

b(6), b(3)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
C Company, 1st Battalion, 325th Airborne Infantry Regiment
82nd Airborne Division
Ft. Bragg, North Carolina 28310

AFVC-BA-C

23 JUNE 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Commander's Inquiry

1. A Commander's Inquiry was conducted 23 JUNE 2003 to determine the circumstances surrounding two possible mock executions of Iraqi nationals in south of Zone 45, and the possible deliberate damage of a civilian vehicle by [REDACTED] (1-13 AR), [REDACTED] (EN), and [REDACTED]. All three personnel are currently attached to [REDACTED] 1-325 AIR. [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] is the [REDACTED] of an ad hoc squad from [REDACTED] 307th EN. [REDACTED] is a [REDACTED] for the squad. Allegations have been made by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] performed a mock execution on the evening of 20 JUN 03. He also alleges that [REDACTED] conducted a mock execution at approximately 1330 hours on 22 JUN 03. He alleges that [REDACTED] was present for the mock execution associated with [REDACTED]. Additionally, [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] deliberately damaged the vehicle of an Iraqi national during the investigation of a site being looted.

b(3)
b(6)-2

2. Events of 20 JUN 2003: During a patrol conducted by [REDACTED] and the engineer squad, a vehicle was seized from some looters at the ammunition plant located outside Zone 45. The vehicle was loaded with steel rods. [REDACTED] entered the vehicle and began to drive the vehicle back and forth to get the rods off of the vehicle. In the process he damaged the vehicle's radiator. The unit then left to continue patrolling in Zone 45. On the return trip to TAA Red Falcon they passed by the ammunition factory a second time. At this time, they saw looters around the vehicle. In order to deny the use the vehicle to the looters, [REDACTED] directed [REDACTED] to slash the vehicle tires. [REDACTED] also alleges that [REDACTED] conducted a mock execution of an Iraqi national who had been detained earlier in the evening. According to [REDACTED] the convoy of two trucks stopped on a road, and the detainee was placed in front of the lead vehicle. [REDACTED] then fired a round. At least two other soldiers from the engineer squad, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] collaborate this story. [REDACTED] has stated that there was a dog that was threatening both himself and the detainee. He shot the dog in order to protect the detainee and himself. Several soldiers stated that they heard the shots, but did not ask their leaders why shots were fired. Most of the soldiers interviewed stated they did not see or hear any dogs; a few soldiers stated they heard the dogs, but could not verify if one of the dogs was threatening [REDACTED]. This is possible because both vehicles may have been running and creating enough noise whereby soldiers may not have heard the dogs.

b(3)
b(6)-2

3. Events of 22 JUN 2003: At approximately 1330 hours on 22 JUN 03, [REDACTED] and several members of the [REDACTED] once again entered the ammunition plant. During this time the engineers detained a father and his two sons. According to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] conducted a mock execution of one of the boys. This occurred after the [REDACTED] reportedly asked the father "which one do you want to die." [REDACTED] then took one of the boys behind a building and fired a round, thereby giving the appearance of an execution. The detainees were then released. According to [REDACTED] one of the boys was taken to a building so that he could be flex-cuffed and hooded for transportation as a detainee. This occurred after a radio conversation between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. 2LT Yancey did not want to release the detainees until they were crying and had learned their lesson. [REDACTED] stated that the detainee began to run away, so he fired a warning shot. When the [REDACTED] returned to their housing area, several members of the squad who had not been on patrol heard [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

b(3)
b(6)-2

0000012

b(6), b(3)

boast about how they had conducted a mock execution. [redacted] also relayed to [redacted] that he had scared the family by threatening to kill the father, and/or one of the boys.

4. Conclusion Recommendation: During this inquiry all members of the [redacted] and the [redacted] were interviewed. There are numerous individual statements which support the statements of [redacted] and [redacted]. There are several disturbing facts that are supported by the numerous personnel involved. First, several personnel reported that warning shots and M203 smoke were fired to stop looters. This was so common that many soldiers considered the use of warning shots "business as usual." Many soldiers also reported that when shots were fired they did not ask who fired the shots, or why they were fired. Additionally, the firing of these warning shots was not reported to the [redacted] command post.

b(6)-2,
b(3)

[redacted] The actions of [redacted] and [redacted] show that the personal property of Iraqi citizens was not protected, but instead was destroyed. In addition, two soldiers in the [redacted] talked about mock executions as an effective way of deterring looting. Given the time to conduct this inquiry (24 hours), I cannot determine if the mock execution associated with [redacted] was actually conducted, or is simply the perception of several soldiers who were viewing the scene from odd angles, and then making assumptions based upon their limited view of the scene.

~~b(6)-2~~
delib process
b(5)-1

[redacted]

b(5)-1
delib
process

5. POC is the undersigned.

[redacted]

b(6)-2, b(3)