



**Pursuing terrorists in US civil courts:
the Encyclopedia of ATA cases**

Edited by Jeff Breinholt

MARCH 2024



Program on
Extremism

March 2024

**Pursuing terrorists in US civil courts:
the Encyclopedia of ATA cases**

Jeff Breinholt



All rights reserved. © 2024

Program on Extremism at the George Washington University

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, D.C. 20006

About the Editor

Jeff Breinholt is a Senior Research Fellow at the Program on Extremism. Jeff had a distinguished 34-year career at the Department of Justice, from which he retired in January 2024. A key player in the government's response to 9/11, Jeff helped revolutionize the use of FISA information in "material support" prosecutions as the leader of the Terrorist Financing Unit of DOJ's Counterterrorism Section. He also played a vital role in training and educating terrorism prosecutors and investigators over the last 20 years. He is a prolific author, particularly on terrorism history. In addition to PoE, Jeff is a Lecturer in Law at George Washington University Law School.

About the Program on Extremism

The Program on Extremism at The George Washington University provides analysis on issues related to violent and nonviolent extremism. The Program spearheads innovative and thoughtful academic inquiry, producing empirical work that strengthens extremism research as a distinct field of study. The Program aims to develop pragmatic policy solutions that resonate with policymakers, civic leaders, and the general public. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of The George Washington University.

A Note about 2333 (ATA) Encyclopedia

By Jeff Breinholt

Initially enacted in 1992, the Antiterrorism Act (ATA), 18 U.S.C. §2333, provides a legal remedy for American victims killed or injured by reason of international terrorism by creating a private cause of action, with treble damages and attorneys' fees. Since then, some 150 lawsuits have been brought under the statute against such terrorist organizations as Hamas, Hizballah, and FARC, as well as the banks and companies alleged to have assisted them. These lawsuits have generated some 600 opinions.

This monograph is an alphabetical list, or Encyclopedia, of lawsuits arising out of the ATA, 18 U.S.C. §2333.

Each case entry includes: (1) a summary of the facts/allegations; (2) the latest judicial opinion in the matter; (3) prior judicial rulings (with citations); and (4) a list of the main plaintiffs' attorneys.

The result is this resource volume. We hope you find it valuable.

Jeffrey A. Breinholt

Encyclopedia of ATA Lawsuits

18 U.S.C. § 2333

Edited by:
Jeff Breinholt

Abecassis v. Wyatt (S.D. Texas)

Facts: Survivors who had been injured and relatives of those who had been killed in 21 suicide bombings in Israel between 2000 and 2003 brought actions against companies and individuals involved in oil and gas business, alleging that defendants purchased oil from Saddam Hussein's Iraq and made payments that violated United Nations "Oil for Food" program, in violation of Alien Tort Statute (ATS). Alleged purchasers filed third-party complaint for contribution against 62 companies and individuals based on their purchase of oil from Iraq during relevant time period.

Latest Action: On October 29, 2014, Judge Miller denied one of the defendant's motions for permission to appeal. 2014 WL 5483724.

Previous: On March 12, 2014, defendants' motion for reconsideration was granted in part and denied in part. 7 F.Supp.3d 668. On February 12, 2014, 33 motions to dismiss filed by various third-party defendants were granted. 999 F.Supp.2d 962. On September 16, 2013, the court denied some of the defendants' motion for reconsideration. 2013 WL 5231543; On September 11, 2013, the court denied the defendants' motion for a more definite statement. 2013 WL 4875095. On September 30, 2012, the court denied the defendants' motion for summary judgment. 902 F.Supp.2d 881. On March 31, 2011, the court granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 785 F.Supp.2d 614. On June 30,

2010, motion for entry of judgment denied. 2010 WL 2671576. On March 31, 2010, motion to dismiss granted with leave to file amended complaint. 704 F.Supp.2d 623. On November 19, 2009, motion to transfer venue granted. 669 F.Supp.2d 130.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Michael J. Miller, David J. Dickens, The Miller Law Firm, Orange, VA, Bena Ochs, Gavriel Mairone, MM-Law LLC, Chicago, IL, Dale Jefferson, Raul Herman Suazo, Martin, Disiere, Jefferson & Wisdom, L.L.P., Houston, TX.

Ahmad v. Christian Friends of Israel Communities (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Plaintiffs, a group of thirteen U.S. and non-U.S. citizens who live in the West Bank sued based on defendants' financial support of Israeli citizens in the West Bank.

Latest Action: On April 15, 2015, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of case. 2015 WL 1811897.

Previous: On May 5, 2014, Judge Furman dismissed the complaint. 2014 WL 1796322.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Louis G. Adolfsen (Michael F. Panayotou, S. Dwight Stephens, Rania Shoukier, Melito & Adolfsen P.C., New York, NY.

Along v. Arab Bank (E.D.N.Y)

Facts: Multiple plaintiffs, United States and foreign nationals allegedly injured, or the survivors of those injured or killed, in

terrorist attacks in Israel, brought actions under, respectively, the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) and the Alien Tort Claims Act (ATS) against Jordanian bank alleged to have knowingly provided banking and other services that facilitated the actions of terrorist organizations.

Latest Action: On January 29, 2007, Judge Gershon denied the bank's motion to dismiss. 471 F.Supp.2d 257 (E.D.N.Y. 2007).

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Allan Gerson, Washington, DC, Donald Migliori, Motley Rice, LLC, Providence, RI, Jodi Westbrook Flowers, John M. Eubanks, Justin B. Kaplan, Michael E. Elsner, Ronald L. Motley, Motley Rice, Llc, Mount Pleasant, SC, Douglas James Pepe, Gregory P. Joseph, Peter Rolf Jerdee, Gregory P. Joseph Law Offices, Llc, New York, NY

Estate of Amergi ex rel. Amergi v. Palestinian Authority (S.D. Fl. 2010)

Facts: Estate of Israeli citizen, who was shot and killed as she drove her car in the Gaza Strip, among others, brought action against the Palestinian Authority (PA) and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) under the Alien Tort Statute and the Federal Terrorism Act.

Latest Action: On July 27, 2010, the 11th Circuit affirmed the prior Judge Seitz opinion granting judgment to the defendants. 611 F.3d 1350.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Robert J. Tolchin, Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Isaac M. Jaroslawicz, Jaroslawicz Law Offices, Miami, FL.

In re Arab Bank Tort Litigation (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: United States and foreign nationals, who were injured or captured by terrorists overseas, or family members and estate representative of those who were injured, captured, or killed, brought actions against bank which allegedly financed and facilitated activities of organizations that committed attacks that took place in Israel, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, alleging violations of Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), the Alien Tort Statute (ATS), and federal common law This case consolidated several lawsuits against Arab Bank: Almog (see above), Lev (see below) Linde, (see below) Afriat-Kurtzer, Jesner, and Agurenko.

Latest Action: On December 17, 2015, the 2nd Circuit affirmed the dismissal of the non-American plaintiffs' case filed under the ATCA, 28 U.S.C. § 1350. 2015 WL 8122895.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Michael E. Elsner (John M. Eubanks, on the brief), Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, Mark Werbner and Joel Israel, Sayles Werbner, PC, Dallas, TX

Asemani v. Government of Islamic Republic of Iran (E.D.Va.)

Facts: Iranian inmate brought action under Antiterrorism Act against Iranian government.

Latest Action: On November 6, 2008, the 4th Circuit affirmed Judge Hilton's dismissal of the complaint. 2008 WL 4820245.

Previous: On May 8, 2008, the 4th Circuit affirmed dismissal (plaintiff was not a U.S. citizen). 2008 WL 1960867. On August 2, 2006, the 4th Circuit affirmed dismissal. 2006 WL 2226574.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro Se

Awan v. Awan (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Aamir Awan commenced this action pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2333 against his estranged wife, Paras Awan, also known as Paras Baloch alleging that she has committed an act of international terrorism

Latest Action: On March 26, 2010, Judge Seybert dismissed the complaint as frivolous. 2010 WL 1265820.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro Se

Bell v. District Courts of Tacoma and Seattle (D. Ore.)

Facts: Plaintiffs filed a 195-page Amended Complaint against some 74 Defendants. The Amended Complaint alleged a vast conspiracy among governmental agencies and officers and private individuals aimed at violating plaintiffs' rights under numerous federal and state laws.

Latest Action: On September 24, 2004, Judge Brown dismissed the amended complaint. 2004 WL 2203274

Previous: On March 29, 2004, Judge Brown granted the State of Washington's motion to dismiss complaint. 2004 WL 3065756

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro Se

Biton v. Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Families of individuals killed in a bus bombing in the Gaza Strip sued the Palestinian Authority.

Latest Action: On July 21, 2008. Judge Collyer denied the defendant request for leave to vacate the default judgments. 252 F.R.D. 1

Previous: On September 26, 2007, Judge Collyer affirmed the default judgment. 510 F.Supp.2d 144. On September 29, 2006, the court granted/denied plaintiffs' motion for damages hearing. 239 F.R.D. 1. On August 22, 2005, the court denied defendant's motion to reconsider denial of dismissal motion. 412 F.Supp.2d 1. On March 18, 2004, the court granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 310 F.Supp.2d 172

Plaintiffs Lawyers: David J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI

Boim v. Quranic Literary Institute (N.D. Ill)

Facts: On May 13, 1996, David Boim, a seventeen-year-old American citizen living in Israel, was killed in a Hamas terrorist attack in the West Bank. His parents, Joyce and Stanley Boim, sued under the Antiterrorism Act of 1990, 18 U.S.C.2333, which creates a cause of action for United States nationals who are injured in their person, property, or business by reason of an act of international terrorism; the Act allows injured persons (or their estates, survivors or heirs) to recover threefold the damages sustained, as well as costs of suit, including attorney's fees. They named as defendants two men who were directly involved in the murder, Amjad Hinawi and Khalil Tawfiq Al-Sharif; they also named several U.S.-based individuals and organizations they claim helped to support Hamas—namely, Mousa Abu Marzook, who the Boims alleged served for many years as the leader of Hamas' political wing in the United States; Mohammed Salah, who they alleged served as the United States- based leader of Hamas' military branch; the United Association for Studies and Research, which they alleged served as Hamas' political command center in the United States; and the Quranic Literacy Institute, the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development, the Islamic Association for Palestine, the American Muslim Society, and the American Middle Eastern League for Palestine, which they alleged raised and laundered money for Hamas and finance Hamas' terrorist activities

Latest Action: On October 27, 2010, Magistrate Keys issued a ruling on attorney fees. 2010 WL 4504876

Previous: On December 3, 2008, the 7th Circuit en banc affirmed in part and reversed and remanded in part the 7th Circuit vacating of the reward for the plaintiffs. 549 F.3d 685. On February 18, 2005, Magistrate Keys denied several defendants' motion for new trial. 2005 WL 433463. On December 14, 2004, Magistrate Keys ordered damages for the plaintiffs. 2004 WL 2931337. On November 4, 2004, Magistrate Keys granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. 340 F.Supp.2d 885. On September 9, 2003, Magistrate Keys denied plaintiffs' motion for default judgment against Hinawi. 2003 WL 22089388. On April 24, 2003, Magistrate Keys issued ruling on attorney fees. 2003 WL 1956132. On June 5, 2002, the 7th Circuit affirmed the district court denial of the motion to dismiss. denied defendants' motions to dismiss. On January 10, 2001, Judge Lindberg denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. 127 F.Supp.2d 1002

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Nathan Lewin, Alyza D. Lewin, Lewin & Lewin, LLP, Washington, DC, David Max Oppenheim, Anderson & Wanca, Rolling Meadows, IL, Matthew Mark Garrett, Stephen J. Landes, Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon, LLP, Sally H. Saltzberg, Loftus & Saltzberg, P.C., Chicago, IL, Richard M. Hoffman, Cohen, Salk & Huvad, P.C., Northbrook, IL.

Burnett v. Al Baraka Inv. and Development. Corp. (D.D.C.)

Facts: Family members and representatives of victims of September 11 terrorist attacks brought action under federal and state law to hold accountable the persons and entities that funded and supported the international terrorist organization as al Qaeda which carried out the attacks

Latest Action: On July 3, 2003, Judge Robertson denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. 274 F.Supp.2d 86.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: George R. Blakey, Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, IN, Harry Huge, Washington, DC, Edward D. Robertson, Mary Doerhoff Winter, Bartimus, Frickleton, Robertson & Obetz, Jefferson City, MO.

In Re Chiquita Brands International Inc. (S.D. Fla.)

Facts: Plaintiffs are United States citizens and the estates, survivors, and heirs of deceased United States citizens who allegedly were kidnaped, held hostage, and murdered by the Colombian terrorist organization known as Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia ("ARC". Plaintiffs brought this action against defendant, Chiquita Brands International, Inc, alleging that defendant is civilly liable to the plaintiffs for damages, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2332 because it (1) aided and abetted the homicide and serious bodily injury of American Nationals located outside the

United States in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2332 and 2333 (Count I); (2) conspired to violate 18 U.S.C. § 2332 in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2333 (Count II); provided material support or resources to terrorists in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339A3 and in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) (Count III).

Latest Action: On January 6, 2015, Judge Marra granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion to reconsider denial of motion to dismiss. 2015 WL 71562.

Previous: On March 27, 2012, Judge Marra denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 2012 WL 1021819. On June 3, 2011, Judge Marra granted/denied motion to dismiss. 792 F.Supp.2d 1301. On February 4, 2010, Judge Marra granted/denied motion to dismiss. 690 F.Supp.2d 1296

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Ellyn F. Essig, Gary M. Osen, Joshua D. Glatter, Osen LLC, Orandell, NJ, Gregory Paul Hansel, Jeffrey T. Edwards, Preti Flaherty Beliveau & Pachios LLP, Portland, ME, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Kohn Swift & Graf PC, Philadelphia, PA, Ramon Alvaro Rasco, Robert C. Josefsberg, Podhurst Orseck Josefsberg et al, Miami, FL, Beth J. Kushner, Von Briesen & Roper SC, Milwaukee, WI, John Scarola, Searcy Denney Scarola Barnhart & Shipley, West Palm Beach, FL, Peter Raven– Hansen, Osen LLC, Orandell, NJ, Sigrid

Stone McCawley, Boies Schiller & Flexner, Fort Lauderdale, FL

Doe v. Ejercito Liberacion Nacional (S.D. Fla.)

Facts: John Doe, a Venezuelan citizen and resident alien of the United States, sued for a total of \$36.8 million against Defendants, Ejercito De Liberación Nacional (ELN) and Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarios de Colombia (FARC)— both guerilla organizations operating in the Republic of Colombia—for injuries arising out of his kidnapping and torture by defendants between 1997 and 1998.

Latest Action: On June 17, 2013, Judge Huck denied intervenors motion to join lawsuit. (This motion was filed by eight American citizens victims who also hold a default judgment - totaling \$318.03 million = against FARC under the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333.

Previous: On January 5, 2012, Judge Huck entered a final default judgment in favor of plaintiff. 2013 WL 8170186. On August 12, 2012, similar motion was denied. 2012 WL 10713165.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: John Thornton, Orlando Do Campo, Do Campo & Thornton, P.A., Seth Eric Miles, Grossman Roth, P.A., Miami, FL

Doe v. Bin Laden (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Husband, individually and on behalf of estate of his wife, who perished in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, brought action against nation of

Afghanistan, asserting claims of assault and battery, false imprisonment, intentional infliction of emotional distress, conspiracy, wrongful death and violation of the Anti-Terrorism Act.

Latest Action: On November 7, 2011, the court held that noncommercial tort exception under Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) could be a basis for a suit arising from terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, and affirmed denial of motion to dismiss (from D.D.C.). See 580 F.Supp.2d 93,

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Paul J. Orfanedes, Judicial Watch, Inc., Washington, D.C

Doe I v. State of Israel (D.D.C.)

Facts: Palestinian current and former residents of West Bank sued State of Israel, Israeli government entities, Israeli officials, and United States congregation that allegedly raised funds for Israeli settlers, asserting causes of action under, inter alia, Alien Tort Claims Act (ATCA) and Racketeering Influenced Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO).

Latest Action: On November 10, 2005, Judge Bates granted the defendants' motion to dismiss. 400 F.Supp.2d 86. Plaintiff asked to amend his complaint so as to include a claim under the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, which is the statute at issue in Boim. The court denied that request because Boim demonstrates that any claim under § 2333 would ultimately fail; hence, any amendment would be futile.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Maher H. Hanania, Hanania & Khader, Falls Church, VA..

Dogan v. Barak (C.D. Cal.)

Facts: A U.S. national killed in a 2010 Israeli military operation targeting Turkey sued the Israeli Defense Minister.

Latest Action: On October 13, 2016, Judge Otis D. Wright granted the Israeli motion to dismiss without leave to amend. 2016 WL 5947236, 2016 WL 6024416.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Dan Stormer, Brian D. Olney, Mary Tanagho Ross, Cindy Panuco, Hadsell Stormer and Renick LLP, Pasadena, CA, Geoffrey Nice, Sir Geoffrey Nice QC, Haydee J. Dijkstal, C.O. Stoke and White LLP, London, UK.

Fields v. Twitter (N.D. Cal.)

Facts: family members of deceased government contractors who were shot and killed by a Jordanian police officer, responsibility for which was claimed by a terrorist organization (ISIS), brought action against social network company, alleging that company provided material support to terrorist organization in violation of the ATA by permitting members to sign up for accounts.

Latest Action: On November 18, 2016, Judge Orrick granted the defendant's motion to dismiss, finding claims based on providing accounts were precluded by Communications Decency Act (CDA), and claims based on allowing

private messages were precluded by CDA. 2016 WL 6822065.

