

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division

ALEXANDER P. KONANYKHINE,

: CIVIL ACTION : NO. 97-449-A

Petitioners,

VS.

December 19, 2003

WILLIAM J. CARROLL,

et al,

Respondent.

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE T.S. ELLIS, III, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioners: Szymkowicz & Szymkowicz, LLP By: J. P. SZYMKOWICZ, ESQ.

1220 10th Street, N.W., Suite 400

Washington, D.C. 20036

For the Respondent:

United States Attorney's Office

By: KATHLEEN PEPPER, ESQ.

BILL HOWARD, ESO.

2100 Jamieson Avenue

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

DON McCOY, RMR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 401 COURTHOUSE SOUARE ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22314-5798 (703) 683-3668

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

these folks.

THE COURT: All right, I have -- this is the -- what's the number on this? It doesn't have a new number, does it?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Civil Action Number 97-449-A.

THE COURT: That isn't appropriate. It should have a new number. This is an entirely new case. You are seeking -there is no order in this court in the 97-449 case, is there?
This is a settlement agreement that you reached with

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: That's correct, Your Honor.

I appreciate your taking this as an emergency matter, and I appreciate Ms. Pepper and Mr. Howard from the United States Attorney's Office for coming here and arguing today; and I apologize for calling your office yesterday.

THE COURT: All right. We are beyond all that now.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I was hired last night around 5:00
o'clock. I have represented Mr. Konanykhine and Ms. Gratcheva,
who are husband and wife, on business matters. I'm not an
immigration lawyer, and I'm not a criminal lawyer.

THE COURT: Whatever happened to Mr. -- (pause)

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Mr. Maggio represents Mr. Konanykhine in the immigration matters, but he apparently is in Richmond arguing at the Court of Appeals, the Fourth Circuit, for a stay, and that was related to me by my client. I don't know if he actually made it down there.

THE COURT: Stay of what? 1 2 MR. SZYMKOWICZ: A stay of the deportation proceedings. 3 The case originated many years ago. 4 THE COURT: I know about that. 5 MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: The only grounds you have raised here today 7 is that it's a violation of the order, or, I mean, of the 8 settlement agreement? 9 MR. SZYMKOWICZ: That's correct, or, in the alternative, 10 we are applying for an application for a writ of habeas corpus 11 both for Mrs. Konanykhine and Mr. Konanykhine. 12 THE COURT: On what grounds? 13 MR. SZYMKOWICZ: On the grounds that there is an illegal 14 detention and on the grounds that they be released from captivity 15 because, in the Konanykhine case, it violates -- his detention 16 violates the settlement agreement reached between the United L7 States and Mr. Konanykhine. 18 In the Gratcheva matter, she still has one --L9 THE COURT: (Interposing) She was allowed to depart 0.5 voluntarily. 21 MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Voluntarily. 22 THE COURT: I don't understand what's going on here. 23 Who is here for the Government? Is this Ms. Pepper? 24 MS. PEPPER: Yes, it is, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: I have your pleading that says that they now intend to put him on an airplane at 5:30.

MS. PEPPER: That is correct, Your Honor, and in the interim here, I went back to the office to ascertain his status, and he is still in transport to New York.

THE COURT: Well, while I'm having this hearing, they had better not put him on the airplane. I'll enter an order right now to stop that. Is that clear?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now, let's move on with this hearing. Do you need to call somebody and tell them don't let him get on an airplane until I'm done?

MS. PEPPER: I would appreciate the opportunity to do that, Your Honor, just to make sure it's crystal clear.

THE COURT: All right, I'll give you a chance to do that, because he is not leaving this country until I have had this hearing.

MS. PEPPER: I understand, Your Honor.

THE COURT: This has all the earmarks of something strange. I don't understand what's happening with this man and Russia and our country. I just don't understand it.

Now, my focus is going to be smaller, because all I have is what his counsel has put before me, but I have clear memories of the past agreements between the successors to K.G.B. and our I.N.S., and I don't know whether you have read all of those proceedings and whether you know of this Court's concern about Ms.

1

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

Rose's misrepresentations. Do you recall that?

MS. PEPPER: No, I don't, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And this gentleman doesn't either. wasn't here. I do want to hear from you about why this isn't a violation of the settlement agreement, and why is the wife with him? Why wasn't she allowed to go to Canada? Why were they whisked back here? It's all quite strange, quite strange indeed.

I'll take a brief recess. You call them, and they can't take him out of this country, and, if they do, they will be in contempt of court until I rule on this matter.

MS. PEPPER: Understood clearly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, do you know what's happening in Richmond?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, I do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is it over?

MS. PEPPER: No, that is not over, Your Honor. Yesterday petitioner filed on his behalf and his wife's behalf explicitly a motion to stay deportation, because they both have a pending petition for review of the Board's November 20th order.

THE COURT: The asylum issue.

MS. PEPPER: Correct. And so the Government filed a response to that stay request this afternoon, and so the Fourth Circuit is considering that. The Government attorney in that case has also been apprised of the fact that Immigration authorities intend to deport at 5:30.

THE COURT: You see, all of that suggests they want to avoid a court resolution, so it makes the courts suspicious, and it makes courts want to say, Let me hear it first. Let me hear what's happening. Why should they be in a rush to send them away? They have been here for ten years now.

I'll take a brief recess while you make that call, because until I rule on this, they are not to move him out of the country.

MS. PEPPER: Thank you, Your Honor.

(Whereupon, at 4:00 o'clock p.m. a short recess was taken.)

THE COURT: All right, Ms. Pepper, thank you for making that call. I don't want this matter rendered moot while I'm hearing it.

MS. PEPPER: Yes, I understand, Your Honor. As a precaution, I had already had Bill Howard from our office stay at his phone, so that when the plane lands in New York, and it has not yet done so, they would call him immediately, as well as calling the Government attorneys for the Fourth Circuit, to let us know of their arrival. He will. Because they must call him, he's going to tell them do not deport him.

And he is also calling all of their supervisors, who are here in the district offices, that they will get a sort of two-prong phone call.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Pepper.

Now, Mr. Szymkowicz, as I see it, you raised two arguments. First, you say that the removal of Mr. Konanykine and his wife is a violation of your settlement agreement, and the second argument you make is really, you raise a habeas petition, but you asked that it be treated as a habeas, as an alternative, but the ground for the habeas is not set out. What is the grounds for the habeas?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: The grounds for the habeas, Your Honor,

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: The grounds for the habeas, Your Honor, is that, with regard to Mr. Konanykhine, his detention and deportation violates the terms of the settlement agreement in the '97 case.

With regard to Ms. Gratcheva, Mr. Konanykhine's wife, her detention and deportation violates the terms of the Board of Immigration Appeals' order dated 11-20-03, which stated in conclusion -- (pause).

THE COURT: Yes. I read it, I read it. She gets to depart voluntarily.

MR. SZYMKOWICz: Voluntarily depart, and they then basically --

THE COURT: (Interposing) Now, what typically happens, Mr. Szymkowicz? I take it you are an immigration lawyer.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Not at all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh, you are not?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: No.

THE COURT: All right, let me ask Ms. Pepper, because

1 this is her area. Is that right, Ms. Pepper? You are a lawyer in 2 this area? 3 MS. PEPPER: Yes, I am, Your Honor. THE COURT: What happens typically with an order to 4 5 remove or deport if there is an appeal to the Court of Appeals? 6 Is it automatically stayed, or what happens? 7 MS. PEPPER: No, it is not, Your Honor. Prior to 1996 8 any alien ordered deported who filed a petition for review with 9 the Court of Appeals got an automatic stay of deportation, but --THE COURT: That's what I remembered, but not any 10 11 longer? 12 MS. PEPPER: No. 13 THE COURT: What do you have to do now? 14 MS. PEPPER: Now, the passage of the Illegal Immigration 15 Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act in 1996 removed the 16 automatic stay provision. 17 THE COURT: Well, it didn't remove the opportunity for a 18 What do you have to do now to get one? 19 MS. PEPPER: You have to file a stay, a motion for stay 20 with the Court Of Appeals, and go through the four-step process of 21 showing likelihood of harm to self, to government.

THE COURT: Why should you all render that moot by moving him before the Fourth Circuit can act? I mean, it's not

MS. PEPPER: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right, and that's what Mr. Maggio is doing.

