Int'l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, No. CV TDC-17-0361, 2017 WL 1018235 (D. Md. Mar. 16, 2017) (preliminarily enjoining section of Executive Order II imposing 90-day entry ban of persons from six Muslim-majority countries).

³ A copy of the Request is attached as Exhibit A.

AGENCY RESPONSES AND EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

14. On March 13, 2017, in a letter sent by email, DHS acknowledged that it had received the Request on March 13, 2017 and granted Requestor's request for expedited processing.⁴

15. In the letter, DHS invoked a 10-day extension beyond the usual 20-day statutory limit to respond to the Request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B).

16. With the 10-day extension, DHS was required to respond to the Request by April 24, 2017. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6).

17. DHS has yet to make available any records responsive to the Request.

18. Because DHS has failed to comply with the FOIA time limit provision, Requestor is deemed to have exhausted its administrative remedies under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(C)(i).

**VIOLATION OF FOIA FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE A DETERMINATION WITHIN
30 BUSINESS DAYS**

19. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 18.

20. DHS was obliged to determine whether to comply with the Request within 30 days (excepting Saturday, Sundays, and legal public holidays) – which includes the usual 20-day limit and the 10-day extension – and to immediately notify Requestor of the agency's determination and the reasons therefor.

21. Defendant's failure to determine whether to comply with the Request within 30 business days after receiving it violates FOIA, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A),(B), and applicable regulations promulgated thereunder.

⁴ A copy of DHS's response is attached as Exhibit B.

VIOLATION OF FOIA FOR FAILURE TO MAKE RECORDS AVAILABLE

22. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the allegations of Paragraphs 1 through 21.

23. Plaintiff has a right under FOIA to obtain the agency records requested on March 7, 2017, and there exists no legal basis for Defendant's failure to promptly make the requested records available to Plaintiff and the public.

24. Defendant's failure to promptly make available the records sought by the Request violates 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(A), and applicable regulations promulgated thereunder.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Muslim Advocates respectfully requests that judgment be entered against Defendant United States Department of Homeland Security and that this Court:

- A. Declare that Defendant violated FOIA by failing to determine whether to comply with the Request within 30 business days and by failing to immediately thereafter notify Plaintiff of such determination and the reasons therefor;
- B. Declare that Defendant violated FOIA by unlawfully withholding the requested records;
- C. Order Defendant to immediately disclose the requested records to the public and make copies immediately available to Plaintiff;
- D. Award Plaintiff its reasonable costs and attorneys' fees; and
- E. Grant such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: May 2, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Leah J. Tulin

Leah J. Tulin (D.C. Bar No. 988003)
Kelly M. Morrison (application for
admission forthcoming)
Joshua M. Parker (admission pending)
Daniel F. Bousquet (admission pending)
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
1099 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: (202) 639-6000
Facsimile: (202) 639-6066

Johnathan Smith (D.C. Bar No. 1029373)
Juvaria Khan (*pro hac vice* application
forthcoming)
MUSLIM ADVOCATES
P.O. Box 71080
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (415) 692-1484

Amir Ali (admission pending)
THE RODERICK & SOLANGE
MACARTHUR JUSTICE CENTER
718 7th Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
Telephone: (202) 869-3434

Attorneys for Plaintiff Muslim Advocates

Exhibit A

Mary Ellen Callahan
Tel +1 202 639 6064
Fax +1 202 661 4921
mecallahan@jenner.com

March 7, 2017

Dr. James V.M.L. Holzer
Deputy Chief FOIA Officer
The Privacy Office
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
245 Murray Lane, SW
STOP-0655
Washington, DC 20528-0655

Re: Freedom of Information Act Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

Dear Dr. Holzer:

The Roderick & Solange MacArthur Justice Center and Muslim Advocates (“Requestors”) submit this letter to The Privacy Office at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) as a request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, *et seq.* We ask that this request be expedited pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E) and that we be granted a fee waiver. We also ask that you refer the requests contained in this letter to U.S. Customs & Border Protection (“CBP”) as appropriate.

I. Background

On January 27, 2017, President Donald Trump issued an executive order, Executive Order 13769 (“Executive Order I”), barring persons from seven Muslim-majority countries – Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen – from entering the United States for 90 days, indefinitely blocking refugees from Syria from entering the United States, and prohibiting all refugees from entering the United States for 120 days.¹

Numerous publications reported that individuals, including U.S. citizens, originally from the seven countries covered by the Executive Order I and with Muslim-sounding names were having their electronic devices searched and potentially also seized, both physically and through the electronic duplication of their contents, in airports after arriving in the United States on international flights.² In its February 2, 2017 Q&A for Executive Order I, the CBP stated that

¹ Exec. Order No. 13769, 82 Fed. Reg. 8977 (Jan. 27, 2017).

² See Joshua Kopstein, *Travelers Affected By Trump Ban Forced to Unlock Phones, Computers*, Vocativ (Jan. 30, 2017, 6:21 PM), <http://www.vocativ.com/397897/travelers-affected-by-trump-ban-forced-to-unlock-phones-computers/>; Kaveh Waddell, *A Stand Against Invasive Phone Searches at the U.S. Border*, The Atlantic (Feb. 21, 2017), <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2017/02/ron-wyden-border-searches/517353/>; Sophia Cope, *Fear Materialized: Border Agents Demand Social Media Data from Americans*, Electronic Frontier Foundation (Jan. 25, 2017), <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2017/01/fear-materialized-border-agents-demand-social-media-data-americans>.

March 7, 2017

Page 2 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

“[k]eeping America safe and enforcing our nation’s laws in an increasingly digital world depends on [the CBP’s] ability to lawfully examine all materials entering the United States” and that “inspection may include electronic devices.”³

On March 6, 2017, President Donald Trump issued another executive order (“Executive Order II”) scheduled to go into effect on March 16, 2017 that replaces Executive Order I but again generally bars persons from six Muslim-majority countries – Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen – from entering the United States on new visas for 90 days and reinstates the prohibition on all refugees from entering the United States for 120 days.⁴

II. Request for Information

The Requestors request disclosure of the following records⁵ that were prepared, received, transmitted, collected and/or maintained by DHS, and/or the CBP⁶:

1. Any and all records created on or after January 24, 2017 related to CBP’s search, review, retention, and dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices⁷ in the possession of individuals who are encountered by CBP at the border, functional equivalent of the border, or extended border, including, but not limited to:
 - a. Records related to CBP’s implementation of Executive Order I with respect to CBP’s search, review, retention, and dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices possessed by individuals who are encountered by CBP at the border, functional equivalent of the border, or extended border.
 - b. Records reflecting revisions of, or documents superseding, the August 25, 2009 “Privacy Impact Assessment for the Border Searches of Electronic

³ Customs and Border Patrol, Q&A for Executive Order: Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States (Feb. 2, 2017), <https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2017-Feb/EO-QA-PDF-WEB-02.02.2017.pdf>.

⁴ Executive Order II is available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/06/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states>.

⁵ The term “records” includes all records or communications preserved in electronic or written form, including but not limited to correspondence, regulations, directives, documents, data, videotapes, audiotapes, e-mails, faxes, files, guidance, guidelines, standards, evaluations, instructions, analyses, legal and policy memoranda, minutes or notes of meetings and phone calls, memoranda, agreements, notes, orders, policies, procedures, protocols, reports, rules, manuals, technical specifications, text communications between phones or other electronic devices (including, but not limited to, communications sent via SMA or other text, Blackberry Messenger, iMessage, WhatsApp, Signal, Gchat, or Twitter direct message), training materials or studies, including records kept in written form, or electronic format on computers and/or other electronic storage devices, electronic communications and/or videotapes, as well as any reproductions thereof that differ in any way from any other reproduction, such as copies containing marginal notations.

⁶ The term “CBP” means CBP Headquarters offices, including any divisions, subdivisions or sections therein; CBP field operations offices, including any divisions, subdivisions or sections therein; CBP offices at ports of entry, including any divisions, subdivisions or sections therein; and/or any other CBP organizational structures.

⁷ The term “electronic devices” includes, but it not limited to, laptop computers, MP3 players, digital cameras, cell phones, and tablet computers.

March 7, 2017

Page 3 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

Devices” and CBP Directive CD 3340-049, “Border Search of Documents and Electronic Devices Containing Information” (August 20, 2009).

- c. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding criteria for selecting individual travelers whose electronic information will be searched, reviewed, or retained, or will be disseminated to other components of DHS, other government agencies, or persons or entities outside the government.
- d. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding search, review, retention, or dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices, including policies, practices, and procedures regarding:
 - i. The use of electronic devices to search, review, retain, and/or disseminate information found in email, located on social media, saved in the cloud, or otherwise stored on the internet that is accessible because of passwords stored on the electronic device or because the electronic device is recognized as a device that does not require a password to access such information.
 - ii. The search, review, retention, and dissemination of information that CBP officers have found not to violate the law.
 - iii. The search, review, retention and dissemination of business information.
 - iv. The protection of confidential information in travelers’ possession, such as information covered by trade secrets, attorney-client privilege, health privacy laws, or other legal protections.
- e. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 on the questioning of travelers targeted for search of electronic devices, including policies, practices, and procedures regarding:
 - i. The questioning of travelers targeted for electronic-device search regarding political views, religious practices, and other activities potentially covered by the First Amendment.
 - ii. Responding to such travelers’ refusal to answer such questions.

March 7, 2017

Page 4 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

- iii. Permitting a traveler targeted for electronic-device search to access legal counsel or invoke a right to remain silent during such questioning.

- f. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 on the information given to travelers targeted for electronic-device search regarding CBP's authority to search, review, retain, and disseminate information stored on or accessed through electronic devices, including policies and procedures about information given related to travelers' rights to refuse to consent to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to access legal counsel before consenting to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to limit the scope of their consent (such as to use of the electronic device to access data not stored on the electronic device itself), and CBP's authority to continue to detain travelers if they deny CBP access.

- g. Documents, including the "Blue Paper" described in the Verge's February 12, 2017 article, "A US-Born NASA Scientist was Detained at the Border Until He Unlocked His Phone,"⁸ given on or after January 27, 2017 to travelers targeted for electronic-device search regarding CBP's authority to search, review, retain, and disseminate information stored on or accessed through electronic devices, travelers' rights to refuse to consent to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to access legal counsel before consenting to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to limit the scope of their consent (such as to use of the electronic device to access data not stored on the electronic device itself), and CBP's authority to continue to detain travelers if they deny CBP access.

- h. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding requesting travelers' passwords to their email accounts, social media accounts, cloud accounts, and other internet-based accounts, such as mobile banking accounts, including information regarding travelers' rights to refuse to provide such passwords, travelers' rights to access legal counsel before providing such passcodes, and CBP's authority to continue to detain travelers if they deny CBP such passwords.

- i. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding providing travelers targeted for electronic-device search access to interpreters, including policies, practices, and procedures regarding the information given to such travelers regarding their rights to access interpreters.

⁸ Loren Grush, *A US-Born NASA Scientist was Detained at the Border Until He Unlocked His Phone*, The Verge (Feb. 12, 2017, 12:37 PM) <http://www.theverge.com/2017/2/12/14583124/nasa-sidd-bikkannavar-detained-cbp-phone-search-trump-travel-ban>.

March 7, 2017

Page 5 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

- j. Records reflecting the number of individuals who have had the information stored on or accessed through their electronic devices searched, reviewed, retained, and/or disseminated on or after January 27, 2017.
 - k. Records reflecting the race, ethnicity, country of origin, citizenship, and gender of individuals who have had the information stored on or accessed through their electronic devices searched, reviewed, retained, and/or disseminated on or after January 27, 2017.
 - l. Records reflecting the number of foreign nationals denied entry into the United States by CBP for refusing to consent to CBP search, review, retention, and/or dissemination of their electronic devices and/or information stored on or accessed through their electronic devices.
 - m. Records regarding the retention of electronic devices, or information accessed from or through electronic devices, by CBP on or after January 27, 2017, including the number of documents or electronic devices retained, the length of retention, the reasons for retention, and the ultimate disposition of retained material.
 - n. Records regarding the dissemination of electronic devices, or information accessed from or through electronic devices, to other components of DHS, other government agencies, or persons or entities outside the government on or after January 27, 2017.
 - o. Records regarding complaints filed on or after January 27, 2017 by individuals or organizations affected by CBP's policies or practices related to the search, review, retention, or dissemination of travelers' information.
 - p. E-mail communications among, between, or cc'ing CBP personnel at Headquarters, Office of Field Operations, and/or Office of Intelligence, sent or received on or after January 24, 2017 containing any of the following words or terms: "electronic device," "smartphone," "tablet," "laptop," "password," "e-mail account," "social media," "facebook," "twitter," and "cloud."
2. Any and all records created on or after February 27, 2017 that pertain to Executive Order II and are otherwise responsive to Request 1 above.

III. Application for Expedited Processing

Expedited processing of this request is warranted because: (1) there is an "urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged Federal Government activity" by organizations, like the MacArthur Justice Center and Muslim Advocates, "primarily engaged in disseminating

March 7, 2017

Page 6 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

information,” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(i) & (v)(II); (2) the request concerns “[t]he loss of substantial due process rights,” 6 C.F.R. § 5.5(e)(1)(iii); 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii); and (3) the request concerns “[a] matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government’s integrity which affect public confidence,” 6 C.F.R. § 5.5(e)(1)(iv); 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii).

Early reports about Executive Order I’s implementation have raised serious due process concerns,⁹ giving rise to “questions about the government’s integrity” and an “urgency to inform the public.” Given the similarities between Executive Order I and Executive Order II, these serious due process concerns persist. Further, attorneys and other services providers need to understand the relevant policies, procedures, and practices to effectively serve and advise the population of individuals potentially affected by Executive Order II. The requested records seek to inform the public about an urgent issue implicating thousands of individuals’ due process rights, namely, CBP’s interpretation, implementation, and enforcement of Executive Order I and Executive Order II.

These expediency concerns are heightened by Executive Order II’s ten-day delay before it goes into effect. The very moment it is enforced, Executive Order II promises to present some of the same serious due process concerns that Executive Order I presented. Thus, attorneys, other service providers, and the public urgently need these important public documents.

Given the foregoing, the MacArthur Justice Center and Muslim Advocates have satisfied the requirements for expedited processing of this Request.

IV. Application for Waiver or Limitation of Fees

The Requestors request a waiver of document search, review, and duplication fees on the grounds that disclosure of the requested records is in the public interest and because disclosure is “likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii). The Requestors also request a waiver of search fees on the grounds that the Requestors qualify as “representative[s] of the news media” and the records are not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II).

A. The Request is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the Requestors.

As discussed above, news accounts underscore the substantial public interest in the records sought through this Request. Given the ongoing and widespread media attention to this issue, the records sought will significantly contribute to public understanding of an issue of profound public importance.

⁹ See, e.g., Loren Grush, *A US-Born NASA Scientist was Detained at the Border Until He Unlocked His Phone*, The Verge (Feb. 12, 2017, 12:37 PM), <http://www.theverge.com/2017/2/12/14583124/nasa-sidd-bikkannavar-detained-cbp-phone-search-trump-travel-ban>.

March 7, 2017

Page 7 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

The Requestors are not filing this Request to further their commercial interest. Any information disclosed by the Requestors as a result of this FOIA Request will be made available to the public at no cost. Thus, a fee waiver would fulfill Congress's legislative intent in amending the FOIA. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (“Congress amended FOIA to ensure that it be liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

B. The Requestors are representatives of the news media and the records are not sought for commercial use.

The Requestors also request a waiver of search fees on the grounds that the Requestors qualify as “representative[s] of the news media” and the records are not sought for commercial use. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II). The Requestors meet the statutory and regulatory definitions of “representative[s] of the news media” because they gather information, exercise editorial discretion in selecting and organizing documents, and “distribute the resulting work to the public.” *Nat'l Sec. Archive v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, 880 F.2d 1381, 1387 (D.C. Cir. 1989). The Requestors are therefore “representative[s] of the news media” for the same reasons they are “primarily engaged in [the] dissemination of information.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II), (6)(E)(v)(II).

Furthermore, courts have found other organizations whose mission, function, publishing, and public education activities are similar in kind to the Requestors' to be “representative[s] of the news media” as well. Requestor Muslim Advocates, for instance, joined with the American Civil Liberties Union in disseminating the records obtained from the CBP in response to a joint 2010 FOIA request.¹⁰ Additionally, in 2009 requestor Muslim Advocates pursued FOIA litigation against the FBI that resulted in public disclosure of previously withheld information.¹¹ *Cf. Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 133 F. Supp. 2d 52, 53–54 (D.D.C. 2000) (finding Judicial Watch, self-described as a “public interest law firm,” a news media requester).¹²

On account of these factors, fees associated with responding to FOIA requests should be waived for the requestors as “representative[s] of the news media.”

* * *

With respect to the form of production, *see* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3)(B), the Requestors request that responsive electronic records be provided electronically in their native file format, if possible. Alternatively, Requestors request that the records be provided electronically in a text-

¹⁰ *See* ACLU, *Invasive Questioning at the Border* (last visited Mar. 2, 2017), <https://www.aclu.org/invasive-questioning-border?redirect=free-speech-national-security-racial-justice-religion-belief/invasive-questioning-border>.

¹¹ *See* Muslim Advocates, *Press Advisory: U.S. Department of Justice Continues to Cloak Public Access to Guidelines on FBI Surveillance of Mosques & Communities*, (Oct. 15, 2009), https://d3n8a8pro7vnm.cloudfront.net/muslimadvocates/pages/191/attachments/original/1361200382/10-15-09_Amended_Complaint_Press_Release.pdf?1361200382.

¹² Courts have found these organizations to be “representative[s] of the news media” even though they engage in litigation and lobbying activities beyond their dissemination of information / public education activities. *See, e.g., Judicial Watch, Inc.*, 133 F. Supp. 2d at 53–54.

March 7, 2017

Page 8 of 8 – FOIA Request re Border Searches of Electronic Devices

searchable, static-image format (PDF), in the best image quality in the agency's possession, and that the records be provided in separate, Bates-stamped files.

Pursuant to applicable statutes and regulations, the Requestors expect a determination regarding expedited processing within 10 days. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii).

If the Request is denied in whole or in part, the Requestors ask that you justify all deletions by reference to specific FOIA exemptions. The Requestors expect the release of all segregable portions of otherwise exempt material. The Requestors reserve the right to appeal a decision to withhold any information or deny a waiver of fees.

Additionally, in order to avoid delays in receiving records, Requestors request that records be produced seriatim as they become available. Due to the exigent circumstances surrounding this request, Requestors are amenable to narrowing the request if it would accelerate production.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. Please furnish the applicable records to:

Mary Ellen Callahan
Jenner & Block LLP
1099 New York Avenue NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001

I affirm that the information provided supporting the request for expedited processing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(vi).

Sincerely,



Mary Ellen Callahan

Exhibit B



Homeland
Security

March 13, 2017

SENT VIA E-MAIL TO: MECallahan@jenner.com

Mary Ellen Callahan
Jenner&Block LLP
1099 New York Avenue NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20001

Re: **2017-HQFO-00513**

Dear Ms. Callahan:

This letter acknowledges receipt of your March 8, 2017, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), for records that were prepared, received, transmitted, collected and/or maintained by DHS and/or the CBP: any and all records created on or after January 24, 2017 related to CBP's search, reviews, retention, and dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices in the possession of individuals who are encountered by CBP at the border, functional equivalent of the border, or extended border, including, but not limited to: records related to CBP's implementation of Executive Order I with respect to CBP's search, review, retention, and dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices possessed by individuals who are encountered by CBP at the border, functional equivalent of the border, or extended border; records reflecting revisions of documents superseding the August 25, 2009 "Privacy Impact Assessment for the Border Searches of Electronic Devices" and CBP Directive CD 3340-049, "Border Search of Documents and Electronic Devices Containing Information" (August 20, 2009). Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding criteria for selecting individual travelers whose electronic information will be searched, reviewed, or retained, or will be disseminated to other components of DHS, other government agencies, or persons or entities outside the government. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 regarding search, review, retention, or dissemination of information located on or accessed through electronic devices, including policies, practices, and procedures regarding: The use of electronic devices to search, review, retain, and/or disseminate information found in email, located on social media, saved in the cloud, or otherwise stored on the internet that is accessible because of passwords stored on the electronic device or because the electronic device is recognized as a device that does not require a password to access such information. The search, review, retention, and dissemination of information that CBP officers have found not to violate the law. The search, review, retention and dissemination of business information. The protection of confidential information in travelers' possession such as information covered by trade secrets, attorney-client privilege, health privacy laws, or other legal protections. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into

effect on or after January 24, 2017 on the questioning of travelers targeted for search of electronic devices, including policies, practices, and procedures regarding: The questioning of travelers targeted for electronic search regarding political views, religious practices, and activities potentially covered by the First Amendment. Responding to such travelers' refusal to answer such questions. Permitting a traveler targeted for electronic-device search to access legal counsel or invoke a right to remain silent during such questioning. Policies, practices, and procedures that went into effect on or after January 24, 2017 on the information given to travelers targeted for electronic-device search regarding CBP's authority to search, review, retain, and disseminate information stored on or accessed through electronic devices, including policies and procedures about information given related to travelers' rights to refuse to consent to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to access legal counsel before consenting to such CBP actions, travelers' rights to limit the scope of their consent (such as to use of the electronic device to access data not stored on the electronic device itself, and CBP's authority to continue to detain travelers if they deny CBP access. Documents, including the "Blue Paper" described in the Verge's February 12, 2007 article, "A US-Born NASA Scientist was detained at the Border Until He Unlocked His Phone," given on or after January 27, 2017 to travelers targeted for electronic-device search regarding CBP's. This office received your request on March 13, 2017.

As it relates to your request for expedited processing and fee waiver, your request is granted.

Due to the increasing number of FOIA requests received by this office, we may encounter some delay in processing your request. Consistent with 6 C.F.R. § 5.5(a) of the DHS FOIA regulations, the Department processes FOIA requests according to their order of receipt. Although DHS' goal is to respond within 20 business days of receipt of your request, FOIA does permit a 10-day extension of this time period in certain circumstances. As your request seeks documents that will require a thorough and wide-ranging search, DHS will invoke a 10-day extension for your request pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(B). If you would like to narrow the scope of your request, please contact our office. We will make every effort to comply with your request in a timely manner.

We have queried the appropriate component(s) of DHS for responsive records. If any responsive records are located, they will be reviewed for determination of releasability. Please be assured that one of the processors in our office will respond to your request as expeditiously as possible. We appreciate your patience as we proceed with your request.

Your request has been assigned reference number **2017-HQFO-00513**. Please refer to this identifier in any future correspondence. To check the status of your FOIA request, you may contact this office at 1-866-431-0486 or 202-343-1743, or you may check the status of your request online at <http://www.dhs.gov/foia-status>.

Sincerely,



LaEbony Livingston
FOIA Program Specialist