Previous: On August 16, 2016, Judge Orrick granted the motion to dismiss, finding ATA claim impermissibly sought to treat company as publisher or speaker of content created by terrorist organization; family members failed to allege facts that would support plausible inference of proximate causation; and terrorist organization's sending of private direct messages through company's social network platform did not remove transmission of such messages from scope of publishing activity protected by the Good Samaritan blocking and screening of offensive material provision of the Communications Decency Act. 2016 WL 4205687.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Joshua David Arisohn, Scott A. Bursor, Bursor Fisher, P.A., New York, NY, Lawrence Timothy Fisher, Bursor & Fisher, P.A., Walnut Creek, CA.

Gallop v. Cheney (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Citizen filed Bivens action against former senior U.S. government officials, alleging that they had caused September 11, 2001 attacks against United States in violation of Antiterrorism Act and in violation of her rights under First, Fourth, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments

Latest Action: On February 2, 2012, the 2nd Circuit imposed sanctions on the plaintiff for the frivolous lawsuit.

Previous: On April 11, 2007, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of the lawsuit. 642 F.3d 364. On March 15, 2010, Judge Chin dismissed the case with prejudice.

Plaintiffs **Lawyers:** Dennis Cunningham, Esq., Brooklyn, NY, William W. Veale, Esq., Walnut Creek, CA, Mustapha Ndanusa, Esq., Brooklyn, NY

George v. Islamic Republic of Iran (N.D.Ill.)

Facts: State prisoners brought action against various Middle Eastern nations, terrorist groups, and banks and relief organizations suspected of funneling funds to terrorist groups, seeking millions of dollars in compensatory and punitive damages

Latest Action: On April 16, 2003, the 7th Circuit affirmed the dismissal of the case. 2003 WL 1919345.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se

Gill v. Arab Bank PLC (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: American victim, who was injured by a gunshot fired from Gaza by a shooter allegedly affiliated with or supported by foreign terrorist organization (FTO), brought action under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) against foreign bank, which allegedly conspired with and provided material support to FTO.

Latest Action: On November 6, 2012, Judge Weinstein granted the bank's

motion for summary judgment. 893 F.Supp.2d 542

Previous: On October 19, 2012, Judge Weinstein issued a ruling on a motion in limine regarding expert and lay testimony. 893 F.Supp.2d 523. On October 17, 2012, Judge Weinstein granted/denied motion to dismiss. 893 F.Supp.2d 474. On September 12, 2012, Judge Weinstein granted/denied a motion to dismiss. 891 F.Supp.2d 335

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Peter Raven– Hansen George Washington University Law School, Washington, DC, Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Joshua D. Glatter, Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ.

Gilmore v. Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Family members and the estate of decedent, a United States national who was killed in a shooting attack in East Jerusalem in 2000, brought action against the Palestinian Interim Self- Government Authority (PA), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and 11 of their current and former employees pursuant to the Anti- Terrorism Act of 1991 (ATA) and related common law theories

Latest Action: On December 13, 2016, the DC Circuit affirmed the dismissal, finding defendants waived their defense of lack of personal jurisdiction; district court did not abuse its discretion in finding “good cause” to vacate

defendants' defaults; extraordinary circumstances warranted district court's in camera consideration of defendants' ten-page ex parte explanatory memorandum in determining whether to compel production of intelligence materials; district court's determination that burden of compelling production of intelligence material outweighed likely benefit was not abuse of discretion; pages from Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs website did not constitute admissible evidence to support plaintiffs' theory that alleged gunman killed decedent; PA intelligence officer's statements to book author were not admissible as vicarious party admissions; and custodial statement of member of armed PLO faction was not admissible as a statement against penal interest. 2016 WL 7210140.

Previous: On July 28, 2014, Judge Kessler granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment. 53 F.Supp.3d 191. On March 7, 2006, Judge Kessler granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion to dismiss.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: David J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI

In re Subpoena of Goldberg (D.D.C.)

Facts: Plaintiff brought action under Antiterrorism Act (ATA) against Palestinian Authority (PA), seeking to recover damages for injuries sustained

during PA attack in Israel. This is the Saperstein case (see below).

Latest Action: On March 15, 2010, Magistrate Faciola denied PA-based journalist motion to quash subpoena. 693 F.Supp.2d 81

Goldberg v. UBS AG (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Widow and children of Canadian citizen and Israeli resident killed in terrorist attack on Jerusalem bus brought action against international financial institution, under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), seeking to impose liability on institution for its alleged role in facilitating transfer of funds to terrorist group allegedly responsible for bombing

Latest Action: On March 5, 2010, Judge Trager denied bank's motion to dismiss. 690 F.Supp.2d 92

Previous: On September 24, 2009, Judge Sifton granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 660 F.Supp.2d 410

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Aaron Schlanger, Gary M. Osen, Joshua D. Glatter, Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Kohn Swift & Graf P.C., Philadelphia, PA

Hayes v. Burns (M.D. Tenn.)

Facts: Lawsuit over mishandled mortgage, which alleged § 2333 cause of action.

Latest Action: August 22, 2007, action dismissed. 2013 WL 4501464

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se

Hogan v. U.S. (D.D.C. 2010)

Facts: Plaintiff is a prisoner at the Georgia State Prison in Reidsville, Georgia. He sued President Barack Obama, former Presidents George W. Bush, William Jefferson Clinton and George H.W. Bush, and several United States agencies under 18 U.S.C. § 2333 for allegedly committing terrorist acts against him.

Latest Action: On June 29, 2010, action dismissed. 2010 WL 2612612

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se

U.S. v. Holy Land Foundation (N.D. Texas)

Facts: After government obtained preliminary criminal forfeiture of assets of designated terrorist organization, victims of terrorist attack, who had obtained writ of garnishment, filed third-party ancillary petition asserting their superior interest in organization's restrained assets. This is part of Rubin and Ungar cases. See below

Latest Action: On June 25, 2013, the 5th Circuit reversed the granting of the government's motion to amend. 722 F.3d 677

Previous: on August 19, 2011, Judge Solis denied the government motion to dismiss. 2011 WL 3703333. On July 18, 2007, the 5th Circuit en banc dismissed the appeal. 493 F.3d 469. On April 4, 2006, the 5th Circuit denied the motion for

summary disposition, vacated the restraining order vacated, and remanded the matter with directions. 445 F.3d 771

Plaintiffs Lawyers: David J. Strachman, Esq., McIntire, Tate & Lynch, L.L.P., Providence, RI 02903-0000, David J. Strachman, Esq., Stephen J. Landes, Matthew Mark Garrett, Jennifer S. Geyer, Edwards, Wildman & Palmer, L.L.P., Chicago, IL, Nathan D. Lewin, Lewin & Lewin, Washington, DC, for Amicus Curiae Stanley Boim and Joyce Boim. Richard Brian Rosenthal, Miami, FL, for Amicus Curiae Victims of F.A.R.C. Narco-Terrorism in Colombia, Keith Stansell, Marc Gonsalves, Thomas Howes, Judith G. Janis, Christopher T. Janis, Greer C. Janis, Michael J. Janis and Jonathan N. Janis.

Hurst v. Socialist People's Arab Jamahiriya (D.D.C. 2007)

Facts: Representatives of victims of aircraft terrorism sued Libya and Libyan director of airline security, seeking compensation for representatives' injuries

Latest Action: On February 7, 2007, Judge Kennedy granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion to dismiss. 474 F.Supp.2d 19

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Mark S. Zaid, Krieger & Zaid, PLLC, Washington, DC, Jonathan S. Abady, Richard D. Emery, Sarah Netburn, Emery Celli Brinckerhoff & Abady LLP, New York City

Kaplan v. Central Bank of Islamic Republic of Iran (D.D.C.)

Facts: American nationals who were victims of Hezbollah terrorist organization's rocket attacks in Israel during specified period brought civil action for damages under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) against, inter alia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea) and the Islamic Republic of Iran

Latest Action: On September 30, 2016, Judge Lamberth held Canadian citizen who owned art gallery lacked standing to assert claims under FSIA; victim who was distressed over state of her apartment following attacks rather than traumatized out of concern for personal safety or safety of children was entitled to receive \$850,000 in compensatory damages for pain and suffering rather than \$1.5 million; victim who suffered miscarriage was entitled to receive \$2.5 million in compensatory damages for pain and suffering rather than \$1.5 million; family members who were potentially entitled to recover damages for their own pain and suffering were entitled to award of damages for solatium; child was not entitled to solatium damages in absence of testimony demonstrating that child suffered any anguish over hardships endured by parents; and victim failed to support claim for economic damages due to rocket attack. 2016 WL 5714754

Previous: On July 23, 2014, Judge Lamberth entered default judgment

against defendants. 55 F.Supp.3d 189. On August 20, 2013, Judge Lambert granted bank defendants' motion to dismiss. 2011 WL 2314783

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY.

Kaplan v. Al Jazeera (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Plaintiffs are a group of United States, Canadian, and Israeli citizens who were injured in a series of rocket and missile attacks carried out in Israel by the Hezbollah organization between July 12, 2006 and August 14, 2006. Defendant is a television network incorporated in Qatar, which conducts business in the United States.

Latest Action: On June 11, 2011, Judge Wood dismissed the complaint without prejudice. 2011 WL 2314783

Plaintiffs Lawyers: The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Robert J. Tolchin, Esq, Nitsana Darshan-Leitner & Co., Nitsana Darshan-Leitner, Adv., Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C., Richard D. Heideman, Esq., Noel J. Nudelman, Esq., Tracy Reichman Kalik, Esq., Ester Lelchook Michal Lelchook, Yael Lelchook, Alexander Lelchook and Doris Lelchook.

Klayman v. Obama (D.D.C.)

Facts: Individuals allegedly subjected to attempted murder and assault by foreign terrorist group brought action against terrorist group, the President of the

United States, the current and former Secretaries of State, and others, alleging violations of Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), the Anti-Terrorism Act, the Constitution, and common law.

Last Action: On August 21, 2015, Judge Chutkan granted defendants' motion to dismiss. 2015 WL 5005009

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Larry E. Klayman, Law Offices of Larry Klayman, Washington, DC

Klieman v. Palestinian Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Estate, survivors, and heirs of American citizen killed in terrorist attack on public bus in Israel brought action under the Antiterrorism Act of 1991 (ATA) and various tort theories, against the Palestinian Interim Self-Government Authority (PA), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), several terrorist organizations, and various individuals.

Last Action: On December 29, 2006, Judge Friedman found service of process on researcher in PLO offices in Washington, D.C. was ineffective to establish personal jurisdiction over the defendants. 467 F.Supp.2d 107.

Previous: On March 30, 2006, Judge Friedman granted in part and denied in part the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. 424 F.Supp.2d 153

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Noel Jason Nudelman, Richard D. Heideman, Tracy

Reichman Kalik, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C., Steven R. Perles, Perles Law Firm, P.C., Washington, DC

Klinghoffer v. Achille Lauro (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Suits were brought against the Palestine Liberation Organization arising from the seizure of an Italian passenger liner and the killing of a passenger thereon

Last Action: On June 21, 1991, the 2nd Circuit vacated and remanded, with instructions to determine whether personal jurisdiction could be asserted over the PLO with respect to some or all of the complaints at issue here, and, if so, whether service of process on the PLO's Permanent Observer to the UN was sufficient.

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Jay D. Fischer, New York City, Stephen Obus, Juliet M. Sarkessian, Proskauer, Rose, Goetz & Mendelsohn), Arbitter and Hodes. Rodney E. Gould, Framingham, Mass. (Rubin, Hay & Gould, of counsel), Daniel J. Dougherty, New York City (Todd L. Platek, Kirlin, Campbell & Keating, Arthur M. Luxemburg, Law Office of Perry Weitz, New York City, Chasser, Meskin, Schneider, Sherman and Weltman. William Larson, Jr., Newman, Schlau, Fitch & Burns, New York City

Knox v. Palestinian Liberation Organization (S.D.N.Y. 2008)

Facts: Survivors and heirs of deceased terrorism victim, allegedly shot while performing in banquet hall in Israel by member or agent of Palestinian terrorist organization, brought suit against, inter alia, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Palestinian Authority (PA) under Antiterrorism Act (ATA).

Last Action: On March 26, 2008, Judge Marrero granted defendants' motion for relief from judgment. 248 F.R.D. 420.

Previous: on July 11, 2006, Judge Marrero awarded damages to the plaintiffs. 442 F.Supp.2d 62. On September 7, 2005, Judge Marrero entered a default judgment against defendants. 230 F.R.D. 383. On March 21, 2005, Magistrate Katz issued a recommended ruling. 2005 WL 712005. On March 1, 2004, Judge Marrero denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. 306 F.Supp.2d 424

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: David J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, L.L.P., Providence, RI,

Lawton v. Republic of Iraq (D.D.C.)

Facts: Survivors and other victims of Oklahoma City bombing brought action against Republic of Iraq, alleging material support of individuals who carried out bombing

Last Action: On October 8, 2008, Judge Walton granted motion to dismiss. 581 F.Supp.2d 43

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Paul J. Orfanedes, Judicial Watch, Inc., Washington, DC, John Michael Johnston, Oklahoma City, OK.

Lelchook v. Commerzbank AG (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: This is a complaint for damages arising out of the conduct of defendant Commerzbank AG. Defendant is a financial institution incorporated and headquartered in Germany that knowingly provided financial services and collects and transmits money for the benefit of Hizbullah a.k.a. Hizballah, Hezbollah, a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) (as that term is defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1189 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), and thereby substantially assisted in the commission of acts of international terrorism, as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 2331. By its actions, the defendant aided and abetted the commission of acts of international terrorism that murdered David Martin Lelchook, the decedent and injured each and all of the plaintiffs, violated the criminal prohibitions on providing material support for acts of international terrorism as set forth in the Antiterrorism Act (ATA) as amended by the AEDPA (see e.g., 18 U.S.C. §§ 2339B and 2339C), and is civilly liable under §2333(a) of the ATA to each of the plaintiffs who have been injured in their person and property and have suffered damages by reason of acts of international terrorism perpetrated by Hizballah.

Last Action: One of the banks moved to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. On December 20, 2016, rather than grant the motion, Judge Saris ordered the case transferred from the District of Massachusetts to the Eastern District of New York. 2016 WL 7381686.

Previous: On August 2, 2011, Judge Hellterstein denied the motion to dismiss. 2011 WL 4087448.

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Heidman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C.

Leibovich v. Islamic Republic of Iran (N.D. Ill.)

Facts: Foreign national family of United States citizen child brought suit in federal district court against the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Iranian Ministry of Information and Security under the ATA and FSIA for providing material support and resources to the organization that carried out terrorist attack along a highway in Israel which seriously injured child, along with killing another child and physically and emotionally injuring other passengers in vehicle. A default judgment was entered in favor of family members.

Latest Action: In an effort to collect on their judgment, family members served worldwide discovery requests and citations on foreign banks with branches in the United States to discover assets. The banks moved to quash citations and subpoenas, and family members moved to compel responses to discovery

requests. On May 19, 2016, Judge Castillo granted the banks' motions to quash granted, and denied the family members' motions to compel.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Daniel A. Shmikler, Robert David Cheifetz, Sperling & Slater, P.C., Chicago, IL, David J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI).

Lev v. Arab Bank (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Plaintiffs Yaffa Lev, et al., have brought an action under the Alien Tort Claims Act (AT), 28 U.S.C. § 1350 (2010), alleging that defendant Arab Bank, PLC has, through the provision of financial and administrative services to Hamas and other terrorist groups, knowingly and intentionally aided and abetted attacks on civilians in Israel by those groups, in violation of international law

Last Action: On January 29, 2010, Judge Gershon denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. 2010 WL 623636

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Donald Migliori, Jodi Westbrook Flowers, John M. Eubanks, Michael E. Elsner, Ronald L. Motley, Motley Rice, LLC, Mount Pleasant, SC,

Licci ex rel. Liccir v. Lebanese Canadian Bank SAL (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Israeli residents who were injured or whose family members were killed in series of terrorist rocket attacks on civilians in Israel brought action under the

Anti-Terrorism Act, Alien Tort Statute, and Israeli tort law against Lebanese bank, which allegedly facilitated terrorist organization's acts by using correspondent banking account at New York bank to effectuate wire transfers on behalf of terrorist organization totaling several million dollars

Last Action: On October 18, 2013, the 2nd Circuit reversed the motion to dismiss granted in favor of defendants. 732 F.3d 161.

Previous: On March 4, 2012, the 2nd Circuit certified to New York high court question of whether foreign bank's maintenance of correspondent bank account at financial institution in New York, and use of that account to effect dozens of wire transfers on behalf of foreign client, constituted "transaction of business" in New York upon which personal jurisdiction could be based under New York long-arm statute. 673 F.3d 50. On March 31, 2010, Judge Daniels granted bank's motion to dismiss. 704 F.Supp.2d 403

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Robert Joseph Tolchin, Robert J. Tolchin, Esq., David Jaroslawicz, Jaroslawicz & Jaros, LLC, New York, NY

Linde v. Arab Bank PLC (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: American citizens who were victims or relatives of victims of 24 terrorist attacks committed in Israel and the Palestinian Territories sued under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) a Jordanian

bank which alleged to have provided financial services to the terrorist organization that carried out the attacks and its allies.

Last Action: On May 24, 2016, Judge Cogan issued opinion involving plaintiffs efforts to enforce of the judgment. 2016 WL 6095850, 2016 WL 6094184.

Previous: On April 8, 2015, Judge Cogan denied granted bank's motion for post-trial relief. 97 F.Supp.3d 287. On June 20, 2013, Judge Gershon held that Congress, in specifying that amendments to the statute of limitations in the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) would apply to any civil action under the ATA that was "pending on, or commenced on or after" the date that amendments were enacted, expressly manifested its intent that amended ten-year limitations period would be applied retroactively to pending claims. 950 F.Supp.2d 459. On June 18, 2013, the 2nd Circuit denied the bank's motion for writ of mandamus. 706 F.3d

92. On September 2, 2005, Judge Gershon granted/denied bank's motion to dismiss. 384 F.Supp.2d 571. On November 29, 2004, Judge Gershon denied plaintiff's motion for injunction, holding that bank's failure to comply with reporting requirements did not give rise to criminal liability. 353 F.Supp.2d 327

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Mark S. Werbner, Sayles Werbner, Dallas, TX, Peter A. Binkow, Law Offices of Lionel Z. Glancy, Neal Dublinsky, Glancy Binkow & Goldberg LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Steven M. Steingard, Kohn, Swift & Graf, PC,

Philadelphia, PA, Aaron Schlanger, Naomi B. Weinberg, Joshua D. Glatter, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Aitan David Goelman, Peter R. Kolker, Semra Aylin Mesulam, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, Washington, DC, Clyde T. Turner, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, James P. Bonner, Stone Bonner & Rocco LLP, Andrew David Friedman, Wechsler, Harwood, Halebian & Feffer, L.L.P., New York, NY,

Litle v. Arab Bank (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Victims, or estates, heirs, or survivors of victims, of terrorist attacks in Israel, brought under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) or the Alien Tort Claims Act (ATS) and alleging that Jordanian bank knowingly provided banking and administrative services that facilitated the actions of the terrorist organizations, Bank brought third-party complaints against several other banks.

Last Action: On April 3, 2009, Judge Gershon dismissed third-party complaints. 611 F.Supp.2d 233

Previous: On September 7, 2007, Judge Gershon granted in part and denied in part bank's motion to dismiss. 507 F.Supp.2d 267

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Lee S. Shalov, James P. Bonner, Shalov Stone & Bonner LLP, New York, NY, Mark S. Werbner, Sayles Werbner, Dallas, TX, Richard D. Heideman, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik PC, Washington, DC.

Livnat v. Palestinian Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Family members of victim, who was killed in machine-gun attack in West Bank brought action against Palestinian Authority, alleging that Palestinian Authority security personnel carried out attack, and asserting claims under, inter alia, civil liability provision of Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Last Action: On February 11, 2015, Judge Kollar-Kotelly granted motion to dismiss. 82 F.Supp.3d 19

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Andrew David Levy, Jessica Paulie Weber, Joseph B. Espo, Brown, Goldstein & Levy LLP, Baltimore, MD.

Lloyd's London v. Great Socialist Peoples Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah (D.D.C.)

Facts: Insurance underwriters brought two actions under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) against, inter alia, the government of Libya, its security services, and various individuals, alleging common law conversion and trespass, and aircraft piracy, arising out of the hijacking of an Egyptian airliner by terrorists

Last Action: On January 6, 2010, Judge Kessler granted dismissal. 677 F.Supp.2d 270

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Richard D. Heideman, Tracy Reichman Kalik, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C.,

Steven R. Perles, Perles Law Firm, P.C.,
Washington, DC

Mohamed v. Palestinian Authority (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Widow and sons of a United States citizen allegedly tortured and killed in Israel brought suit against three individuals, the Palestinian Authority (PA), and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), alleging violations of the Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA), the Alien Tort Statute (ATS), and federal common law.

Latest Action: On April 18, 2012, the Supreme Court affirmed the dismissal. 132 S.Ct. 1702.

Previous: On September 29, 2008, Judge Preska dismissed the action. 2008 WL 4444572

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Jeffrey L. Fisher, Counsel of Record, Pamela S. Karlan, Jenny S. Martinez, Stanford Law School Supreme Court Litigation Clinic, Stanford, CA, Nathaniel A. Tarnor, Tarnor, PLLC, Washington, DC, Robert J. Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Thomas C. Goldstein, Kevin K. Russell, Goldstein & Russell, P.C., Washington, DC,

Morgan v. FARC (N.D. Texas)

Facts: Federal prisoner filed putative class action against terrorist organizations alleging violation of Antiterrorism Act for engaging in narco-terrorism against the United States and

its citizens seeking three trillion dollars on behalf of victims

Latest Action: On August 15, 2012, the 5th Circuit affirmed the dismissal of the action. 2012 WL 3493464

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Pro se

Morris v. Kadr (D. Utah)

Facts: Army soldier who had been wounded in Afghanistan, and survivors of Army soldier who had been killed in same attack, sued al Qaeda member under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Latest Action: On February 16, 2006, Judge Cassell granted plaintiff's default judgment. 415 F.Supp.2d 1323

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Richard D. Burbidge, Edwin W. Christensen, Donald J. Winder, Salt Lake City, UT,

Parsons v. Palestinian Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Estate and survivors of American citizen killed in terrorist bombing in Gaza brought action under Antiterrorism Act (ATA) alleging that Palestinian Authority (PA) and Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) provided material support to militant organization alleged to have carried out attack.

Latest Action: On July 3, 2013, Judge Rothstein denied the defendant's motion for summary judgment. 952 F.Supp.2d 61

Previous: On August 5, 2011, the D.C. Circuit affirmed, reversed, and remanded the summary judgment previously granted defendants. 651 F.3d 118. On May 29, 2010, Judge Robertson granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion for summary judgment. 715 F.Supp.2d 27

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Richard D. Heideman, Noel Jason Nudelman, Steven R. Perles, Tracy Reichman Kalik, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C., Washington, DC.

Price v. Socialist Arab Libyan Jamahiryah (D.D.C.)

Facts: Two American citizens brought suit against Libya for alleged torture and hostage taking

Latest Action: On November 23, 2004, the D.C. Circuit affirmed the dismissal on sovereign immunity grounds. 389 F.3d 192

Previous: On June 28, 2002, the D.C. Circuit reversed in part the dismissal, and remanded. 294 F.3d 82

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Stuart H. Newberger, Clifton S. Elgarten, Michael L. Martinez, and F. Ryan Keith. Laurel P. Malson.

Pugh v. Socialist Arab Libyan Jamahiryah (D.D.C.)

Facts: On September 19, 1989, Union des Transports Aeriens Flight 772 exploded in mid-air over Niger, Africa,

killing all 170 people on board. The personal representatives and family members of the seven American victims and the corporate owner-lessor of the exploded airplane brought an action against the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Libyan External Security Organization, Muammar Qadhafi in his official capacity as Libya's Head of State, and six other high-ranking Libyan government officials in their personal capacities. Plaintiffs sought to hold defendants liable, pursuant to the state-sponsored terrorism exception of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1605(a)(7), for violating, inter alia, the Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA), 28 U.S.C. § 1350 note, the so-called Flatow Amendment, 28 U.S.C. § 1605 note, and 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a). Plaintiffs also assert various state and federal common law causes of action

Latest Action: On January 15, 2008, Judge Kennedy awarded damages. 530 F.Supp.2d 216

Previous: On May 11, 2006, Judge Kennedy granted joint motions for summary judgment and denied in part. 2006 WL 2384915. On October 27, 2003, Judge Kennedy granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 290 F.Supp.2d 54

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Michael Lee Martinez, Stuart H. Newberger, Shari Ross Lahlou, Crowell & Moring, L.L.P., Washington, DC.

Richards v. Snyder (W.D.Mich.)

Facts: Plaintiff Kyle B. Richards presently is incarcerated at the St. Louis Correctional Facility but complained of events that occurred at the Bellamy Creek Correctional Facility (IBC). In “Claim 5,” Plaintiff argued that Defendants Snyder, Calley, McLellan and Heyns violated his Eighth Amendment rights by denying him “recreational appliances” so that he suffers from sensory deprivation and mental torture. Plaintiff also alleged that Defendants have violated federal statutes on torture and terrorism, 18 U.S.C. § 2340 and 18 U.S.C. § 2333, respectively, and the Michigan constitution by torturing prisoners with sensory deprivation. Plaintiff complained that prisoners spend eighteen hours or more in a cell without any stimulating activity. While plaintiff could read a book, he alleges that the amount of concentration required to read a book could trigger seizures in him.

Latest Action: On June 12, 2015, Judge Neff dismissed the action. 2015 WL 3658836

Plaintiff’s Lawyers: Pro se

Rothstein v. Laskar-E-Taiba (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: American and Israeli citizens who were injured or had relatives killed during terrorist attack in India brought action under Alien Tort Statute (ATS) and Antiterrorism Act (ATA) against agency of Pakistan and two of its former directors

Latest Action: On September 30, 2013, Judge Irizar granted defendants’ motion to dismiss. 980 F.Supp.2d 336

Plaintiff’s Lawyers: James P. Kreindler, Kreindler & Kreindler, LLP, New York, NY

Rothstein v. UBS AG (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Victims and/or families of victims of violence perpetrated by terrorist organizations in the form of bombings in Israel brought suit against international bank, alleging that bank aided and abetted international terrorism and aided and abetted violations of customary international law.

Latest Action: On February 14, 2013, the 2nd Circuit affirmed bank’s motion to dismiss. 708 F.3d 82 2013

Previous: On January 3, 2011, Judge Rakoff affirmed the bank’s motion to dismiss. 772 F.Supp.2d 511. On August 23, 2009, Judge Rakoff granted bank’s motion to dismiss. 647 F.Supp.2d 292

Plaintiff’s Lawyers: Robert Joseph Tolchin, Robert J. Tolchin, Esq., New York, NY, Nathaniel A. Tarnor, Tarnor, PLLC, Washington, DC

Rubin v. Hamas-Islamic Resistance Movement (D.D.C.)

Facts: On September 4, 1997, terrorists acting on behalf of the defendant detonated several bombs at the Ben Yehuda pedestrian mall in downtown Jerusalem, Plaintiffs Jenny Rubin, Daniel Miller, Abraham Mendelson, Stuart Hersh and Noam Rozenman were

present at the bombing and suffered serious injuries. The remaining plaintiffs are relatives of the bombing victims

Latest Action: On September 27, 2004, Judge Urbino granted plaintiffs' default judgment. 2004 WL 2216489

Plaintiff's Lawyers: David Jacob Strachman, Mcintyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI

Rux v. Republic of Sudan (E.D. Va.)

Facts: Surviving family members of sailors killed in the terrorist bombing of an American warship brought suit under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) against the Republic of Sudan alleging that it was liable for damages because it provided material support and assistance to the terrorist organization whose operatives planned and carried out the attack

Latest Action: On December 9, 2009, following judgment for plaintiffs, Judge Doumar denied plaintiffs' motion to amend. 672 F.Supp.2d 726

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Alan Woodbury Young, Young Law Firm P.C., Portola Valley, CA, Timothy Paul Sceviour, Abrons Fasanaro & Sceviour PLLC, Mary Jane Hall, Kaufman & Canoles P.C., Norfolk, VA, Nelson Marion Jones, III, Nelson M. Jones III, Houston, TX, Andrew C. Hall, Hall Lamb and Hall P.A., Miami, FL, James Davis Cooper-Hill, James D. Cooper-Hill, Rockport, TX.

Safra v. Palestinian Authority (D.D.C.)

Facts: Victims, who were injured in machine-gun attack in the West Bank, brought action against Palestinian Authority, alleging that attack was carried out by Palestinian Authority security personnel, and asserting claims under, inter alia, civil liability provision of Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Latest Action: On February 11, 2015, Judge Kollar-Kottely dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction, improper venue, insufficient service of process, and failure to state claim. 82 F.Supp.3d 37.

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Andrew David Levy, Jessica Paulie Weber, Joseph B. Espo, Brown, Goldstein & Levy, L.L.P., Baltimore, MD.

Saperstein v. Palestinian Authority (S.D. Fla.)

Facts: An American citizen injured in a terrorist attack in the Gaza Strip brought a civil action in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida against the Palestine Liberations Organization and the Palestinian Authority under the Antiterrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, alleging that the PA and the PLO are liable for the terrorist attack in which he was injured.

Latest Action: On April 6, 2010, Magistrate Carter granted plaintiff's motion to compel BBC to produce the unedited outtakes of Rumaileh and Zubaidi and its request to depose an

appropriate BBC employee regarding the authenticity of the outtakes and published documentary. 2010 WL 1371384.

Previous: On September 29, 2008, Judge Seitz set aside the default judgment. 2008 WL 4467535. On December 22, 2006, the court granted dismissal of two of the counts. 2006 WL 3804718

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Katherine Warthen Ezell, Robert C. Josefsberg, Stephen Frederick Rosenthal, Podhurst Orseck Josefsberg et al, Miami, FL.

September 11 Litigation (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Owner of building near site of terrorist attacks on World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, brought action seeking to recover cleanup and abatement expenses under Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) for removing pulverized dust that infiltrated into owner's building after collapse of Twin Towers of World Trade Center, naming as defendants the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey as owner of World Trade Center, the primary lessee of World Trade Center and primary lessee's affiliated corporations, operators of businesses at World Trade Center, and two airlines whose hijacked airplanes crashed into Twin Towers

Latest Action: On March 20, 2013, Judge Hellerstein ruled the al Qaeda

terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, constituted an "act of war," for purposes of act-of-war exception to strict liability under CERCLA. 931 F.Supp.2d 496

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Jay B. Spievack, Ginnine Beth Fried, Sari E. Kolatch, Cohen, Tauber, Spievack & Wagner, P.C., New York, NY

Shatsky v. Syrian Arab Republic (D.D.C.)

Facts: In the aftermath of a February 16, 2002 suicide bombing in the Samaria region of the West Bank, plaintiffs, the victims and personal representatives of United States citizens injured and killed in the attack, initiated a suit against the Palestinian Authority and the Palestinian Liberation Organization for alleged violations of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 et seq., and related torts

Latest Action: On November 20, 2015, Judge Leon granted/denied defendants' motion for sanctions. 2015 WL 7429971.

Previous: On July 6, 2011, Judge Leon, on defendant's motion, vacated the default judgment. 795 F.Supp.2d 79.

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Abbe David Lowell, Joy L. Langford, Chadbourne & Parke LLP, Washington, DC, Norman Steiner, Law Offices of Norman Steiner, New York, NY, Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY.

Sisso v. Islamic Republic of Iran (D.D.C.)

Facts: This civil action against defendants Islamic Republic of Iran, Iranian Ministry of Information and Security and Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiyya, the jihadist Palestinian militia more commonly known as Hamas arises out of a suicide bombing that destroyed a public bus in Tel Aviv, Israel, on September 19, 2002. Rozana Sisso, the mother of plaintiff Avraham Sisso, was killed in the explosion.

Latest Action: On July 5, 2007, Judge Bates entered default judgment against defendants. 2007 WL 2007582

Previous: On August 23, 2006, Judge Bates granted/denied default judgment. 448 F.Supp.2d 76

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Alan Vinegrad, Covington & Burling, New York, NY, Damara L. Griffith, Laura Haldeman McNeill, Covington & Burling, Washington, DC.

Smith ex rel Estate of Smith v. Federal Reserve Bank of New York (S.D.N.Y)

Facts: Representatives of estate brought declaratory action against Federal Reserve Bank of New York and Secretary of Treasury seeking to satisfy their judgment against Republic of Iraq by attaching certain Iraqi assets that were held by Federal Reserve Bank.

Latest Action: On October 3, 2003, the 2nd Circuit affirmed defendant's summary judgment. 346 F.3d 264

Previous: On May 7, 2003, Judge Baer granted judgment for plaintiffs in underlying case. 262 F.Supp.2d 217

Plaintiff's Lawyers: James E. Beasley, the Beasley Firm, Philadelphia, PA.

Sokolow v. Palestinian Liberation Organization (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: United States citizens and estates and family members of United States citizens injured or killed in terrorist attacks in Israel brought action against Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian Authority (PA) alleging violation of Antiterrorism Act (ATA), wrongful death, battery, assault, loss of consortium and solatium, negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress.

Latest Action: On November 19, 2014, Judge Daniels granted/denied defendants' motion for summary judgment. 60 F.Supp.3d 509

Previous: On September 6, 2012, Judge Ellis denied Motion to Quash a Subpoena to Testify at a Deposition brought by non- Party the British Broadcasting Corporation. 2012 WL 3871380. On

March 30, 2011, Judge Daniels denied, the defendants' motion to dismiss. 2011 WL 1345086. On September 30, 2008, Judge Daniels granted/denied defendants motion to dismiss and plaintiffs cross-motion for summary denial of that motion or for jurisdictional discovery. 583 F.Supp.2d 451

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Kent A. Yalowitz, Ken Laves Hashimoto, Arnold & Porter, LLP, New York, NY, Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Philip W. Horton, Arnold and Porter, Washington, DC, Rachel Weiser Weiser, Milano Law Offices, Rocky River, OH.

Song v. Chang (N.D. Cal.)

Facts: Plaintiff is a physician. He alleges that while he was working as an intern at Taipei Veterans General Hospital in Taiwan in the 1980's he was treated by defendant, a surgeon, for treatment of snoring. Plaintiff claims that defendant intentionally created a severe upper airway obstruction and that this intentional conduct caused plaintiff to become permanently disabled. He alleges that defendant engaged in such "intentional mayhem" because defendant resented plaintiff's American medical education, advanced degrees and United States citizenship. Plaintiff's second complaint, 05-3813, identified the statute pursuant to which he brought his claim: the Antiterrorism Act of 1990, 18 U.S.C. section 2333.

Latest Action: On March 21, 2006, Judge Breyer dismissed the complaint. 2006 WL 734350

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Pro se

Stansell v. FARC (M.D. Fla.)

Facts: After former hostages, and survivors of murdered hostage, won default judgment in their action, under the

Antiterrorism Act, against a Colombian terrorist organization, they filed a series of ex parte garnishments and executions, pursuant to the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA), against alleged agencies and instrumentalities (third-party claimants) of the organization.

Latest Action: The plaintiffs then tried to enforce their judgement against FARC by going after a U.S. bank account. They filed a state case against the bank, which was removed to federal court. On February 25, 2016, Judge Michael Moore ordered the case remanded back to state court. *Siman v. Ocean Bank*, 2016 WL 739659 (S.D. Fla. 2016).