22

23

24

25

1 lik
2 and
3 wer
4 hav
5 Cir

6

9

10

11

13 14

16 17

15

18

19 20

21

24

23

25

focusing on Mr. Konanykhine, because he is the only named

like Mr. Maggio has been slow. He has already filed the appeal, and I take it he has moved with alacrity once he knew that you all were going to move to deport his client, that he is now seeking to have it stayed pending a hearing on the merits in the Fourth Circuit. Now why should the -- is it I.C.E. that does this?

MS. PEPPER: That is correct, Your Honor.

MS. PEPPER: Well, first, Your Honor, it does not render it moot, because the Court still has jurisdiction over the qustions of law in much the same way that --

THE COURT: Why should I.C.E, render that moot?

THE COURT: What good does that do Mr. Konanykhine?

MS. PEPPER: If it rules in his favor, then the
government must at its own expense bring him back.

THE COURT: If he's alive.

MS. PEPPER: True, Your Honor, but Congress' intent in removing the automatic stay provisions from the Immigration Act was to require aliens who had meritorious claims to get a stay.

THE COURT: All right, and that's what's going on right now?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, why is Mrs. Konanykhine, whatever her name is, why is she being removed in apparent violation of the order that says she can depart voluntarily?

MS. PEPPER: Well, Your Honor, I have primarily been

petitioner in the motion before us, so I have limited information regarding her because I was not making inquiries. However, it appears, and I say appears because I do not know this for a fact, that her passport expired, and she doesn't have a valid passport.

Therefore, even though she does have until tomorrow in which to voluntarily depart the United States, she has no valid passport in which to do so, and she cannot travel to Canada or Mexico to voluntarily depart, because she is not a native or citizen of either country, and you cannot voluntarily depart to either of those two countries under the law.

THE COURT: Why is there such an interest by the United States to get this man back to Russia?

MS. PEPPER: I don't -- I do not know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I accept that. You know, back a few years ago, this was going on again, and I don't know whether you have reviewed all of the past of this.

MS. PEPPER: Your Honor, the only information I know about this case is the present motion.

THE COURT: You really need to look back at it, because my recollection may be mistaken, but I recall that there was, in effect, a sinister deal between the I.N.S. and the successors to the K.G.B. There's no treaty between Russia and the U.S., and they wanted this guy back for some reason, and the U.S. also wanted an F.B.I. office in Moscow; and so they dealt. It was that simple.

And there were misrepresentations made to this Court in the course of it, too. I don't recall what they were, and I don't recall specifically what happened, but I was quite upset with it, and it seemed to me to be a sad spectacle.

Indeed, ultimately, the United States paid money to

Konanykhine in settlement of the suit he brought. Am I correct in
that regard?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: That's correct, Your Honor. I believe it was in the neighborhood of eighty-some-thousand-dollars, but it was to the firm of Arent Fox, who had taken the case on apparently pro bono at that point.

THE COURT: Well, I just find it hard to understand. There is something more going on, obviously, than you know, Ms. Pepper, and that I know, because there is a lot of erg being spent on hustling somebody out of here who has been here for years and years.

There is more to this than meets the eye, and I'm unlikely to be very hospitable to doing nothing as long as there appears to be an avenue of appeal that I don't want these people to -- now, if the Fourth Circuit this afternoon says no stay, that would be about the end of the matter as far as I was concerned.

But tell me this: Why is this not a violation of the agreement? What is it that has arisen that means he can't stay, because it says here, Pending final resolution of his immigration proceedings, and they haven't ended yet?

MS. PEPPER: Your Honor, the Government argues that the settlement agreement has expired on two different grounds.

First, the specific provision, which is paragraph (d) on page two of the settlement agreement, says that the settlement agreement will remain in force until there is a final, enforceable order. When the Board of Immigration Appeals issued -
THE COURT: (Interposing) What does it say? Am I

reading something -- the settlement agreement says, Respondent, that's the INS, agrees to parole petitioner -- that means let him stay here -- pending final resolution of his immigration proceedings.

MS. PEPPER: Your Honor, I'm looking at the prior page,

paragraph (d) on page 2, which says that this agreement will take effect on the date it's entered, and this agreement will end when there is a final and enforceable order of exclusion or deportation entered against the petitioner, when the petitioner's immigration proceedings are otherwise resolved, or, stated in the disjunctive, when parole is revoked pursuant to the paragraph in the next section that you are referring to.

THE COURT: Well, all of that I construe as meaning when it's over, when his immigration matters are over.

MS. PEPPER: Well, the government's first argument on this is when there's a final and enforceable order of exclusion or deportation, the first of the three items listed, has occurred when the Board of Immigration Appeals isued its order on November

20, 2003.

When the Board issues an order, it becomes the final administrative order. The fact that there is a petition for review pending with the Court of Appeals doesn't change the fact that the board's order is a final, enforceable order under the law.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. PEPPER: And, alternatively, the Government argues that the third provision when parole is revoked has occurred. I have a copy of the parole revocation for Your Honor and for counsel if you would like, which is dated today.

THE COURT: Dated today. Isn't that interesting?

Something is going on here, and it's very very suspicious, that there is some effort to try to do this so quickly. I don't understand it. There must be -- what is the quid pro quo that this Government gets in return for delivering this person? Hum. I don't know. All right, his parole has been revoked, you say?

MS. PEPPER: His parole was revoked.

THE COURT: For what reason?

MS. PEPPER: He did not comply with three of the terms of the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: Which were?

MS. PEPPER: Which was on paragraph three, page four, he was required to notify them of any change of address, and, according to the parole revocation letter, he had a change of

address and did not notify them within this past month. He was supposed to consistently report into INS, now the Immigration --

THE COURT: When would he receive revocation of the parole? Today, right?

MS. PEPPER: Right. The letter is dated today.

THE COURT: And when would he receive an opportunity to say, hey, you all made a mistake? Today?

MS. PEPPER: Yes.

THE COURT: And in the meantime, they are going to put him on a 5:30 airplane? Does any of this strike you as at all unfair? How about that for a word that maybe the I.C.E should consider? Unfair. Give him a chance, for gosh sakes, to at least get his argument before the Fourth Circuit and to tell you whether or not he did report.

This man may be a scoundrel, for all I know. I don't remember all of the things in '97, but golly Pete, the way it's being handled is fraught with -- it invites the inference that something is going on here that's very odd indeed.

I understand his position. His position is he doesn't want to go to Russia, because people there want to kill him, and I understand that; and I understand his desire to try to get to Canada, but he wasn't able to do that.

I find it strange, you know, if the U.S. wants him out of here, what difference does it make to the U.S. where he goes? That was my view in '97. Why do you care whether he goes to the

I

1 Caribbean or anywhere else? No, they wanted him to go to Russia.

Now why do we imagine that's the case? Because there's something going on. Now it may be legitimate, or it may be illegitimate,

and even if it's illegitimate, it may not be the business of this Court. I don't know.

But right now, Ms. Pepper, I don't see any reason why I shouldn't enter an order that says that he doesn't get on that 5:30 airplane, and I'll consider the matter Monday morning after I hear whether the Fourth Circuit has ruled on his petition for a stay. That's seems to me to be the only fair way to go about it, and in the meantime, I would have a number of other questions to ask you; and we can litigate here the question about whether he

Szymkowwicz, he had better get himself an immigration lawyer here.

I'm not sure that the violation of his, of this settlement

agreement, is something you can raise by way of a petition in this

court.

But then Mr. -- I'll tell you something, Mr.

don't think that's appropriate. I'm not sure what is, but somebody is going to have to think about this pretty quickly. The only thing I'm determined not to do is let events overtake us before fairness can be considered.

Right now this has got a case number of a '97 case.

One element of fairness is that the Fourth Circuit gets a chance to say whether or not it is stayed.

did indeed violate his order.

2 3

1

4 5

7

6

8 9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

21 22

20

23 24

25

I must tell you, Mr. Szymkowicz, if the Fourth Circuit decides not to stay the removal order, then I think it's over.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Your Honor, I think there is a difference between the Fourth Circuit not doing anything on a motion and actually make a decision against the stay.

THE COURT: Well, it's going to issue something.

I would imagine Mr. Maggio has told them there -- he should have the same information -- that it's an emergency.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I would imagine that he did that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So it's either going to be granted or denied.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: The only thing I have -- (pause) THE COURT: If not, you had better tell him to do so. Tell him that I told him he has to do so.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, none of this addresses her. I do understand now a little bit more about her, and that is that her passport expired; I take it her Russian passport expired.

MS. PEPPER: Right. So I understand.

THE COURT: Yes. Well, isn't that convenient? Because she could have voluntarily departed anywhere she wanted to, couldn't she? She could have gone to Canada.

MS. PEPPER: Your Honor, aliens who are granted voluntary departure are allowed by law to voluntarily depart to any country except Canada and Mexico, the two contiguous ones, unless they are native citizens of those countries.

L3

L4

1.6

L9

THE COURT: I see. Well, I didn't know that. All right, that's useful. That's important to know. That's by statute, I take it.

MS. PEPPER: Yes, it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But she could, for example, have departed to the Caribbean or somewhere?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, she could have, Your Honor. In fact, another alternative that was available to them, though to what success obviously I don't know, is they could have requested, in light of the information from Canadian authorities that asylum might be possible, is to have immigration authorities here be part of the discussion with Canada, so that if Canada would agree to grant them asylum, as opposed to just let them apply for it, then they could have been deported to Canada where they could have received asylum status.

THE COURT: What difference does it make, as long as they are gone from here, what difference does it make to the United States? That's what I have always found strange.

MS. PEPPER: I -- I have no way to respond to that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, the only possible answer is that

Russia really wants him back. I can only shudder to think what

reasons there may be for that, either because he's done some very

bad things, or because they want to do -- he may deserve whatever punishment, aside from being killed, of course, he may deserve punishment. I don't know what he's done or hasn't done. But I know that in his asylum claim he fears being killed there; is that right?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: That's correct, Your Honor. The only allegations --

THE COURT: (Interposing) I recall that from '97.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: The only allegations that are levied against my client are business-related.

THE COURT: Oh, I understand that.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: They are not considered to be deathpenalty offenses such as murder or treason or things like that.

The other thing I would like the Court to be aware of, and I do
know this, because I did represent Alexander during this time,
he's been living in New York City for at least four years.

The part of the settlement agreement that says that he cannot depart from the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area was superceded by this agreement that he entered into with the I.N.S. back, presumably in 1999, that allowed him to live in New York, and since that time he has informed me that he has maintained contact with the I.N.S.

THE COURT: That would at least be disputed?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Certainly, and he's informed me, and again I'm not an immigration lawyer, and I didn't give him any

immigration advice, and I'm not comfortable doing so, he's informed me that he has maintained a contact with I.N.S, as was required, the entire time, including these last months.

L4

1.5

THE COURT: Well, there are obviously two sides to that issue, or there wouldn't have been a revocation of his parole issued.

I think what needs to happen -- I take it you are in touch with counsel in Richmond as well?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, I am, Your Honor.

receive it quickly and then deliberate on it.

MS. PEPPER: No, Your Honor. The Government attorney is in Washington, D.C., but the Fourth Circuit, in recognition of the fact that deportation was imminent, allowed the Government to fax its response in opposition to the stay motion so that they could

THE COURT: And nothing has been heard in that regard?

I haven't heard from that attorney whether they have set any kind of timeframe for resolution on the motion. I do have a copy of the petitioner's motion for stay that was presented to the Fourth Circuit.

THE COURT: Does it indicate that's an emergency motion?

MS. PEPPER: Yes, it does. It's entitled Emergency

Motion for Stay of Removal and indicates that they fear that

deportation is imminent. This was filed yesterday before there

were travel documents, and it was as imminent as it is this

moment.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Your Honor, if I may be heard on that.

THE COURT: Before you are, is there anything else that I should know about this case that you know, Ms. Pepper?

MS. PEPPER: As to the facts of the case, those are the facts as I know them. I was unaware that he was living in New York. I was unaware that there appears to be any modification of the settlement agreement, because the only information I have is what's provided here.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. PEPPER: And there is no modification with that, because the Government's information was that he hadn't sought permission to travel outside of this area to go to Canada. I don't know any conditions that are on any modifications and have no way to know that or respond to you on that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Mr. Maggio may have some of those documents or all of those documents, and I will be getting in touch with him later tonight.

With regard to giving some background on what I know from having spoken to my client last night and this morning around between midnight and 2:00 in the morning, I received a frantic call, and Mr. Konanykhine is not a histrionic person. He was the most emotional, in fact, I have ever heard him.

He informed me that he was deported -- that he was

stopped at the Canadian border. He was attempting to cross the Peace Bridge into Canada from New York to Ontario. His car was swarmed by at least 12 immigration officers.

He was immediately put on a plane from Buffalo and brought to Reagan National, where he was taken right away to the Russian Embassy, inside the Embassy.

THE COURT: For what purpose?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I don't know, presumably to get a travel document. The travel document, the Russian Embassy was not able to physically produce the travel document. I don't what the travel document is, what it looks like, or how hard it is to create one, but apparently they had a hard time, which is why he was transferred to the I.N.S. office on Fairfax Drive in Arlington. That's where I first talked to Mr. Konanykhine.

And, if it hadn't been for the Immigration officer, she was very nice, at that office, I probably would not have been able to talk to him; but they were very helpful, and that's when I called your chambers. When Mr. Konanykhine was on the other line, I had your office on the other line trying to get an emergency stay.

After that, he was transferred to the Arlington County
Detention Center, and that's when I had more substantive
conversations with him; and it was his opinion that it was just a
matter of time, probably early in the morning, that the travel
documents would be issued, and he would be on a plane. He was

surprised, if he knew that he was leaving on a 5:30 plane, he would have been surprised; he thought it would have been earlier than that. So you are up to the minute right now as to my knowledge of the case.

THE COURT: All right. I think it is important to be clear what the Court's jurisdiction is. It seems to me that the papers filed can be construed to be a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, in which the petitioner contends that his due process rights are being violated because he's being deported before the Court can act on his request for a petition for a stay of the Immigration Board's order; in other words, to permit him even to act on the motion for an emergency motion to stay. It appears to be an effort to prevent even that.

When did Mr. Maggio go down there?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I haven't spoken to Mr. Maggio since last night, but he was in Washington last night. I presume, based on conversations with my client, Mr. Konanykhine, that he was going down today. I don't know whether he actually made that trip or he was doing it by telephone. So I really can't comment on that just because I don't know.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Szymkowicz, what jurisdictional basis would be furnished by an alleged violation of this settlement agreement?

Come to the podium. What is the jurisdictional basis?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: As I informed Your Honor, I primarily

practice in civil matters, and last month I had a violation of a settlement agreement in Montgomery County, Maryland, in the Circuit Court, and the case law in that case was that the Court had continuing jurisdiction to -- and this was a civil matter -- had continuing jurisdiction to effectuate the terms of the settlement agreement.

1.3

L4

THE COURT: This settlement agreement doesn't have anything to do -- didn't come out of -- did it come out of the case that I held? No, it came out of a civil action, didn't it? Wasn't this part of a civil action that he filed?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I was before Your Honor on the Federal Tort Claim Act, I believe it was in 1998. I was actually the attorney in that case, '98 or '99.

THE COURT: And that was settled?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: That was put on a stay by Your Honor pending the outcome of all this.

The settlement agreement that is referenced in this petition today is the resolution of the habeas corpus proceeding. And remember you had two proceedings, Your Honor, and this was before my time, so if I'm misquoting, I apologize; but there apparently were two habeas corpus proceedings before Your Honor.

You granted the writ of habeas corpus, and Mr.

Konanykhine was released from captivity. That same day, the INS rearrested him. I don't even know if he even left the jail, and that necessitated a second habeas corpus petition.

THE COURT: Yes, I recall that.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Which was filed by the Arent Fox law firm. That was the proceeding in which there was testimony taken where Your Honor found strange things afoot with the INS and its activities with Mr. Konanykhine.

There were apparently two days of hearings in that second habeas corpus action. And to resolve that second habeas corpus action, the INS and Mr. Konanykhine, acting through the Arent Fox attorneys, entered into the settlement agreement with the language that we are relying upon, on page three: Respondent agrees to parole petitioner pending final resolution of his immigration proceedings, including any direct judicial appeals thereof.

