

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

**ABDUL HAMID AL-GHIZZAWI,**

**Petitioner,**

**v.**

**GEORGE W. BUSH, et al.,**

**Respondents.**

**Civil Action No. 05-2378 (JDB)**

**ORDER**

Before the Court is [277] respondents' emergency motion to enforce the protective orders in this case, which was filed yesterday. Respondents ask the Court to order petitioner's counsel to remove an article from her website that respondents contend reveals protected information. See Resp'ts' Mot. to Enforce the Protective Orders [Docket Entry 273], at 1. They also request that the Court direct petitioner's counsel "not to further disseminate 'protected' information." Id. For her part, petitioner's counsel asserts that the information she posted on her website and used in the article was disclosed by the government before the present dispute. See Pet'r's Opp'n to Resp'ts' Mot. [Docket Entry 274], at 5. Accordingly, she offers, "it is an extraordinarily odd situation to permit everyone else in the world to discuss this matter except counsel." Id. She also suggests that this Court has no jurisdiction to address a filing made in the Supreme Court in petitioner's original habeas corpus proceeding. See Pet'r's Supplemental Resp. to Resp'ts' Mot. [Docket Entry 276], at 2-3.

Petitioner's counsel is bound by the various protective orders in this case, whether or not any "protected" information is now available on the internet. Here, despite its apparent inadvertent disclosure, the disputed information remains "protected" material. And accordingly,

petitioner's counsel is precluded from disclosing it. Therefore, it is hereby

**ORDERED** that respondents' motion is **GRANTED** pending further order of the Court;  
it is further

**ORDERED** that petitioner's counsel shall remove the article entitled "The Muzzle is Back On" from her website because it contains "protected" information and derivative material; it is further

**ORDERED** that petitioner's counsel shall not disclose "protected" information and information or documents derived from "protected" information as defined by the protective orders in this case; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the parties may file supplemental memoranda, limited to fifteen (15) pages, addressing this matter by not later than December 7, 2009.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/  
JOHN D. BATES  
United States District Judge

Dated: November 25, 2009