Previous: On October 16, 2014, the 11th Circuit affirmed in part, dismissed in part, and reversed and remanded in part the appeal of the order of garnishment. 771 F.3d 713. On January 9, 2014, the 11th Circuit reversed the writ of garnishment awarded to plaintiffs. 704 F.3d 910. On March 31, 2011, Judge Moody granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 2011 WL 1296881

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Richard B. Rosenthal, Law Office of Richard B. Rosenthal, PA, Miami, FL, Tony Korvick, Newton Patrick Porter, Porter & Korvick, PA, Coral Gables, FL.

Strauss v. Credit Lyonnais S.A. (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: United States citizens and several estates, survivors, and heirs of United States citizens who were victims of 15 terrorist attacks in Israel and Palestine,

brought actions, later consolidated, against French bank, alleging the bank was liable for damages under the civil liability provision of Antiterrorism Act (ATA) for aiding and abetting, providing material support or resources to foreign terrorist organization (FTO) which was responsible for the attacks, and for financing acts of terrorism

Latest Action: On May 31, 2016, Judge Irazzary denied the defendants' motion for summary judgment, finding bank did not waive personal jurisdiction defense; actions were not exceptional cases that would support general jurisdiction over bank; purposeful availment prong of New York's long-arm statute for asserting specific jurisdiction over bank was satisfied; nexus prong of New York's long-arm statute permitted exercise of specific jurisdiction over bank; bank was subject to specific jurisdiction regarding each of 19 attacks; district court had personal jurisdiction in ATA action under rule providing that personal jurisdiction may be established through proper service of process upon a defendant pursuant to federal statute containing its own service provision; and plaintiffs demonstrated purposeful availment and relatedness sufficient to establish minimum contacts, as would satisfy due process. 175 F.Supp.3d 3

Previous: On February 28, 2013, Judge Irazzary granted/denied plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. 925 F.Supp.2d 414. On October 6, 2011, Magistrate Go modified the scope of the protective order. 2011 WL 4736359. On March 10,

2008, Magistrate Mastsumoto rejected bank's motion for protective order based on French bank secrecy laws. 249 F.R.D.

429. On August 6, 2007, Judge Sifton dismissed some counts. 2007 WL 2296832. On May 25, 2007, Magistrate Matsumoto granted plaintiff's motion to compel disclosure of bank records. 242 F.R.D. 199. On October 5, 2006, Judge Sifton granted/denied motion to dismiss. 2006 WL 2862704

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Aaron Schlanger, Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Naomi B. Weinberg, Osen, LLC, Hackensack, Peter Raven– Hansen, Osen, LLC, Oradell, NJ, David

J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI, Steven M. Steingard, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Kohn, Swift & Graf, PC, Philadelphia, PA, Aitan David Goelman, Semra Aylin Mesulam, Washington, DC, Andrew David Friedman, Wechsler, Harwood, Halebian & Feffer, L.L.P., New York, NY, Clyde T. Turner, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR,

Stutts v. De Deitrich Group (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Plaintiffs are a proposed class of military servicemen or civilian employees of United States Department of Defense contractors who were deployed in the Persian Gulf region during the 1991 Gulf War. They sought relief for damages sustained as a result of exposure to toxic agents contained in chemical weapons developed or otherwise obtained by the Iraq government and ultimately

detonated by the United States and its allies (Coalition forces) during the Gulf War conflict. Plaintiffs assert causes of action against two classes of defendants: the “Supplier Defendants,” foreign corporations that allegedly sold chemical precursors and manufacturing equipment to Iraq that was used to develop the chemical weapons to which plaintiffs were exposed, and the “Bank Defendants,” foreign corporations that acted as correspondent banks under letters of credit issued in favor of the Supplier Defendants to support the sale of goods and services by the Supplier Defendants to Iraq.

Latest Action: On June 30, 2006, Judge Glazer granted the Bank Defendants' motion in its entirety. 2006 WL 1867060

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Kenneth F. McCallion, McCallion & Associates LLP

In re Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001 (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Plaintiffs, in multi-district litigation, sought to hold liable for terrorist attacks on United States those who provided material support to terrorists and terrorist organization, asserting federal claims under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), alien tort statute, Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA), and Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), and also asserting state-law claims for, inter alia, wrongful death and survival, assault and battery, and intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress

Latest Action: On April 16, 2013, the 2nd Circuit issued three opinions. It affirmed the dismissal of the case by 76 defendants. 714 F.3d 118; 714 F.3d 109; and affirmed/vacated the motion to dismiss granted to 37 defendants. 714 F.3d 659

Previous: On October 114, 2011, Magistrate Maas recommended awarding plaintiff over \$ 9 billion, following default judgment granted against al Qaida. 2011 WL 4903584. On September 13, 2010, Judge Daniels granted/denied defendants' motion to dismiss. 740 F.Supp.2d 494. On December 23, 2008, Judge Daniels granted Riggs' Bank's motion to dismiss. 2008 WL 7073447. On December 14, 2006, Judge Casey granted dismissal of insurance companies' claims. 464 F.Supp.2d 335. On September 21, 2005, Judge Casey granted/denied motion to dismiss. 392 F.Supp.2d 539. On January 18, 2005, Judge Casey granted/denied motion to dismiss. 349 F.Supp.2d 765

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Richard Klingler, Sean P. Carter, Stephen A. Cozen, Elliott R. Feldman, Cozen O'Connor, Philadelphia, PA; Ronald L. Motley, Robert T. Haeefe, Motley Rice, LLC, Mount Pleasant, SC; Carter G. Phillips, Sidley Austin, LLP, Washington, DC; Andrea Bierstein, Hanly Conroy Bierstein Sheridan Fisher & Hayes, LLP, New York, NY; Robert M. Kaplan, Ferber Chan Essner & Collier, LLP, New York, NY; James P. Kreindler, Justin T. Green, Andrew J. Maloney, III, Kreindler & Kreindler LLP, New York, NY; Jerry S.

Goldman, Anderson Kill & Olick, P.C., New York, NY; Chris Leonardo, Adams Holcomb LLP, Washington, DC, on the brief), Sidley Austin, LLP, Washington, Andrew J. Maloney, III, Blanca I. Rodriguez, Brian J. Alexander, David Beekman, David C. Cook, Francis G. Fleming, James P. Kreindler, Justin Timothy Green, Lee S. Kreindler, Marc S. Moller, Milton G. Sincoff, Noah H. Kushlefsky, Paul S. Edelman, Robert James Spragg, Steven R. Pounian, Kreindler & Kreindler, New York City, Elliot R. Feldman, J. Scott Tarbutton, John M. Popilock, Sean P. Carter, Stephen A. Cozen, Cozen O'Connor (Philadelphia), Philadelphia, PA.

Ungar v. Arafat (various jurisdictions)

Facts: Personal representative of probate estate of American citizen murdered by terrorists while in Israel sued, inter alia, Palestinian Authority (PA) and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) pursuant to Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Latest Action: On February 9, 2011, the 1st Circuit affirmed denial of pension fund's motion to intervene. 634 F.3d 46

Previous: On May 12, 2010, Judge Martin granted plaintiffs' motion for payment decree. 715 F.Supp.2d 253. On May 13, 2009, Judge Lagoux denied defendants' motion for post-verdict relief. 613 F.Supp.2d 219. On September 15, 2008, Judge McMahon granted Egyptian telecommunications company's motion to dismiss. 578 F.Supp.2d 536. On November 7, 2005, Judge McMahon granted Egyptian telecommunication company's motion to quash. 400 F.Supp.2d

541. On October 11, 2005, Judge McMahon granted Egyptian telecommunication company's motion to quash. 396 F.Supp.2d 376. On March 31, 2005, the 5th Circuit affirmed the default judgment. 402 F.3d 274. On July 12, 2004, Judge Lageux entered judgment for plaintiffs. 325 F.Supp.2d 15. On April 23, 2004, Judge Lageux denied defendant motion to dismiss for sovereign immunity. 315 F.Supp.2d 164.

On March 31, 2004, Magistrate Martin, in a long opinion, recommended judgment and damages for plaintiffs. 2004 WL 882454. On January 27, 2004, Judge Lageux adopted magistrate's recommendation of judgment and damages. 304 F.Supp.2d

232. On November 4, 2002, Judge Lageux denied the motion to dismiss. 228 F.Supp.2d 40. On June 26, 2002, Judge Robertson (D.D.C.) denied the plaintiffs' motion for default judgment. 211 F.Supp.2d 91. On July 24, 2001, Judge Lageux denied the motion to dismiss. 153 F.Supp.2d 76

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Robert J. Tolchin, with whom Jaroslawicz & Jaros LLC, David J. Strachman, and McIntyre, Tate & Lynch, LLP.

Waldman v. Palestinian Liberation Organization (S.D.N.Y.)

Facts: United States citizens and guardians, family members, and personal representatives of United States citizens injured or killed in terrorist attacks in Israel brought action against Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian Authority (PA) alleging violation of the ATA wrongful death, battery, assault, loss of consortium and solatium, negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress. They won a large jury verdict. See Strachman, above.

Latest Action: On August 31, 2015, the 2nd Circuit vacated the judgment, finding PA and PLO did not waive their objections to personal jurisdiction; PA and PLO possessed due process rights; PA and PLO were not subject to general personal jurisdiction in United States; and terrorist attacks in Israel were not sufficiently connected to United States to subject PA and PLO to specific personal jurisdiction in United States. 835 F.3d 317.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Kent Yalowitz, Arnold & Porter LLP.

Weiss v. National Westminster Bank PLC (E.D.N.Y.)

Facts: Victims who suffered injuries and estates of victims who were killed over course of 15 terrorist attacks in Israel and Palestine in two and one-half year period filed suits against United Kingdom bank under Antiterrorism Act, based on claims

that bank aided and abetted murder and attempted murder of Americans and that bank collected and transmitted funds that were used to support terrorist activities.

Latest Action: On March 31, 2016, Judge Judge Irazzary denied the bank's motion to dismiss, finding bank did not waive its personal jurisdiction defense by omitting that defense from its prior motions to dismiss; bank's contacts with New York were not so substantial and of such a nature to render it essentially at home in New York, and thus district court's exercise of general personal jurisdiction over bank would not comport with due process; business transaction provision of New York's long-arm statute permitted district court's exercise of specific personal jurisdiction over the bank; bank was subject to personal jurisdiction in New York under business transaction provision of New York's long- arm statute with respect to all claims made in connection with 15 different terrorist attacks; bank had minimum contacts required for district court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over bank to satisfy due process clause; and district court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over bank was reasonable, and thus satisfied due process clause. 176 F.Supp.3d 264.

Previous: On September 22, 2014, the 2nd Circuit reversed the summary judgment motion granted in favor of plaintiffs. 768 F.3d 202 On July 28, 2013, Judge Irizarry granted bank's motion for summary judgment.. 936 F.Supp.2d 100. On December 3, 2008, Magistrate Go

denied the plaintiff motion to compel. 2008 WL 5115027. On December 21, 2007, Judge Gershon denied the bank's motion to dismiss. 2007 WL 4565060. On May 14, 2007, Magistrate Matsumoto denied/granted parties' cross-motions to compel. 242 F.R.D. 33. On September 27, 2006, Judge Sifton granted/denied bank's motion to dismiss. 453 F.Supp.2d 609

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Peter Raven– Hansen, Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Joshua D. Glatter & Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ; Steven M. Steingard & Stephen H. Schwartz, Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C., Philadelphia, PA; Aitan D. Goelman, Zuckerman Spaeder LLC, Washington, D.C.; C. Tab Turner, Turner & Associates, P.A., North Little Rock, AR, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Mark S. Werbner & Joel Israel, Sayles Werbner, Dallas, TX; James P. Bonner, Susan M. Davies, Stone Bonner & Rocco LLP, New York, NY; Richard D. Heideman, Noel J. Nudelman & Tracy R. Kalik, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, P.C., Washington, D.C., on the brief, for Plaintiff–Appellants

White v. Time-Warner Cable Inc. (D. Hawaii)

Facts: On July 19, 2012, plaintiff filed this action alleging various claims arising from a ten-day blackout period in July 2012 when Honolulu television station KITV was not carried by the Cable Defendants. Liberally construed,

perhaps Plaintiff seeks relief under 18 U.S.C. § 2333, providing a private cause of action for “[a]ny national of the United States injured in his or her person, property, or business by reason of an act of international terrorism.”

Latest Action: On February 28, 2013, Judge Seabright dismissed the complaint. 2013 WL 787967

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Pro se

Wultz v. Bank of China Ltd. (S.D.N.Y)

Facts: Injured victim of suicide bombing, which occurred in Israel, and personal representative of victim who was killed in bombing, brought action against Chinese bank, alleging that bank facilitated wire transfers to terrorist group in violation of Antiterrorism Act (ATA).

Latest Action: On August 7, 2014, Judge Scheindlin affirmed her denial of Israel's motion to quash a deposition subpoena served on Uzi Shaya, a former Israeli national security officer. 56 F.Supp.3d 276.

Previous: On July 21, 2014, Judge Scheindlin granted State of Israel's motion to quash deposition subpoena served on former Israeli national security officer. 32 F.Supp.3d 486. On February 13, 2014, Judge Scheindlin denied Israeli bank's motion to quash or modify subpoena. 298 F.R.D. 91. On October 25, 2015, Judge Scheindlin's denied/granted motion to compel bank to produce documents located in China in bank's

control. 979 F.Supp.2d 479. On October 15, 2013, Magistrate Gorenstein granted Israeli bank motion to quash deposition subpoena it was served by Chinese bank. 293 F.R.D. 677. On May 1, 2013, Judge Scheindlin granted/denied motion to compel production of documents that bank claimed would violate Chinese law. 942 F.Supp.2d 452. On April 16, 2013, Judge Scheindlin, held that vicarious liability claim was time barred. 306 F.R.D. 112. On April 9, 2013, Judge Scheindlin granted denied plaintiffs' motion to compel bank and non-party Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) to produce investigative files and United States regulatory communications. 61 F.Supp.3d 272. On November 5, 2012, Judge Scheindlin granted/denied bank's motion to dismiss non-federal claims. 2012 WL 5431013. On October 29, 2012, Judge Scheindlin issued motion to compel bank records. 910 F.Supp.2d 548. On May 25, 2012, Judge Sheindlin issued ruling that Chinese law applied. 865 F.Supp.2d 425. On May 14, 2012, Judge Lamberth issued judgment for plaintiffs against Iran. 864 F.Supp.2d 24. On January 9, 2012, Judge Scheindlin issued ruling on state of mind required to impose tort liability under Israeli law. 860 F.Supp.2d 225. On August 3, 2011, Judge Scheindlin ruled that Israeli rather than New York applied to tort claims. 811 F.Supp.2d 841. On January 28, 2011, Judge Lamberth issued a reconsideration opinion. 762 F.Supp.2d 18. On October 20, 2010, Judge Lamberth denied bank's motion to dismiss. 755 F.Supp.2d 1

Plaintiff's Lawyers: David Boies, Esq., Mary Boies, Esq., Lee S. Wolosky, Esq., Steven I. Froot, Esq., Marilyn C. Kunstler, Esq., Joseph W. Dunn, Esq., Boies, Schiller & Flexner LLP, New York, NY

Zhengxing v. Government of the People's Republic of China (D.D.C.)

Facts: Plaintiff sued China under 18 U.S.C. § 2333.

Latest Action: On January 12, 2020, Judge Leon dismissed the cryptic complaint. 2010 WL 128312.

Plaintiff's Lawyers: Pro se

Adams v. Alcolac, Incorporated (SD Texas)

Facts: Former United States military personnel who were injured by mustard gas during Gulf War filed state court suit against manufacturer of chemical used to produce the gas, asserting violation of the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) and conspiracy to violate Export Administration Act. Following removal, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, George C. Hanks, J., 2019 WL 4757392, granted chemical manufacturer summary judgment

Al–Tamimi v. Adelson,(DDC)

Facts: Palestinians and Palestinian–Americans from East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip, and five Palestinian village councils brought action against 49 defendants, including individuals, multi-national corporations, non-governmental organizations, banks, and the United States, alleging a civil conspiracy to expel all non-Jews from East Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip, the commitment of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in violation of the Alien Tort Claims Act (ATS) and the Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA), aiding and abetting, and trespass.

Latest Opinion: On September 8, 2020, the 5th Circuit affirmed the dismissal of complaint. 974 F.3d 540

Prior decisions: On September 6, 2018, Magistrate Edison recommended dismissal of complaint. 2019 WL 4774006

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Michael Patrick Doyle, Doyle, L.L.P., Houston, TX, Michael John Maloney, Michael J. Maloney & Associates, LLP, Houston, TX, Michael B. Martin, Martin Walton, L.L.P., Houston, TX, Gary Benjamin Pitts, Pitts & Mills, Friendswood, TX.

Latest Opinion: On August 29, 2017, Judge Chutkan dismissed case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. 264 F.Supp.3d 69

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Martin F. McMahon, William Jameson Fox, Esq., Pro Hac Vice, Martin F. McMahon & Associates, Washington, DC.

Alvarez v. University of Oregon (D.OR)

Facts: Plaintiff James-Brent: Alvarez, proceeding pro se, filed this action against defendants University of Oregon, University of Oregon Police Department (OPD), Luke Sitts, Geri Brooks, Scott Geeting, Stephen Barrett, Matthew Carmichael, and Michael H.

Schill. Plaintiff's claims arise from a traffic stop that led to his arrest and from defendants' response to complaints plaintiff made to UOPD after his arrest The Amended Complaint a claim under the Anti-Terrorism Act 18 U.S.C. § 2331, et seq. (claim four)

Latest Opinion: Defendants' motions to dismiss was granted in part and denied in part. The ATA charge was dismissed with prejudice. 2020 WL 61036

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se

Angel v. Scott (SDFL)

Facts: Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, brought purported qui tam action pursuing claims under the False Claims Act (FCA) and various other laws, including federal and state criminal statutes, against, inter alia, her neighbor, arising from purported harassment

Latest Opinion: On October 6, 2023, Judge Smith dismissed case.2023 WL 6567688

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se

Atchley v. AstraZeneca UK Limited (DDC)

Facts: American victims of terrorist attacks in Iraq and their families filed suit under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) and state law alleging that domestic and foreign medical supply and manufacturing companies knowingly financed attacks.

Latest Opinion: On January 4, 2022, the DC Circuit reversed the dismissal of complaint and remanded to district court. 22 F.4th 204

Prior decisions; On July 17, 2020, Judge Leon dismissed case for lack of personal jurisdiction. 474 F.Supp.3d 194.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Andrew Edward Goldsmith, David Charles Frederick, Joshua Daniel Branson, Matthew M. Duffy, Thomas Graham Schultz, Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, P.L.L.C., Ryan R. Sparacino, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC.

Attia v. Frank (SD Miss.)

Facts: Attia filed this lawsuit on March 26, 2021, against sixteen defendants. He asserted that this Court has federal question jurisdiction based on “terrorism, theft of body parts ..., HIPPA rights, federal privacy rights and to [sic] many to list.”). He also claimed that the Court has diversity jurisdiction because he is a citizen of Alabama, the defendant David Martin is a resident of Mississippi, and the amount in controversy is ten trillion dollars. He claimed that the defendants “took [his] life on numerous occasions and [he has] died many deaths only to be awoken by God.”

Latest Opinion: On June 30, 2021, Judge Guirola adopted the Report and Recommendations entered by United States Magistrate Judge John C. Gargiulo in which he recommends that this lawsuit should be dismissed for several reasons, including lack

of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a plausible claim for relief.

Prior Rulings: On December 16, 2020, Judge Guirola adopted Magistrate Myers recommendation that the lawsuit be dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and as frivolous. 2020 WL 7388430. On November 20, 2021, Magistrate Myers issued his Report and Recommendation. Plaintiff has not alleged any facts demonstrating that he has been injured by an act of international terrorism. 2020 WL 7701018

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se

Averbach v. Cairo Amman Bank (SDNY)

Facts: This case arises out of a series of terrorist attacks in Israel perpetrated by Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya (Hamas) a Palestinian terrorist organization, during the Second Intifada—a period of intense Israeli-Palestinian violence between 2000 and 2004 that included attacks on Israeli civilian centers, military installations, and buses. Plaintiffs include United States nationals injured in the attacks, as well as the estates, heirs, and families of U.S. nationals killed or injured in the attacks. They bring suit against Defendant Cairo Amman Bank pursuant Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA), alleging that CAB aided and abetted these attacks by providing financial services to Hamas through affiliated charities and

prominent members of Hamas. 18 U.S.C. § 2333, as amended by JASTA, Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 852 (Sept. 28, 2016).

Latest Opinion: On April 11, 2022, Magistrate Parker recommended that CAB's motion to dismiss be GRANTED without prejudice with respect to Plaintiffs' primary liability claims under the ATA and GRANTED with prejudice as to Plaintiffs Julie Averbach, Matanya Nathansen, Nevenka Gritz, and Arie Miller for lack of standing. I recommend that CAB's motion be DENIED with respect to Plaintiffs' aiding-and-abetting claims under JASTA. 2022 WL 2530797

Prior decisions. On March 9, 2000, Judge Woods accepted magistrate's recommendation and dismissed the case. 2020 WL 1130733. On January 2, 2020, Magistrate Parker recommended dismissal of complaint. 2020 WL 486860

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gerard Filitti, Cindy Tamar Schlanger, Gary M. Osen, Osen LLC, Michael Jacob Radine, William Adam Friedman, Osen LLP, Hackensack, NJ, Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Dina Gielchinsky, Osen LLC, New York, NY, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen Harris Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Kohn, Swift & Graf, P.C., Philadelphia, PA, Clyde Talbot Turner, Turner & Associates P.a, North Little Rock, AR.

Bartlett v. Société Générale de Banque au Liban SAL (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs are a group of 1,279 American nationals, or their surviving family

members, who were injured or killed in terrorist attacks that they allege were perpetrated abroad by Hezbollah.

Latest Opinion: On August 24, 2023, the 2nd Circuit held that as matter of first impression, immunity under Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) may attach when defendant becomes instrumentality of foreign sovereign after suit is filed. 2021 WL 3706909

Prior decisions; On March 31, 20233, Magistrate Merkl The Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion to compel in part and denies Defendants’ motion for a protective order. 2023 WL 2734641. Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Amended Complaint are granted as to Plaintiffs’ First and Fourth Claims for Relief. The motions are denied as to Plaintiffs’ Second and Third Claims for Relief under 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d). 2020 WL 7089448

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Dina Gielchinsky, Michael Jacob Radine, Naomi B. Weinberg, Patrick DuPrey, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Clyde T. Turner, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, John M. Eubanks, Michael E. Elsner, Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, SC

Bernath v. American Legion (MD Fla)

Latest Opinion: The 11th Circuit on November 28, 2017 Bernath’s claim for civil damages under the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18

U.S.C. § 2333(a), (d), is “wholly insubstantial,” Int’l Cafe, S.A.L. v. Hard Rock Cafe Int’l (U.S.A.), Inc., 252 F.3d 1274, 1277 (11th Cir. 2001). The defendants do not plausibly comprise a “foreign organization,” 8 U.S.C. § 1189(a)(1), that committed acts against Bernath with the intent “to intimidate or coerce a civilian population,” “to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion,” or “to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination or kidnapping,” 18 U.S.C. § 2331(1). And Bernath alleged no pattern of racketeering activity by the Shipleys, The American Legion, and Extreme Seal Experience LLC, consisting of acts that violated the Patriot Act, Pub. L. No. 107-56, § 813, 115 Stat. 424, or the Hobbs Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1961(1)(B), to present a plausible claim under the Racketeer Influenced Act, id. § 1964(c). 704 Fed.Appx. 917

Previous Rulings: On March 20, 2017, Judge Steele dismissed the complaint. 2017 WL 1050070.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se.

Bernhardt v. Islamic Republic of Iran (DDC)

Facts: Family members of victims of fatal attack by al-Qaeda operative at secret Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) base in Afghanistan brought action against financial institution incorporated in the United Kingdom (UK) and several of its foreign and domestic affiliates, for aiding and abetting violation of Anti-

Terrorism Act (ATA), and participating in conspiracy that caused victims' deaths, through evasion of sanctions which sought to restrict flow of money to individuals, entities, and countries on the Office of Foreign Assets Control's (OFAC) list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons.

Latest Opinion: On September 6, 2022, the DC Circuit affirmed dismissal.

Prior Rulings: On November 6, 2020, Judge Kelly granted UK bank's motion to dismiss. 2020 WL 6743066

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Randy D. Singer, Kevin Allin Hoffman, Singer Davis, LLC, Virginia Beach, VA

Bloomfield v. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (SDTX)

Facts: Ryan Bloomfield is the son and heir of Gerald Bloomfield II, who was a Major in the United States Marine Corps. According to Plaintiff, on November 2, 2005, terrorists operating as part of al Qaeda in Iraq shot down a Marine AH-1 W Cobra helicopter piloted by the Plaintiffs father, Major Bloomfield. Major Bloomfield tragically lost his life during the attack. Plaintiff filed a suit against Defendants the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia a foreign state, and Motiva Enterprises, LLC ("Motiva") for the death of his father by al Qaeda terrorists during the Iraq War.

Latest Opinion: On June 21, 2021, Judge Gilmour granted dismissal. 2021 WL 3640716

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Omar W. Rosales, Harlingen, TX

Boim v. American Muslims for Palestine (ND Ill)

Facts: In 1996 David Boim was shot and killed by Hamas terrorists while studying abroad in Israel. His parents later sued several American nonprofit organizations for their role in funding Hamas and secured a \$156 million judgment under the federal Anti-Terrorism Act. Those organizations then shuttered, leaving Stanley and Joyce Boim mostly empty handed. So in 2017 they filed a new lawsuit against two different American entities and three individuals, alleging that these new defendants are alter egos of the now-defunct nonprofit organizations and therefore liable for the remainder of the \$156 million judgment.

Latest Opinion: On May 17, 2022, Judge Feinerman denied the defendants' motion to dismiss. 2022 WL 1556085

Prior Rulings: On August 16, 2021, the 7th Circuit reversed dismissal of complaint, holding that action arose from federal law. 9 F.4th 545. On October 20, 2020, Judge Coleman granted defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. On December 13, 2019, Judge Coleman granted plaintiffs' motion to leave to file amended complaint. 2019 WL 13040497. On August 18, 2017, Judge Coleman granted defendants motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter. 2017 WL 3581141. On May

18, 2017, Magistrate Coleman rejected an ex parte motion a petition to revive the judgment against defendants Islamic Association for Palestine and American Muslim Society entered and amended in this case in 2004-05 an ex parte motion for an order approving the manner and form of service the plaintiffs propose to employ to serve the defendants with their petition to revive judgments and a motion under Fed.R.Civ.P. 25(c) to join non-parties American Muslims for Palestine, The Americans for Justice in Palestine Educational Foundation, Rafeeq Jaber, Abdelbasset Hamayel, and Osama Abu Irshaid as judgment debtors in this action, with plaintiffs claiming they are alter-egos and successors of the defendants.

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Joshua Michael Fliegel, Stephen J. Landes, Michael Brett Kind, William Allen Woolley, Locke Lord LLP, Daniel I. Schlessinger, Seth Corthell, Jaszczuk P.C., Chicago, IL, Alyza D. Lewin, Nathan Lewin, Lewin & Lewin, LLP, Washington, DC.

Bonocases v. Standard Chartered PLC (SDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs bring this action pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (“JASTA”), alleging that Standard Chartered PLC (“SC PLC”)—through its subsidiary, Standard Chartered Bank (“SCB”) (together with SC PLC, “Standard Chartered”)—aided

and abetted al-Qaeda by providing banking services to the Fatima Group (“Fatima”), a Pakistani fertilizer company that purportedly supplied al-Qaeda with materials used to make improvised explosive devices (“IEDs”).

Latest Opinion: On March 7, 2023, Judge Gilmour granted defendant’s motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 2390718

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Andrew Joshua Lichtman, Jenner & Block LLP, New York, NY, Lee Scott Wolosky, Jenner & Block LLP, New York, NY, Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Gary M. Osen, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ Michael Jacob Radine, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ

Brill v. Chevron Corp. (NDCA)

Facts: action against American energy corporation, for alleging that surcharges from the corporation's use of oil were used to finance terrorist activity in Israel, ultimately harming plaintiffs. Appellants, 18 United States nationals and 298 foreign nationals, brought the present action against Chevron and claimed that surcharges from Chevron's purchase of Iraqi crude oil were remitted to Saddam Hussein, who used the funds to finance terrorist activity in Israel from 2000 to 2002. That activity allegedly harmed Appellants and their family members who now appeal the district court's order dismissing the second amended complaint for failing to state a cognizable claim. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291 and review de nov

Latest Opinion: On March 12, 2020, the 9th Circuit affirmed dismissal of complaint for failure to state claim. **804 Fed.Appx. 630**

Prior Rulings: On August 14, 2018, Judge Donato granted Chevron dismissal. 2018 WL 3861659. On June 9, 2017, Judge Donato granted Chevron dismissal of complaint. 2017 WL 76894

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Raymond P. Boucher, Attorney, Maria L. Weitz, Boucher LLP, Woodland Hills, CA, Mark J. Geragos, Attorney, Ben J. Meiselas, Attorney, Geragos & Geragos, Los Angeles, CA, for Plaintiffs - Appellants

Brown v. National Bank of Pakistan (SDNY)

Facts: This is a lawsuit against the National Bank of Pakistan for financing, and thus aiding and abetting, international terrorism. Six Americans who were seriously injured by terrorists in Afghanistan, and close family members of two hundred and seventy-seven Americans who were injured or killed and who also claim injury to their persons, filed this lawsuit under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), as amended in 2016 by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d)(2).

Latest Opinion: On April 19, 2022, Judge Hellerstein granted dismissal of complaint with leave to amend. 2022 WL 1155905.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Ari Ungar, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Eli Johnson Kay-Oliphant,

Sparacino PLLC, Chicago, IL, Gary M. Osen, Osen LLC, Michael Jacob Radine, Osen LLP, Hackensack, NJ, Ryan Sparacino, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC, Tejinder Singh, Goldstein & Russell, P.C., Bethesda, MD, for Plaintiffs Harold Brown, Sr., Barbara Brown, Paula Rich, Regina Brown, MindyLou Paresi, Janet G. Paresi, Alexandra VandenBroek, Elizabeth Santina Paresi, Santina Cartisser, Terry Paresi, Dana Marie Bernhardt, Mary Lee Wise, E.P., Mary Heather Wise

Bruce v. Great Britain (EDTN)

Facts: Shane Bruce filed this action alleging the 2010 Deepwater Horizon explosion and subsequent oil leak “affected” him. According to him, that incident did not result from negligence or recklessness. Bruce claims, rather, that the Deepwater Horizon incident was a deliberate attack, orchestrated as part of an international conspiracy. This alleged conspiracy involved numerous conspirators, including, but not limited to: some local Tennessee healthcare providers, national medical associations—such as the American Medical Association (AMA) and the American Association of Poison Control Centers (AAPCC)—and even the highest levels of the American and British governments, including Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and United States Secretary of Defense, James “Mad Dog” Mattis.¹ Although details are sparse, Bruce further concludes that “genetically modified bacteria” released during the Deepwater Horizon incident caused him to suffer from arsenic poisoning and undergo “an

unwilling genetic transformation,” which is something he discovered sometime last year—seven years after the Deepwater Horizon incident. Bruce, acting pro se, brought a slew of federal claims, ranging from the Anti-Terrorism Act (18 U.S.C. § 2333) to maritime law, state tort law claims, and even a claim pursuant to the English Magna Carta. As damages, he asks the Court to award him “\$1,136,000,” which he believes is enough to: pay “several specialists” to monitor his health indefinitely, relocate to a “very hot climate” with a “higher cost of living,” build medically necessary “saunas,” and maintain his “emotional support animals.

Latest Opinion: On September 25, 2017, Judge Mattice dismissed the complaint. 2018 WL 4604020

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se

Caballero v. FARC (SDFL)

Facts: Facts: Plaintiff brings the instant case against several Defendants, including FARC and Ejercito de Liberacion Nacional (“ELN”), pursuant to the Anti-Terrorist Act (“ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333. According to Plaintiff, Defendants are “criminal narco-terrorist organizations from the jungles and mountains of Colombia” that conspired with each other to kidnap, torture, and murder his father. Plaintiff alleges that his father owned property “located along the Defendants’ drug trafficking route,” and that Defendants kidnapped and killed him “to send a message to other potentially uncooperative

landowners in the region that resistance to ... Defendants’ demands would not be tolerated.”. After Defendants began threatening Plaintiff, Plaintiff fled to the United States to seek refuge. Plaintiff later sued Defendants in Florida state court, and the state court awarded Plaintiff a default judgment of over \$190 million.

Latest Opinion: On November 15, 2023, Judge Moore denied one of the plaintiffs’ Motion for Relief from Prior Judgments. 2023 WL 9020048

Prior Rulings: On June 28, 2023, Judge Moore denied plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment. 2023 WL 4363886. On November 10, 2020, Judge Moore Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Agent and Instrumentality and Writ of Execution (ECF No. 73) is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. Here, Plaintiff is entitled to a writ of garnishment, but not a writ of execution because claimants are entitled to notice and to be heard before execution. 2020 WL 13850427. On May 20, 2020, Judge Moore granted default judgment against FARC. 2020 WL 7481302. On August 21, 2023, Judge Moore granted on of the defendant’s summary judgment motion. 2023 WL 5437222. On January 15, 2023, Judge Moore UPON CONSIDERATION of the Motion, the pertinent portions of the record, and being otherwise fully advised in the premises, it is hereby ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Interested Parties' Emergency Motion (ECF No. 187) is GRANTED IN PART. Accordingly, it is further ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff, his entities, and agents are hereby RESTRAINED from

dissipating, conveying, encumbering, or otherwise transferring ownership of the Fisher Island and Collins Avenue properties as described in the R&R2023 WL 187685. On January 6, 2023, Judge Hanen (SDTX) granted Rosneft Trading S.A.'s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings. 2023 WL 125240. On December 10, 2022, Magistrate Beccera issued a R & R on TRO motion. 2022 WL 18664563. On April 25, 2022, Judge Moore: it is hereby ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Plaintiff's Ex Parte, Expedited Motion for Agent or Instrumentality Determination (ECF No. 150) is GRANTED. 2022 WL 20610691. On January 3, 2022, Judge Meyer (D CT) denied motion Judgment creditor brought action to collect judgment issued by Florida federal court against Colombian paramilitary organization, seeking turnover order under Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (TRIA) against financial account at Connecticut brokerage company held by oil company incorporated in El Salvador that creditor alleged was an agency or instrumentality of paramilitary organization. 579 F.Supp.3d 315. On December 29, 2021, Judge Holcomb (CDCA) granted in part and denied in part the Judgment creditor, who successfully sued foreign terrorist organization and was awarded millions of dollars in damages, under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), for their terrorist acts against him, commenced enforcement action and was granted ex parte writ of execution, under Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA), for post-judgment execution on blocked assets of four non-parties as agencies or instrumentalities of foreign terrorist organization. 562 F.Supp.3d

867. On September 30, 2021, Judge Talwani (D. Mass.) granted Caballero's Motion for TRIA Turnover Judgment but is, with regard to the Plan, limited to those assets which Marquez Alvarez has a right to receive under the terms of the Plan. 565 F.Supp.3d 110. On August 24, 2021, Judge Moore Plaintiff Antonio Caballero's Motion for TRIA Turnover Judgment (ECF No. 99) is GRANTED; 2021 WL 3927826. On October 8, 2020, Magistrate Kim recommended that plaintiff's motion be denied, 2020 WL 11571726. On November 21, 2019 Magistrate Berrera recommended that plaintiff's motion for alternative service be denied. 2019 WL 11505370. On July 11, 2019, Judge Scheier (DSD) denied motion by other FARC victims to intervene. 2019 WL 13222189. On June 27, 2019, Judge Moore denied other FARC victims' motion to intervene. 2019 WL 11505371. On April 3, 2019, Judge Moore denied without prejudice plaintiff's motion for alternative service. 2019 WL 11505368.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Plaintiffs Lawyers: James R. Myers, Joshua D. Zellmer, Myers Billion, LLP, Sioux Falls, SD, Charles Nicholas Rostow, Pro Hac Vice, Zumpano Patricios & Popak, PLLC, New York, NY, Joseph I. Zumpano, Pro Hac Vice, Leon N. Patricios, Pro Hac Vice, Zumpano Patricios, P.A., Coral Gables, FL.

Cabrera v. Black & Veatch Special Projects Corporations (DDC)

Facts: Plaintiffs, members of the United States armed forces and civilians who were tragically killed or injured in one of 197

attacks in Afghanistan between 2009 and 2019, as well as estates and family members of deceased victims of such attacks, bring this action against seventeen corporate entities¹ pursuant to the civil liability provision of the Antiterrorism Act of 1992, 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) (the ATA), as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 854 (2016) (JASTA) (codified at 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d)(2))

Latest Opinion: On July 30, 2021, Magistrate Faruqi recommended dismissal of all defendants. 2021 WL 3508091

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Randall Wade Jackson, Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP, New York, NY, Ryan R. Sparacino, Sparacino PLLC, Nicholas M.H. Reddick, Michael J. Gottlieb, Willkie Farr and Gallagher LLP, Joshua Daniel Branson, Grace W. Knofczynski, Andrew Edward Goldsmith, Kellogg, Hansen, Todd, Figel & Frederick, P.L.L.C., Washington, DC.

Cain v. Twitter (NDCA)

Facts: The plaintiffs' family members were killed in large-scale terrorist attacks that occurred in Europe in 2015 and 2016. ISIS claimed responsibility for the attacks. The likely perpetrators, and many other individuals affiliated with ISIS, posted messages on Twitter accounts about the attacks along with other pro-ISIS content. ISIS used Twitter to proselytize, recruit members, raise funds, and plan various terrorist attacks. Twitter knew about this activity but made minimal and largely ineffective efforts to

curtail it. Plaintiffs' ATA claims allege that Twitter supported, and aided and abetted, a designated terrorist organization

Latest Opinion: On September 24, 2018, Judge Donato dismissed the case against Twitter. 2018 WL 4657275

Prior Rulings: On April 25, 2017, Judge Crotty transferred the case from SDNY to NDCA. 2017 WL 1489220

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Diane Young Park, Weinstock Manion, a Law Corporation, Los Angeles, CA, Keith L. Altman, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Carrow v. Roberts (CDCA)

Facts: On September 8, 2021, pro se litigant James Carrow filed a Complaint against Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., Merrick Garland, Janet Louise Yellen, Jerome Powell, the United States Marshals Service, the National Football League, and "Unidentified Tenants of Apts. 105 & 110 at 5059 Quail Run Rd., Riverside, CA 92507 and their employers." (.) The Complaint alleges 40 causes of action, including ATA.

Latest Opinion: On January 3, 2022, Judge Bernal dismissed complaint. 2022 WL 2102934

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Cassaday v. Trump (WDMI)

Facts: Plaintiff is presently detained at the Newaygo County Jail pending trial. Plaintiff sues former president Donald J. Trump, former United States Attorney General William Barr, political consultant Roger Stone, and former White House political strategist Steve Bannon. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Trump violated a number of federal criminal statutory provisions: 18 U.S.C. §§ 598, 2331, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, and 2385. Plaintiff makes no allegations regarding Defendants Barr, Stone, or Bannon. Plaintiff does not request any particular relief.

Latest Opinion: On August 3, 2022, Judge Beckering dismissed the complaint as frivolous.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

In re Chiquita Brands International, Inc. Alien Tort Statute and Shareholder Derivative Litigation (SDFL)

Facts: Missionary organization, as well as relatives and representatives of six Americans who were kidnapped and killed by Colombian terrorist organization known as the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC), brought actions alleging, inter alia, that United States multinational corporation that produced and marketed bananas violated the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) by providing material support to the FARC by funneling money to it over a nine-year period

through one of its wholly-owned Colombian subsidiaries.

Latest Opinion: On November 11, 2023, Judge Marra denied Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration of Partial Denial of Summary Judgment Motions. 2023 WL 9034773

Prior Rulings: On September 13, 2023, Judge Marra finds that Plaintiffs' complaint failed to meet the specific repleading requirements of its August Order, and the governing law, and so are due to be dismissed. It is therefore ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Individual Defendants' Omnibus Joint Motion to Dismiss "New Jersey" Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaints (DE 3295) is GRANTED. Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaints are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. 2023 WL 9029686. On September 16, 2021, the 11th Circuit, in a per curiam opinion, whether the district court abused its discretion when it held that foreign national plaintiffs cannot impose a constructive trust over the assets of a Colombian guerrilla group that the plaintiffs have never sued. The 11th Circuit held that the district court did not abuse its discretion and affirmed. 2021 WL 4204808. On January 3, 2018, Judge Marra Defendant's motion granted in part and denied in part defendant motion for summary judgment ; plaintiffs' motion was granted on defense of duress, 284 F.Supp.3d 1284. On September 6, 2017, Judge Marra issued a discovery ruling. 270 F.Supp.3d 1332. On January 18, 2018, Judge Marra denied Defendant's motion for certification of the Court's January 3, 2018 summary judgment for interlocutory appeal under Section 1292 (b). 2018 WL 11251119.

On October 10, 2017, Judge Marra denied the motion of George Welsh, Jr. for reconsideration of the Court's April 26, 2017 order denying Mr. Welsh's motion for appointment as guardian ad litem on behalf of his elderly parents. 2017 WL 11584044.

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Paul David Wolf, Law Offices of Paul David Wolf, Washington, DC

Clayborne v. Twitter Inc (NDCA)

Facts: On December 2, 2015, Syed Farook and Tashfeen Malik killed 14 people and injured 22 others in San Bernardino, California. The Megalla plaintiffs were injured in the attack, and the Clayborn plaintiffs are the surviving family members of those who died in the attack.¹ The parties stipulated to the consolidation of the cases on December 6, 2018. The plaintiffs allege that “[t]he terror attacks in this case were carried out by ISIS [the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria], a terrorist organization for years closely affiliated with al-Qaeda...”³ The plaintiffs sued Twitter, Google, and Facebook — all operators of online social-media platforms — on the ground that by allowing “foreign terrorist organizations” to use their platforms, they aided and abetted international terrorism and provided material support to international terrorists, in violation of several civil-remedies provisions in the Anti-Terrorism Act (“ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) and (d), 2339A, 2339B, and 2339C, and resulting

in negligent infliction of emotional distress and wrongful death, in violation of state law.⁴

Latest Opinion: On December 31, 2018, Magistrate Beeler dismissed the complaint.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Keith L. Altman, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Cohen v. Facebook Inc (EDNY)

Facts: Israeli residents who had been threatened with terrorist attacks by Palestinian terrorist organizations and estates of victims of attacks by such organizations brought state court action against operator of social networking website, asserting Israeli law claims of negligence, breach of statutory duty, and vicarious liability, as well as New York law claims for prima facie tort, intentional infliction of emotional distress, aiding and abetting a tort, and civil conspiracy, based on allegations that operator allowed Palestinian terrorist organization and its members to operate accounts to further their aims

Latest Opinion: On May 18, 2017, Judge Garaufus granted defendants motion to dismiss. 252 F.Supp.3d 140

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY.

Colon v. Twitter Inc. (MDFL)

Facts: This putative class action arises from a mass shooting carried out on June 12, 2016, at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida

("Pulse Shooting"). (Third Am. Compl. ("TAC"), Doc. 81, at 77). A man named Omar Mateen entered the nightclub with an assault-style rifle and a semi-automatic pistol and thereafter began shooting into the crowd, killing forty-nine people and injuring an additional fifty-three people, prior to Mateen being killed by police officers. Plaintiffs, all persons either injured in the Pulse Shooting or representatives of decedents killed in the shooting, initiated this lawsuit against Defendants Twitter, Inc. Google, LLC and Facebook, Inc. each of which run social media platforms. Plaintiffs allege that Mateen was "self-radicalized on the Internet," by a Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO) called The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS") Plaintiffs also assert that ISIS uses social media platforms—here, Defendants' platforms—for the purpose of recruiting and radicalizing people in the United States to join their FTO. And, Plaintiffs allege that Mateen was self-radicalized through use of Defendants' platforms.

Latest Opinion: On September 27, 2021, the 11th Circuit affirmed the district court's dismissal of the plaintiff's claims for aiding and abetting under the ATA and for negligent infliction of emotional distress and wrongful death under Florida law.

Previous Opinion: On March 24, 2021, Judge Mendoza dismissed the complaint. 2021 WL 11226013

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Keith Altman, Pro Hac Vice, Law Office of Keith Altman, Southfield,

MI, Michael T. Gibson, Michael T. Gibson, PA, Orlando, FL

Copland v. Twitter Inc. (NDCA)

Facts: Family member, whose husband and son were intentionally struck and killed by truck, responsibility for which was claimed by foreign terrorist organization, brought action against social media providers, alleging various claims, including direct and secondary liability under the Antiterrorism Act (ATA), arising from, inter alia, providers allegedly providing material support, resources, and services to organization

Latest Opinion: On November 29, 2018, Judge Orrick granted social media company's motion to dismiss complaint. 352 F.Supp.3d 965

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Keith L. Altman, Ari Kresch, Solomon M. Radner, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Crosby v. Twitter Inc. (ED Mich)

Facts: This case follows the tragic mass shooting at the Pulse Night Club in Orlando, Florida. In June 2016, Omar Mateen entered the club and opened fire, killing forty-nine people and injuring another fifty-three. Many victims and family members of deceased victims brought this lawsuit seeking damages for their senseless losses. But they did not sue Mateen, the lone terrorist responsible for the shooting. Nor did they sue ISIS, the international terrorist organization that

allegedly motivated Mateen through social media. Instead, Plaintiffs filed claims against social media giants Twitter, Facebook, and Google under the Anti-Terrorism Act (“ATA”). According to Plaintiffs, ISIS used Defendants’ social media platforms to post propaganda and “virtually recruit” Americans to commit terrorist attacks. This worked on Mateen: he allegedly viewed ISIS-related material online, became “self-radicalized,” and carried out the Pulse Night Club shooting. Following the attack, ISIS claimed responsibility. Thus, according to Plaintiffs, Defendants are responsible for Mateen's act of terrorism.

Latest Opinion: On April 16, 2019, The 6th Circuit affirmed denial of plaintiffs’ claims. 921 F.3d 617

Previous Rulings: On March 30, 2018, Judge Lawson dismissed the complaint with prejudice. On March 15, 2017, Judge Lawson dismissed order to show cause on venue issue. 2017 WL 11696940

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Solomon M. Radner, Keith L. Altman, Excolo Law PLLC, Ari Kresch, Southfield, MI.

Davis v. MTN Irancell Telecommunications Services Company (DDC)

Facts: These cases arise out of a tragic series of terrorist attacks perpetrated against Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan between 2005 and 2010. Plaintiffs are the victims of these attacks and their estates and families.

They have brought suit under the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 (ATA) against MTN Group Limited (“MTN Group”), a South African telecommunications company; MTN Irancell Telecommunications Services Company, an Iran-based joint venture between MTN Group and Iranian investors; and two of MTN Group's senior executives, Phuthuma Nhleko and Irene Charnley. The complaints allege that by entering into and participating in the MTN Irancell joint venture—along with certain other related conduct—MTN Group and its executives intentionally provided aid to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and various affiliated terrorist organizations and, in so doing, participated in the commission of the attacks that injured Plaintiff.

Latest Opinion: On March 30, 2023, Judge Moss denied defendants motion to transfer. 2023 WL 2755415

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Eli J. Kay-Oliphant, Sparacino PLLC, Chicago, IL, Ryan R. Sparacino, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC

Delloye v. FARC (MDPA)

Facts: The facts alleged in the complaint: On February 23, 2002, FARC kidnapped Delloye's mother, Ingrid Betancourt.¹⁴ Defendants were high-ranking FARC members who participated in FARC's decision to kidnap Betancourt and hold her hostage. They did so to influence American and Colombian policy, prevent military action, further drug trafficking, inflict terror on Americans, and

demand FARC members' release. As FARC held Betancourt hostage, it starved, threatened, and otherwise mistreated her. FARC also released several hostage videos showing that Betancourt was alive. These videos caused Delloye immense emotional distress, which manifested in sleepless nights and educational losses. On December 1, 2007, FARC released yet another video. In it, Betancourt was sitting on a bench in the dark jungle and describing the harsh conditions. After seeing the video, Delloye woke up every morning with a knot in his stomach. And unable to escape the thought of his mother's being held hostage, Delloye missed classes at his university. On July 2, 2008, Betancourt was rescued and released.²³ Still, it was not easy for Delloye to reconnect with his mother. He continues to suffer emotional distress from her kidnapping.

Latest Opinion: On February 23, 2022, Judge Brann awarded attorneys fees under ATA. 2022 WL 545030

Prior Rulings: On January 4, 2022, Judge Brann awarded plaintiffs a default judgment. 2022 WL 36292 . On August 11, 2021, Judge Brann denied the motion for default judgment. 2021 WL 5757341

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Eric G. Zajac, Zajac, Arias & Trichon, P.C., Philadelphia, PA, Robert E. Levy, Scarinci & Hollenbeck, LLC, Lyndhurst, NJ.

Does v. Tapang (NDCA)

Facts: Plaintiffs claim that Tapang is a spokesperson for the Ambazonia Defense Forces, a military wing of a separatist movement involved in Cameroon. Plaintiff Jane Doe alleges that her father and brother were killed by ADF forces under Tapang's instructions on May 20, 2018, in Kumbo, Cameroon. John Doe claims that his father was kidnapped by Tapang's elite "Red Dragon" ADF forces and then killed in May 2018.

Latest Opinion: On September 10, 2019, Magistrate Cousins denied the motion for TRO. 2019 WL 13201171

Prior Rulings: On August 6, 2019, Magistrate Cousins dismissed all but the ATA counts. 2019 WL 3576995

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Emmanuel Kongnyuy Nsahlai, Nsahlai Law Firm, Los Angeles, CA.

Does v. Fobeneh (CDCA)

Facts: Plaintiff's case arises out of Defendant's alleged terrorist and criminal conduct. The Complaint alleges that Defendant, who resides in the United States, is a terrorist, scammer, and opportunist, who, in late 2016, began scamming millions of Cameroonians by taking advantage of a lawyers' civil protest to declare a secessionist government that he leads. Defendant is allegedly the spokesperson, cabinet member, and Secretary of Communications and IT, as well as one of the founding fathers and de facto leader of the Ambazonian Interim Government ("AIG"). Plaintiff claims that AIG

is a “self-anointed” government of a violent and repressive Ambazonian separatist movement in Cameroon. Plaintiff further claims that AIG is a criminal enterprise formed under the umbrella of an illegally obtained non-profit organization called Ambazonian Foundation, Inc, which was created by Defendant and his accomplice by making false representations to the Internal Revenue Service. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, who have suffered the loss of family, friends, relatives, employees, agents, co-workers, and laborers because of Defendant's alleged criminal and terrorist activity. She claims that they have suffered severe emotional distress, harassment, anxiety, and lack of sleep due to Defendant's material support of his agents, joint venture partners, and organizations, namely AIG. Defendant's actions have allegedly resulted in a total loss of Plaintiff's economic interest in her business because whenever Plaintiff's laborers, workers, or agents go to Plaintiff's business in Cameroon, they are allegedly killed, kidnapped, maimed, and tortured. These acts are allegedly per the instructions of Defendant.

Latest Opinion: On February 6, 2020, Judge Anderson denied plaintiffs request for an injunction against certain actions by defendants. 2020 WL 4852858

Prior Rulings: On August 29, 2019, judge Anderson denied plaintiff's request for a TRO. 2019 WL 8013095. On July 29, 2019, Judge Klausner granted the defendants' motion to dismiss. 2019 WL 6520032. On May 13, 2019,

Judge Real granted Fobenoe's motion to set aside default. 2019 WL 8917734

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Emmanuel Nsahlai, Nsahlai Law Firm, Los Angeles, CA.

Does v. Wooten (D. MD)

Facts: The eighteen-page Complaint is largely incomprehensible. It seems that Plaintiff intends to bring a civil suit against two private individuals for allegedly providing support to a foreign terrorist organization as defined in 8 U.S.C. § 1189 and 18 U.S.C. §§ 2331, 2333. causing Plaintiff to suffer nervous breakdown and almost certain brain damage. These statutes, however, do not convey a private right of action to file a civil suit. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss this case sua sponte for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

Latest Opinion: On April 16, 2018, Judge Bedar dismissed the complaint as frivolous. 2018 WL 11312950

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro Se.

Dorgan v. Barak (CD Cal)

Facts: Parents brought action alleging that former Israeli defense minister violated Torture Victim Protection Act (TVPA) when he authorized Israeli military forces to board vessel at sea and use lethal force against their son, who was United States citizen. On October 15, 2015, the Doğans filed this lawsuit in federal court. They asserted eight

causes of action, each of which falls under one of three federal statutes: (1) the Alien Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1350 (“ATCA”); (2) the Torture Victim Protection Act, 106 Stat. 73, note following 28 U.S.C. § 1350 (“TVPA”); and (3) the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 (“ATA”). The complaint alleges that Furkan's killing constitutes “torture,” “terrorism,” and/or an “extrajudicial killing” under the relevant federal statutes and international law, and that Barak is personally responsible because of his commanding authority.

Latest Opinion: On August 7, 2019, the 9th Circuit held that defense minister was entitled to common law foreign official immunity. 932 F.3d 888

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Dan Stormer (argued) and Brian Olney, Hadsell Stormer & Renick LLP, Pasadena, California; Haydee J. Dijkstal, Stoke and White LLP, London, United Kingdom.

Fields v. Twitter, Inc (ND Cal)

Facts: Family members of deceased government contractors who were shot and killed in Jordan by a Jordanian police officer, responsibility for which was claimed by a foreign terrorist organization (FTO), brought action against microblog company, alleging that company knowingly provided material support to FTO in violation of Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) by permitting organization's members to sign up for microblog accounts

and use microblog's direct messaging feature.

Latest Opinion: On January 31, 2017, the 9th Circuit affirmed the dismissal for failure to state a claim. 881 F.3d 739

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Joshua D. Arisohn (argued), L. Timothy Fisher, and Scott A. Bursor, Bursor & Fisher P.A., Walnut Creek, California, New York, New York.

Force v. Facebook (EDNY)

Facts: Victims, estates, and family members of victims of terrorist attacks in Israel brought action alleging that Facebook provided material support to terrorist organization

Latest Opinion: On July 31, 2019, the 2nd Circuit granted in part and denied in part the plaintiffs' motion to dismiss. 934 F.3d 53

Previous Rulings: On January 18, 2018, Judge Garaufus denied motion for leave to amend. 304 F.Supp.3d 315

Plaintiffs' Lawyers: Meir Katz (Robert J. Tolchin), The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, New York.

Freeman v. HSBC Holdings (EDNY)

Facts: Members of United States Armed Forces who were wounded in terrorist attacks, along with families of service

members who were killed in such attacks, brought action against banks under the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) amendment to the Antiterrorism Act (ATA), alleging banks conspired with Iranian entities to circumvent sanctions imposed by the United States and channel funds to terrorist groups. In November 2014, a group of American citizens killed or injured by terrorist attacks in Iraq between 2004 and 2011, and/or their families, filed an action, *Freeman, et al. v. HSBC Holdings PLC, et al.*, 14-CV-6601 (PKC) (CLP) (“Freeman I”), against ten banking institutions—HSBC Holdings, PLC, HSBC Bank PLC, HSBC Bank Middle East Ltd., and HSBC Bank USA, N.A. (the “HSBC Defendants”); Barclays Bank PLC; Standard Chartered Bank; Royal Bank of Scotland, N.V.; Credit Suisse AG; Bank Saderat PLC (“Bank Saderat”);¹ and Commerzbank AG (“Commerzbank”)—as well as John Does 1–50, seeking damages pursuant to the Antiterrorism Act (the “ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333, as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (“JASTA”), Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 852 (2016). While *Freeman I* was pending, a different group of Americans who were injured or killed by terrorist attacks in Iraq, and/or their families, represented by the *Freeman I* counsel, filed these two additional actions, *Freeman, et al. v. HSBC Holdings PLC, et al.* No. 18-CV-7359 (PKC) (CLP) (“Freeman II”), and *Bowman, et al. v. HSBC Holdings PLC, et al.*, No. 19-CV-2146 (PKC) (CLP) (“Bowman”), seeking damages under the ATA and JASTA against the same defendants for materially the same conduct

Latest Opinion: On January 5, 2023, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of complaint. 57 F.4th 66

Prior Rulings: On January 7, 2021, Judge Chen denied Plaintiffs’ motion for a default judgment relating to Defendant Bank Saderat PLC as to Plaintiffs’ First, Second, and Eighth Claims for Relief, but granted that motion as to their Ninth and Eleventh Claims for Relief asserting aiding-and-abetting liability under the JASTA. 2021 WL 76925. On August 4, 2020, Judge Chen denied Defendant Commerzbank’s motion for reconsideration and directed Plaintiffs to file motions for default judgment as to Defendant Bank Saderat PLC in *Freeman II* (No. 18-CV-7359) and *Bowman*. 2020 WL 4481944. On June 5, 2020, Judge Chen granted bank defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of personal subject matter and for failure to state a claim. 465 F.Supp.3d 220. On September 116, 2019, Judge Chen overruled recommendation of magistrate and dismissed complaint. 413 F.Supp.3d 67. On July 27, 2018, Magistratee Pollack recommended denial of motion to dismiss. 2018 WL 3616845

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Dina Gielchinsky, Michael Jacob Radine, Aaron Schlanger, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Peter Raven-Hansen, Pro Hac Vice, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ.

Fuld v. Palestine Liberation Organization (SDNY)

Facts: Family members of United States citizen killed in terrorist attack in Israel brought action against Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian Authority (PA) alleging violation of Antiterrorism Act (ATA) as amended by Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act (PSJVTA). The United States intervened.

Latest Opinion: On September 8, 2023, the 2nd Circuit affirmed the lower court's constitutional ruling. 82 F.4th 74

Prior Rulings: On January 6, 2022, Judge Furman held that assertion of personal jurisdiction over PLO and PA did not comport with due process. 578 F.Supp.3d 577

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Jeffrey Fleischmann, New York, NY.

Glascoc v. Soloman (SDNY)

Facts: Plaintiff purports to bring claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, Plaintiff pro se, Deirdre C. Glascoe, was a special education teacher at the Business of Sports School, a public school in Manhattan. Compl. She brings this action on behalf of (1) herself, individually, "as a descendant of African slaves ('DOA[S]')," (2) on behalf of all DOAS, and (3) on behalf of God, under federal, state, and local law.

Latest Opinion: On March 17, 2020, Judge Torres dismissed the complaint. 2020 WL 1272120

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se

Goldstein v. Facebook (EDTX)

Facts: Goldstein concedes that he has not been injured in a terrorist attack. His § 2333 claim stems from two terrorist attacks—one in Kenya and one in Sri Lanka—that he claims were aided and abetted by Facebook. But he struggles to explain how these attacks inflicted an injury on him that is actionable under § 2333. His argument relies on a sponsored post that he published on Facebook reporting that the Obama administration ordered the FBI to halt an investigation into illegal drug trafficking by Hezbollah. Facebook included Goldstein's sponsored post in a public registry of political advertisements that had been published on the social media platform. Goldstein claims that Facebook's inclusion of his sponsored post in its registry made him visible enough in the public eye to render him a potential target of terrorist attacks by Hezbollah, Hamas, and ISIS. Goldstein claims that, with his sponsored post in the Facebook registry, the terrorist attacks that Facebook aided and abetted prompted unnamed "third parties ... to avoid hiring, contracting with, or otherwise do business with those who are perceived as potential targets of international terrorism, including Plaintiff.". So Goldstein's claim is that the terrorist attacks injured him by causing unnamed individuals to disassociate themselves from him out of concern that he could be a target in future terrorist attacks. Goldstein also claims that, by including his post in the registry and aiding and abetting

several terrorist attacks, Facebook forced him to spend money to protect himself from future terrorist attacks.

Latest Opinion: On August 12, 2020, Judge Barker adopted Magistrate's recommendation and granted Facebook's motion to dismiss. 2020 WL 4696457

Prior Rulings: On May 26, 2020, Magistrate Mitchell recommended granting the defendants motion to dismiss. 2020 WL 6482979

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Gonzalez v. Google (NDCA)

Facts: In 2015, ISIS terrorists unleashed a set of coordinated attacks across Paris, France, killing 130 victims, including Nohemi Gonzalez, a 23-year-old U. S. citizen. Gonzalez's parents and brothers then sued Google, LLC, under 18 U.S.C. §§ 2333(a) and (d)(2), alleging that Google was both directly and secondarily liable for the terrorist attack that killed Gonzalez. For their secondary-liability claims, plaintiffs alleged that Google aided and abetted and conspired with ISIS. All of their claims broadly center on the use of YouTube, which Google owns and operates, by ISIS and ISIS supporters.

Latest Opinion: On May 18, 2023, the Supreme Court declined to address the application of § 230 to a complaint that appears to state little, if any, plausible claim for relief. Instead, it vacated the judgment and remand the case for the Ninth Circuit to

consider plaintiffs' complaint in light of our decision in Twitter. 143 S.Ct. 1191

Prior Rulings: On October 23, 2018, Magistrate Ryu dismissed complaint with leave to amend. 282 F.Supp.3d 1150. On August 15, 2018, Judge Ryu granted dismissal of complaint. 335 F.Supp.3d 1156

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Ari Kresch, Solomon M. Radner, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI, Keith L. Altman, The Law Office of Keith Altman, Temecula, CA, Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Marshall Neil Solarz, Weinstock Manion et al, Los Angeles, CA.

Hageman v. Morrison County Sheriffs Office (D. Minn)

Facts: Hageman's Complaint and accompanying exhibits total 219 pages, of which the primary Complaint comprises the first 46 pages. Hageman has been detained at the Morrison County Jail on multiple occasions. Following a period of incarceration in 2018, he filed a civil rights lawsuit in this Court. Hageman v. Morrison County, Case No. 18-cv-1005-JNE-LIB (D. Minn. 2018). He alleges that when he returned to detention at the Morrison County Jail in August of 2019, he was subjected to retaliation and mistreatment as a result of his prior civil rights litigation. He alleges that as part of the retaliation, his First Amendment rights to religious freedom and free speech were obstructed. He asserts that the retaliatory behavior was the result of a conspiracy

among many individually named defendants, whom he has sued in their personal and official capacities, and that Morrison County should also be held vicariously liable. He brings claims both under 28 U.S.C. § 1983 and under state law.

Latest Opinion: On April 22, 2020, Magistrate Bowbeer recommended dismissal of complaint, including ATA count. 2020 WL 3547218

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se.

Hale v. United States (CLAIMS)

Facts: On September 10, 2018, Mr. Robert Hurford Hale filed suit in this court against the United States, requesting approximately \$ 100,000 in monetary damages and describing his claim as one founded on an “insurance fraud scheme and copyright violation.” The factual allegations in the complaint address, in large part, certain actions of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that have had a negative impact on plaintiff's financial situation. Plaintiff also seeks treble damages for monies the IRS has obtained from him, under 18 U.S.C. § 2333 (2012).

Latest Opinion: On April 5, Judge Campbell-Smith dismissed the complaint. 2019 WL 1504370

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se

Hebert v. CIA Command in Afghanistan (WDLA)

Facts: The lengthy factual allegations are difficult to interpret and some of them are irrational and nonsensical. The legal basis for his claims is equally far-fetched. Plaintiff asserted a claim under the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, alleging in general terms that he sustained personal injuries because the civilian contractor that employed him as well as the entire CIA and the individual defendants named in his lawsuit were engaged in a conspiracy to aid and abet a foreign terrorist organization, Al-Qaeda. His complaint lacks a concrete factual basis sufficient to establish a nonfrivolous claim and he also failed to articulate a potentially meritorious legal theory

Latest Opinion: On January 12, 2022, Magistrate Hanna dismissed the case as frivolous. 2022 WL 310111

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Henkin v. Kuveyt Türk Katilim Bankasi A.Ş. (EDNY)

Facts: This action arises after multiple victims were killed in terrorist attacks in the West Bank in 2015 and 2018. Their estates, survivors, and heirs bring a claim under the civil liability provision of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a), as amended by the Justice Against State Sponsors of Terrorism Act, against a Turkish bank, Kuveyt Turk Katilimi Bankas, A.S. Plaintiffs allege that the Bank aided and abetted Hamas, the terrorist organization responsible for the killings.

Kuveyt Turk has moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. For the reasons that follow, the case is dismissed for lack of personal jurisdiction

Latest Opinion: On July 28, 2023, Judge Cogan granted bank's motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 4850999

Prior Rulings: On March 31, 2023, Judge Donnelly granted Qatar National Bank's motion to dismiss; Masraf Al Rayan and Qatar Charity's motions are denied without prejudice to renew, and jurisdictional discovery is ordered for those defendants. On November 13, 2020, Judge Cogan granted certification of interlocutory appeal. On October 20, 2020, Judge Cogan denied the bank's motion to dismiss. 495 F.Supp.3d 144

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gavriel Mairone, MM-Law LLC, Chicago, IL, Michael Petrino, Jonathan Eric Missner, Pro Hac Vice, Stein Mitchell Beato & Missner LLP, Washington, DC, Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Aaron Schlanger, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ.

Honickman v. BLOM Bank SAL (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs are victims, or the relatives of victims of attacks conducted by Hamas, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO), between December 2001 and August 2003 in Israel and the Palestinian Territories. Plaintiffs commenced this action pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), as amended by

the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d), to recover damages from BLOM Bank SAL for allegedly aiding and abetting Hamas' commission of terrorist acts by providing financial services to Hamas through three of BLOM's customers who are alleged to be Hamas affiliates: the Sanabil Association for Relief and Development ("Sanabil"), Subul Al-Khair, and the Union of Good (collectively, BLOM's "Three Customers").

Latest Opinion: On April 8, 2022, Judge Matsumoto held Plaintiffs' motion for vacatur pursuant to Rule 60(b)(6) DENIED.

Prior Rulings: On July 29, 2021, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of complaint. 6 F.4th 487. On January 4, 2020 Judge Matsumoto granted bank's motion to dismiss. 432 F.Supp.3d 253

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Dina Gielchinsky, Michael Jacob Radine, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Aitan D. Goelman, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, Washington, DC, Clyde T. Turner, Pro Hac Vice, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Pro Hac Vice, Kohn Swift & Graf P.C., Philadelphia, PA, Shawn Patrick Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York, NY, for Plaintiff Michal Honickman.

Hussein v. Dahabshiil Transfer Services Ltd. (SDNY)

Facts: Estates and relatives of United States citizens killed in Somalia, who were allegedly murdered by foreign terrorist organization (FTO), brought action against entities that were members of network used to transfer funds in Middle East and South Asia under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), alleging they conspired to provide material support for the FTO directly through financial contributions and indirectly by facilitating the transfer of funds to the FTO from terrorist financiers abroad.

Latest Opinion: On January 27, 2017, Judge Caproni granted defendants' motion to dismiss complaint. 230 F.Supp.3d 167

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Joshua David Arisohn, Bursor & Fisher P.A., New York, NY.

Kaplan v. Hizballah (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs, American citizens injured in rocket attacks in Israel in the summer of 2006, sought default judgment against Hezbollah for violations of the Antiterrorism Act (18 U.S.C. § 2331 et seq.). The case has a far longer history than the 2019 index number would suggest. It was originally commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in 2009. Difficulties with service of process caused it to languish until special service was authorized, and, after service and no appearance, the Clerk of Court of the District of Columbia noted Hezbollah's default on the record pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 55(a) in 2011. The district court then dismissed the

case sua sponte for substantive reasons not material here. Subsequently, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed and remanded, holding that the district court had to first determine whether it had personal jurisdiction over Hezbollah before it reached the substantive issues. In 2019, at plaintiffs' request, the claims against Hezbollah were transferred here. Judge Cogan dismissed the case for failure to prosecute, as plaintiffs had taken no action against Hezbollah for ten years except service, but the 2nd Circuit reversed and remanded, calling for a more detailed analysis. Plaintiffs then moved for a default judgment.

Latest Opinion: On September 16, 2022, Magistrate Tiscione recommended granting plaintiff's default judgment. 2022 WL 17772031

Prior Rulings: On April 22, 2021, the 2nd Circuit vacated the lower court's dismissal and remanded. 844 Fed.Appx. 459. On February 28, 2022, Magistrate Tiscione recommend Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment be denied for lack of personal jurisdiction. 2022 WL 2467084. On June 21, 2022, Judge Cogan rejected magistrate's recommendations that default judgment be denied and remanded case to district court. 2022 WL 2207263.

Kaplan v. Lebanese Canadian Bank, SAL (SDNY)

Facts: American citizens injured by rocket attacks perpetrated by designated foreign terrorist organization (FTO) in Israel brought action against Lebanese bank under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) and Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA), alleging that bank facilitated attacks by providing banking services to FTO

Latest Opinion: On June 9, 2021, the 2nd Circuit reinstated the JASTA claim after reviewing allegations, and vacated district court's dismissal.

Prior Rulings: On September 20, 2019, Judge Daniels granted bank's motion to dismiss. 405 F.Supp.3d 525

Plaintiffs Attorneys: GARY M. OSEN, Hackensack, New Jersey (Ari Ungar, Michael Radine, Dina Gielchinsky, Aaron A. Schlanger, Osen, Hackensack, New Jersey; Robert J. Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office.

Kaplan v. Central Bank of Islamic Republic of Iran (DDC)

Facts: Following a conflict along the border between Israel and Lebanon which included rocket attacks on civilians in Israel, victims and family members or the estates of victims of attacks brought action, under the terrorism exception to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), the Alien Tort Statute (ATS), and Israeli law, against two banks, North Korea and others, alleging that they were involved in transfers of funds from the Islamic Republic

of Iran to the terrorist group that carried out the attacks.

Latest Opinion: On August 10, 2023, the 2nd Circuit vacated the district court's judgment denying Plaintiffs' motion for default judgment and dismissing the case for lack of jurisdiction, and remanded the case to the district court for proceedings consistent with this opinion. 77 F.4th 110.

