

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
ELECTRONIC PRIVACY	)	
INFORMATION CENTER	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 14-0776 (BAH)
	)	
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

The parties respectfully file this status report pursuant to the Court’s June 9, 2014 Order, which granted a stay in this case until August 10, 2014, and directed parties to file this status report.

Plaintiff brings this case under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552, relating to records it had requested from Defendant through a FOIA request for documents pertaining to the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (“JLENS”). Compl. ¶ 2. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant did not timely respond to this request. Compl. ¶¶ 31-38.

To date, Defendant has not yet produced responsive documents; however, Defendant has located and is preparing for approximately 4700 responsive documents from two different responsible organizations across three separate offices. Many of these documents contain information that must be redacted to include documents with classified information. Accordingly, once redacted, the responsive documents located must undergo additional security reviews to protect against inadvertent disclosure of classified material. Additionally, the method

used to process these documents requires the documents to be printed, highlighted and redacted by hand then digitally rescanned into an electronic file. This process is a security measure to protect against redaction manipulation software. Moreover, approximately 4500 documents are required to be reviewed by the appropriate government contractors to protect propriety technical and cost data. Because of the unique method of processing and these additional levels of review, production of the documents has taken more time than originally estimated. However, significant progress has been made in the identification and processing of Plaintiff's FOIA request.

Defendant continues to prepare and review relevant documents to provide to Plaintiff in response to its Freedom of Information Act request. Defendant believes that full production can be accomplished in the next 60 days barring any unforeseen complications. Further, Defendant believes the intended production will narrow the matters requiring briefing and will allow any remaining issues to be resolved by dispositive motions, if necessary.

Defendant plans to move for an additional 60 day stay, which Plaintiff plans to oppose on the grounds that the agency has already had ten months to process Plaintiff's FOIA request. An additional 60 day stay is contrary to the deadlines and spirit of the FOIA, ”), 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). In Plaintiff's opposition, Plaintiff will present an alternative schedule.

Respectfully Submitted,

BY: \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
GINGER P. MCCALL, D.C. Bar #1001104  
JULIA HOWITZ, D.C. Bar # 422825  
Electronic Privacy Information  
Center  
1718 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
(202) 483-1140 (telephone)  
(202) 483-1248 (fax)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

RONALD C. MACHEN JR., D.C. Bar #447889  
United States Attorney  
for the District of Columbia

DANIEL F. VAN HORN, D.C. Bar #924092  
Chief, Civil Division

BY: \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
WAYNE H. WILLIAMS  
Special Assistant U.S. Attorney  
555 Fourth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
(202) 252-2574  
wayne.williams@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendant*