

Information Report

16 June, 2004

(b)(1),(b)(3):10
USC 424.(b)(6)

[REDACTED]

OFFICE OF OPERATIONS

ARLINGTON, VA

(S//NF) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Building 3100, Clarendon, Arlington, VA, was interviewed and provided the following information to special agent (SA) [REDACTED] Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) Office of the Inspector General (IG) regarding alleged violations of the Geneva Conventions and the International Laws of Land Warfare. [REDACTED] provided essentially the following information.

(S//NF) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] stated the [REDACTED] episode did not appear to be out of anger; it was more like a modus operandi (MO). Also, [REDACTED] prepared statement contained [REDACTED] observation during a pre-planned raid to capture a [REDACTED] who was not captured, however, the spouse of the [REDACTED] was detained, which [REDACTED] objected to the detainment of the woman to the raid team leader. The woman was not harmed and was released about two days later.

(S//NF) During the interview of [REDACTED] he related that [REDACTED] first three weeks in [REDACTED] were spent at the Task Force facility, which at the time [REDACTED] was under the control of an unidentified military (06) officer, which appeared to be a great operation. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] was then sent out to the field element to assist in field interrogations, which led to [REDACTED] observations as listed above. [REDACTED] went on to say that any "harsh" treatment of any detainees had to be approved by the task force commander or the J-2, along with a medical surgeon, and Staff

DERIVED FROM: [REDACTED] (b)(2)

DECLASSIFY ON: Source marked X1, date of source 30 September 2003

Interviewed On: 10 June 04

At: Arlington, VA

Case No.: 04-23810MA-056

Date Drafted: 15 Jun 04

(b)(3):10
USC 424

V-270

Judge Advocate. [redacted] described harsh treatment as [redacted] or putting the detainee under [redacted]. Each and every phase of an interrogation had to be specifically documented and monitored, and in [redacted] capacity as an [redacted] was one who monitored interrogations.

[redacted]

[redacted] was an [redacted] and that [redacted] had a reputation of [redacted] detainees. [redacted] stated [redacted] was not involved in the previously mentioned incident that occurred on [redacted]. [redacted] stated there were no DIA personnel other than [redacted] and [redacted] replacement that viewed, and or participated in the interrogation. [redacted] finally stated he never visited the [redacted] and could provide no information pertaining to that facility.