THE COURT: So long as.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: So long as petitioner engages in -and I can't read what that word is. That was the copy that was
faxed to me last night by the helpful people in INS, which they
certainly didn't have a duty to do that. And they faxed it to me,
and it looks like it had been previously faxed to Mr. Maggio, and
before that previously faxed by Alexander at his office at KMGI
Studios. So, it's not a very clear copy.

THE COURT: And what is this other arrangement that you referred to in '97 or '98 that allowed him to live in New York?

Is that here?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: No. That's not included in any of the

materials that I have, to my knowledge. We may have had a copy in relation to the civil cases that I had represented Mr. Konanykhine on, but if those files exist, they are probably with Mr. Maggio.

I know Alexander was living in the Watergate apartment complex back in '96 and '97.

He was then -- he wanted to go to New York to open up an Internet graphics production house, and he did so in -- he was living there definitely in 1999, and has lived there continuously since. So the language in the revocation of parole document today, dated December 19, 2003, where it says, You failed to request permission from your authorized residence to another state is strange considering that he's been living in New York for at least four years.

THE COURT: The time is late. Was it 5:30 that they were going to put him on a plane or 5:30 that he was to arrive?

MS. PEPPER: The plane was supposed to have departed at 5:30, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Then they might well be boarding at the moment.

MS. PEPPER: If so, it would be without the petitioner, given the strong phone calls that were made.

THE COURT: All right. I hope so. All right.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Your Honor, we ask that this matter, we maintain the status quo until a time when we can hear this in full, and hopefully I can bring Mr. Maggio and at least one of the

Arent Fox attorneys here.

THE COURT: Well, you are going to have to do it very quickly.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I think that that won't be a problem.

THE COURT: This matter is before the Court on an emergency basis, and it must be considered as a temporary restraining order. The Blackwelder and its progeny are the cases that guide the Court's analysis.

Before we even get to Blackwelder, the Court has to determine whether there is jurisdiction, and here the Court sees two bases for jurisdiction.

First, it would appear that the settlement agreement on which the petitioner relies is a settlement agreement that resolved a habeas petition0 that was pending in this court and that led to a dismissal order.

The Court did not retain jurisdiction, however, but I think it is fair to say that a claim of a breach of the agreement could be said to furnish a basis for jurisdiction, but more importantly is an alleged violation of his due process rights.

This petitioner has a right to file a petition for a stay of the Immigration Board's order. That could be mooted by his removal.

Now, Ms. Pepper correctly points out that it doesn't really moot it. She correctly points out that all of the issues of law remain active and that if the Court were to rule in

Konanykhine's favor, he could be returned. That's not very comforting, given the claim that Mr. Konanykhine makes about why and what may occur to him in Russia.

So, it is the Court's view that we then proceed to the Blackwelder analysis. The first step in the Blackwelder analysis is to assess whether there is immediate irreparable harm to the petitioner. Of that, there can be no doubt. His removal to Russia would unquestionably be irreparable and immediate, if it happens today.

The next step in the analysis is to consider whether there is harm to the respondent, and, if so, a balance of that harm. I don't see any significant or substantial harm to the Government in failing to carry out this order today. Even if there were some harm articulable, and I don't think there is, the balance of harms is decidedly in favor of the petitioner.

Now when the balance of harms is decidedly or decisively in favor of the petition, then in that event, the petitioner must, or need only show that there is a signficant issue to litigate and need not show a likelihood of success on the merits. And that, I think, is clearly shown here.

There is a dispute about whether there is a violation of the settlement agreement. I haven't been provided all copies of the settlement agreement. I don't know what the settlement agreement says about how disputes under it are to be resolved.

But that matter needs to be probed.

As far as due process is concerned, it seems just straightforward and fundamental that if a petitioner moves for a stay, an emergency stay, of the removal order, that that petitioner, that order -- I beg your pardon -- that Court should have an opportunity to have that order considered before it's rendered moot.

0 5

first paragraph, it says --

So I think there's a clear likelihood of success in that case, and certainly an issue to be litigated on the settlement agreement.

The public interest is not easy to discern here, except that people's rights ought to be vindicated, and that's in the public interest. And it seems to the Court that a stay maintaining the status quo, namely, Konanykhine's presence here in the United States, and it seems to me his wife's, too, although she is not even a named party to this, Mr. Szymkowicz. Why not?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: She is, Your Honor. If you read the

THE COURT: (Interposing) You just didn't put her in the caption?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: No, she wasn't a part --

THE COURT: (Interposing) You made her a third-party beneficiary of the order, of the settlement?

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: I suppose, if you want to use that term, yes.

THE COURT: You have a lot of thinking to do about this

case over the weekend, because I'm going to set it for hearing at 3:00 o'clock on Monday. Do we have another matter at 3:00 -- we have an arraignment at 2:00 -- at 3:00 o'clock on Monday. And you and Arent Fox and everybody else in the world better turn up, and we had better see what there is.

You can file anything you wish beforehand, and Ms.

Pepper, you can take this opportunity to become more involved.

But the stay is entered.

He is not to be removed from the United States until further order of this Court, and I expect to issue that. By Monday, perhaps the Fourth Circuit will have ruled.

I tell you if the Fourth Circuit denies a stay, I'm going to be -- I will listen to the parties' positions on why the settlement agreement is or is not violated, but it seems to me that that, in essence, might be the end of the matter.

I find it hard to believe that the full -- maybe Mr. Maggio remembers the full taste of this -- but what I am going to do is enter the stay now.

I'm going to direct that the Clerk of this Court, the
Deputy Clerk, while I'm entering this order, call the Clerk of the
Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and tell the Clerk of the
Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit that I have entered a
stay, or TRO, preventing the removal or deportation of these
people pending the hearing on Monday and pending the Fourth
Circuit's disposition of the emergency motion that has been filed

there. And the motion there is likely to be dispositive of this TRO.

0.5

What you have to do over this weekend is you have to be prepared to file early on Monday, reasonably early on Monday, amended papers that make clear the causes of action you allege, the bases for jurisdiction, and why you think you are entitled to whatever relief there is. And all this stuff about how many agreements are there and what the allegations are or the proof is relating to the violations of the parole agreement, all of that will need to be set out.

Ms. Pepper, I would suggest that you become fully familiar with this case and be able to tell me Monday afternoon, what was the big rush? What happened? What's going on here? This doesn't seem to me -- this fellow is not a member of al Qaeda or anything of that sort, at least so far as I am aware. But this seems passing strange that they would hustle him out of the country so quickly.

Now I know that that's what they tried to do in 1996 and '97 as well, and there was a sinister reason then, and I thought that had passed by now. I don't know what's going on, and you might be able to fill me in on -- maybe it isn't the least bit sinister, and to some extent I'm open to your telling me that it's none of this Court's business. It may well not be.

But here it is Friday afternoon. They are going to put him on an airplane to Russia, which is forever. And I have

memories -- I don't know whether you have been to Russia or not,

Ms. Pepper, but I was in what was then the Soviet Union for a

month and a few days in 1969. Returning him now could be forever.

I think it will take the folks there a few generations to change that society completely. The notion that he could somehow come back if the Fourth Circuit decided that the ALJ was right and the board was wrong is fantasy. He isn't going anywhere.

But I am perfectly open to understanding that the Government has a full right to deport him and to remove him. I think that's probably true, although I want to hear about this parole agreement, why they think it was violated, and maybe there isn't anything sinister; and I will be very interested in that.

But one way or the other, Mr. Szymkowicz, I want to dispose of this matter. I anticipate this temporary restraining order to last no more than Monday.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I don't see any reason why it should. I would expect the Fourth Circuit not to delay its consideration, or if it does, to enter the stay; and if it enters the stay, then this Court has no more interest or jurisdiction in the matter.

MR. SZYMKOWICZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Court stands in recess, and I thank counsel for your cooperation.

And I thank you, Ms. Pepper, for advising the Court

promptly, as I think you should have, as to what was happening. MS. PEPPER: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I think that was appropriate, and I expect you to do appropriate things, but I also appreciate it. Thank you, Your Honor. MS. PEPPER: THE COURT: As far as I'm concerned, nothing you have done is sinister. MS. PEPPER: Thank you. THE COURT: Court stands in recess. (Whereupon, at 5:22 o'clock p.m., the hearing in the above-captioned matter was concluded, and court stood in recess.)