Prior Rulings: On May 14, 2019, Judge Lamberth severed and transferred the ATA claims against BSPLC to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York. All remaining claims in this case have been addressed. Therefore, the Court will terminate this case on the active dockets in accordance with the final judgments issued in this matter. 2019 WL 2103168. On July 20, 2018, the DC Circuit affirmed the district court's dismissal of the plaintiffs' ATS claims against the Banks. It vacated the district court's judgment dismissing the plaintiffs' ATA claims against Hezbollah and Bank Saderat PLC, and remanded for the district court to determine whether it has personal jurisdiction over the defendants. 896 F.3d 501

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Meir Katz, Baltimore, Robert J. Tolchin, Brooklyn, NY.

Keren Kayemeth LeIsrael- Jewish National Fund v. Education for a

Just Peace in the Middle East (DDC)

Facts: American families living in Israel, who had allegedly suffered harm from acts of international terrorism in the form of incendiary attacks in Israel, brought action under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) against American nonprofit organization, alleging that nonprofit engaged in acts of terrorism or aided and abetted such acts.

Latest Opinion: On May 2, 2023, The DC Circuit affirmed dismissal of lawsuit. 66 F.4th 1007

Prior Rulings: On March 29, 2021, Judge Leon granted defendant's motion to dismiss. 530 F.Supp.3d 8

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Noel Jason Nudelman, Richard D. Heideman, Tracy Reichman Kalik, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, PC, Washington, DC.

Keaton v. Iredell County Emergency Medical Services (WDNC)

Facts: Plaintiff Karen Adelle Keaton filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on July 7, 2022, naming ten Defendants ranging from the Iredell County Clerk of Court to the "Iredell Statesville Schools" to the City of Statesville Storm Water Division and one individual Defendant. On initial review of Plaintiff's Complaint, the Court found that "not only [had] Plaintiff failed to state a claim

for relief against Defendants, but that her Complaint [was] founded on fantastical and delusional scenarios." The Court allowed Plaintiff 21 days to amend her complaint to properly state a claim for relief. Plaintiff timely filed an Amended Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which is now before the Court on initial review. [Doc. 6]. Plaintiff names the Iredell County Emergency Medical Service and the Iredell County Public Library as Defendants. She seeks relief under "The Protection from Harassment Act 1997" and 18 U.S.C. § 2333. For injuries, Plaintiff claims she was "blackballed from being able to attain & secure employ[ment]," lost all her hair from anxiety, was homeless for over a month, and was defamed on social media.

Latest Opinion: On August 22, 2022, Judge Bell dismissed the case with prejudice. 2022 WL 3590344

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Kemper v. Deutsche Bank (SD Ill)

Facts: Mother brought action under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) against bank, alleging that bomb that killed her son was placed with Iraqi militias by Hezbollah through Iranian banking transactions that bank executed in contravention of U.S. sanctions. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois, No. 16-CV-0497-MJR-SCW, Michael J. Reagan, Chief Judge, 2017 WL 8786497, dismissed her complaint for failure to state a claim. Mother appealed.

Latest Opinion: On December 2, 2018, the 7th Circuit affirmed the dismissal of complaint. 911 F.3d 383

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Attorney, OSEN LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Peter RavenHansen, Attorney, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL, Washington, DC.

King v. Habib Bank Limited (SDNY)

Facts: American nationals or surviving family members of American nationals, brought this action against Defendant Habib Bank Limited under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism ACT (JASTA), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) and (d), in connection to a series of attacks in Afghanistan in 2010 through 2019 by a syndicate of terrorist organizations led by al-Qaeda.

Latest Opinion: On December 22, 2023, Magistrate Wang issued a discovery order. 2023 WL 8879170. On December 1, 2023, Judge Schofield denied Defendant's motion for reconsideration of King I's rulings on Defendant's motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 8355359.

Prior Rulings: On April 21, 2023, Magistrate Wang issued a discovery order. 2023 WL 3558773. On September 28, 2022, Judge Schofield Defendant moves to dismiss the Complaints. For the reasons stated below, the motion is granted in part and denied in part. 2022 WL 4537849

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Adam Joshua Goldstein, Ryan Sparacino, Tejinder Singh, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC, Danielle Nicholson, Ian Micheal Gore, Susman Godfrey LLP, Seattle, WA, Seth D. Ard, Susman Godfrey LLP, New York, NY, Steven Gerald Sklaver, Susman Godfrey LLP, Los Angeles, CA.

Kleiman v. Palestinian Authority (DDC)

Facts: Estate, survivors, and heirs of victim of terrorist attack in Israel brought action under Antiterrorism Act (ATA) against Palestinian Authority (PA) and Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), as well as several other individuals and organizations allegedly involved in attack, alleging, inter alia, that PLO and PA failed to take measures to prevent attack and provided support to organizations and individuals responsible for attack.

Latest Opinion: On May 14, 2019, the DC Circuit granted the motion to dismiss. 923 F.3d 1115

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Edward B. MacAllister, Richard D. Heideman, Tracy Reichman Kalik, and Steven R. Perles.

Kumer v. Hizballah (EDNY)

Facts: On December 31, 2018, plaintiffs – American citizens purportedly harmed by or as a result of rockets and missiles fired by Hezbollah at civilians in Israel in 2006 – filed

a complaint against Hezbollah pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), 18 U.S.C. § 2333.

Latest Opinion: On June 7, 2023, Magistrate Merkl granted Plaintiffs' motion to effect substitute service on Defendant Hezbollah pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3). 2023 WL 3867301

Prior Rulings: On February 12, 2020, Magistrate Mann denied plaintiffs' motion requesting leave to effect substitute service on defendant pursuant to Rule 4(f)(3). 2020 WL 13572820. On October 20, 2020, Magistrate Mann denied with prejudice the application for leave to serve Alexei Saab under Rule 4(h)(1). 2020 WL 6146622

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY.

Lau v. ZTE Corp. (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs are a group of American citizens killed or injured by terrorist attacks in Afghanistan between 2012 and 2017, or their families. Plaintiffs filed this action against several telecommunications companies, seeking damages pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act ("ATA"), 18 U.S.C. § 2333, as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act ("JASTA"), Pub. L., No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 852 (2016)

Latest Opinion: On September 28, 2023, Judge Amon granted defendants' motion to dismiss complaint,

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Adam Goldstein, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC, Eli Johnson Kay-Oliphant, Sparacino PLLC, Chicago, IL.

Lebovich v. Islamic Republic of Iran (ND III)

Facts: Family members and estate of deceased child brought action against Islamic Republic of Iran seeking damages for providing support to terrorist organization that carried out terrorist attack against family while in Jerusalem

Latest Opinion: On February 27, 2018, Judge Castillo granted Motion to compel in part and denied in part. 297 F.Supp.3d 816

Prior Rulings: On March 29, 2017, the 7th Circuit held that district court did not have personal jurisdiction over parent banks to enforce subpoenas. 852 F.3d 687

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Robert Joseph Tolchin, Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Daniel A. Shmikler, Robert David Cheifetz, Sperling & Slater, P.C., Chicago, IL.

Lelchook v. Société Générale de Banque au Liban SAL (EDNY)

Facts: American citizens, who were relatives of victim of terrorist attack, individually and as personal representatives of deceased victim's estate, brought claims pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), Israeli

negligence laws, and Massachusetts tort law against the Islamic Republic of Iran, its central bank, and other international banks, claiming that \$50 million transfer of funds from banks to Iranian terrorist organization facilitated terrorist organization's rocket attack that killed victim while he was in Israel.

Latest Opinion: On April 26, 2023, the 2nd Circuit certified a personal jurisdiction issue for interlocutory appeal. 67 F.4th 69

Prior Rulings: On April 11, 2023, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of complaint, 2023 WL 3215333. On February 18, 2022, Judge Glauser ADOPTED that recommendation and dismissed Ester's individual claims under the ATA. 2022 WL 7534195. On March 31, 2021, Judge Dearie dismissed the complaint. 2021 WL 4931845. On November 23, 2020, Magistrate recommended that plaintiffs' motion for a default judgment be granted against BLSPC as follows: an award of (trebled) economic damages in the amount of \$899,958 to Ester Lelchook, acting as the legal representative of David Lelchook's Estate; and (trebled) compensatory damages in the aggregate amount of \$60,000,000, with \$7,500,000 allocated to Alexander Lelchook, \$15,000,000 allocated to the Estate of Doris Lelchook, and separate awards of \$18,750,000 allocated to Michal and to Yael Lelchook, respectively. This Court further recommended that Ester Lelchook's individual claim under the ATA be dismissed. 2020 WL 12656283. On June 27, 2019, Judge Glauser granted plaintiffs motion for summary judgment with respect to liability. 393 F.Supp.3d 261

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Robert Joseph Tolchin, Marna F. Berkman, Charles Berkman, Attorney at Law, Brooklyn, NY.

Levine v. Palestine Liberation Organizations (D. Col.)

Facts: Personal representatives of estates of citizens and non-citizens of United States killed in terrorist attack in Israel brought action against Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Palestinian Authority (PA), and alleged representative of PLO and PA, asserting claims for direct liability and respondeat superior liability for international terrorism, aiding and abetting, and conspiracy under Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act (PSJVTA), and negligence and vicarious liability under Israeli Civil Wrongs Ordinance (CWO). This civil action arises from a terrorist attack in a synagogue in the Israeli Har Nof neighborhood of Jerusalem on November 18, 2014 Plaintiffs allege that two operatives of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), Uday Abu Jamal and Ghassan Abu Jamal, carried out a terrorist attack and killed several worshippers at the synagogue (some of whom were also American citizens). The victims included Rabbi Aryeh Kupinsky, Rabbi Moshe Twersky, Rabbi Abraham Goldberg, Rabbi Kalman (Cary) Levine, and Police Sergeant Zidan Saif. The suspects also seriously injured Dr. Norman Heching and Rabbi Saul Goldstein (id. at 38-39). This civil action is brought by

the personal representatives of the estates of U.S. citizens Rabbi Kalman (Cary) Levine, Rabbi Aryeh Kupinsky, and Rabbi Moshe Twersky as well as of non-U.S. citizens Zidan Saif and Rabbi Abraham Goldberg

Latest Opinion: On August 23, 2023, Judge Gallagher granted defendants' motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 6121196

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Asher Perlin, Asher Perlin, Attorney at Law, Hollywood, FL, Daniel Kennedy Calisher, Michael Andrew Rollin, Foster Graham Milstein & Calisher, LLP, Denver, CO, Jordan D. Factor, Allen Vellone Wolf Helfrich & Factor P.C., Denver, CO.

Licci v. Lebanese Canadian Bank (SDNY)

Facts: This action was brought by American, Israeli, and Canadian citizens whose family members were injured or killed by rocket attacks carried out by the terrorist organization Hezbollah during July and August 2006. In this action, Plaintiffs alleged that LCB and its American correspondent bank, American Express Bank ("Amex Bank") provided millions of dollars in financial and banking services to Hezbollah, which caused, enabled, and facilitated the Rocket Attacks.

Latest Opinion: On October 3, 2018, Judge Daniels granted American Plaintiffs' motion to set aside that portion of this Court's April 2015 Order. 2018 WL 5090972

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: none listed.

Linde v. Arab Bank (EDNY)

Facts: American citizens, who were victims or relatives of victims of three terrorist attacks committed in Israel, brought action against foreign bank under the Antiterrorism Act (ATA) alleging that bank facilitated attacks by knowingly providing financial services to foreign terrorist organization, which was responsible for terrorist attacks, and its affiliates

Latest Opinion: On November 28, 2023, Magistrate Kuo issued an attorney fee ruling. 2023 WL 9232942

Prior Rulings: On February 19, 2018, the 2nd Circuit vacated and remanded the \$100 million award against the bank. 882 F.3d 314

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Peter Raven-Hansen, Osen LLC, Hackensack, New Jersey (Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Aaron Schlanger, Osen LLC, Hackensack, New Jersey; Shawn Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York, New York, Michael E. Elsner, John M. Eubanks, Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, James P. Bonner, Stone Bonner & Rocco LLP, New York, New York; John M. Eubanks, Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, South Carolina; Noel J. Nudelman, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik PC, Washington, D.C.; Lee S. Shalov, McLaughlin & Stern, LLP, New York, New York; Mark S. Werbner, Sayles Werbner, Dallas, Texas

Livnat v. Palestinian Authority (DDC)

Facts: : This action arises from a machine-gun attack on a group of worshippers at a Jewish holy site known as Joseph's Tomb, near the West Bank city of Nablus. One of those worshippers, Ben-Yosef ("Benyo") Livnat, was killed and several others were injured in the shooting, which was carried out allegedly by Palestinian Authority ("PA") security personnel. Yehuda Livnat, Benyo's brother, was also present at the scene of the attack. Plaintiffs are members of Ben-Yosef Livnat's family, including his parents, his siblings, his wife, and his several minor children. The defendant, the Palestinian Authority, is a non-sovereign government providing certain government services in the West Bank. Members of the Livnat family who are U.S. citizens and residents of Israel² bring two claims against the Palestinian Authority under the civil liability provision of the Anti-Terrorism Act ("ATA"), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a). These family members bring a claim under section 2333(a) under a vicarious liability theory and a claim for aiding and abetting international terrorism. In addition, certain plaintiffs bring several nonfederal claims pursuant to the law of the State of Israel. Rivka Livnat, on behalf of the estate of Ben-Yosef Livnat, brings a claim for battery against the Palestinian Authority. Yehuda Livnat brings a claim for assault against the Palestinian Authority. Finally, all plaintiffs

bring a claim for negligence against the Palestinian Authority.

Latest Opinion: On March 24, 2017, the DC Circuit affirmed the dismissal for lack of personal jurisdiction. 851 F.3d 45

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Andrew David Levy, Jessica Paulie Weber, Joseph B. Espo, Brown, Goldstein & Levy LLP, Baltimore, MD.

Lopez v. Ambro (EDNY)

Facts: The Amended Complaint is incomprehensible. Plaintiff identifies himself as "a trustee/secured party by fact; not a strawman vessel in commerce, corporate fiction, legal entity, ens legis, or transmitting utility," and alleges that he "is not; a citizen within, surety for, subject of, an officer of and does not owe allegiance, realty bond, undertaking, obligation, duty, tax, impost, or tribute to the "United States Corporation" (28 U.S.C. § 3002(15)(A)" The first twelve paragraphs of the Amended Complaint continue in this fashion and appear to describe and identify Plaintiff and the United States.

Latest Opinion: On January 21, 2020, Judge Seybert dismissed complaint with prejudice. 2020 WL 364135

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Marron v. Moros (SDFL)

Facts: On September 2, 2021, Plaintiffs filed this complaint asserting claims against Defendants for orchestrating the torture and kidnapping of Carlos Eduardo Marrón. Marrón was kidnapped, tortured, and detained for more than a year. Marrón, his wife, Maria, and their two minor children, C.R. and S.A., filed this case. Plaintiffs served the complaint in a variety of ways. Plaintiffs served the FARC and the Cartel of the Suns by serving its leaders, Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda and Cliver Antonio Alcala Cordones. Both are in prison in the United States. The Clerk entered default as to both cartels as neither responded to the complaint. The Court also granted default judgment against both Defendants but reserved the decision on damages until the Plaintiffs served the remaining Defendants.

Latest Opinion: On September 29, 2023, Judge Moreno granted motion for writ of execution. 2023 WL 6356969

Prior Rulings: On January 23, 2023, Judge Moreono granted plaintiffs default judgment and damages

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Alex C. Lakatos, Jonathan Samuel Klein, Stephen M. Medlock, Mayer Brown LLP, Washington, DC, Jaime D. Guttman, Scale Law Partners, LLC, Miami, FL.

Martinez v. Deutsch Bank (SDIL)

Facts: On November 2, 2016, plaintiffs, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a), filed suit against Deutsche Bank AG, HSBC Holdings PLC, HSBC Bank PLC, HSBC Bank Middle East

Limited, HSBC Bank USA, N.A., Barclays Bank PLC, Standard Chartered Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland, N.V., Credit Suisse AG, Bank Sanderat PLC, COMMERZBANK AG and John Does 1-50 as a civil action brought by citizens of the United States and/or their estates, survivors, or heirs, who have been injured by acts of “international terrorism,” as such term is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2331(1) (Doc. 1). Plaintiffs seek “treble damages against six Western international banks (Defendants) who knowingly supported the nation of Iran and its banking agents (including Defendant Bank Saderat Plc, Bank Mellli Iran, the Central Bank of Iran (“CBI”), Bank Mellat, Bank Tejarat, Bank Refah, and Bank Sepah), by evading U.S. economic sanctions, conducting illicit trade-finance transactions, and disguising financial payments to and from U.S. dollar dominated accounts.” Plaintiffs allege that “each Defendant knew, or was deliberately indifferent to the fact, that Iran was thus able to provide material support and resources to designated foreign terrorist organizations which engaged in terrorist activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B(a)(1); and knowing or having reasonable cause to know that a country (Iran) is supporting ‘international terrorism,’ engaged in financial transactions with that country in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2332d. Plaintiffs will show that each Defendant’s specific aims and objectives was keeping U.S. depository institutions, law enforcement and counter-terrorism agencies blind to Iran’s movement of U.S. dollars through the international financial system.” (Doc. 1, ¶ 2). Plaintiffs bring claims against each defendants for committing acts of

international terrorism in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339b and 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) (Count I) and for conspiracy to commit acts of international terrorism in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B and 18 U.S.C. § 2332(a) (Count II). Additionally, plaintiffs bring claims for acts of international terrorism in HSBC defendants' violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2332d (financial transactions) (Count III), acts of international terrorism by defendants' Standard Chartered Bank, Royal Bank of Scotland N.V. and Commerzbank for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2332d (Count IV), civil liability against Commerzbank AG under 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B constituting acts of international terrorism (IRISL) (Count V), civil liability against Commerzbank AG under 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B constituting acts of international terrorism (Orphans Project Lebanon E.V.), and civil liability against Standard Chartered Bank under 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) for violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2339B constituting acts of international terrorism (Count VII).

Latest Opinion: On April 12, 2017, Judge Herndon granted transfer of case to EDNY. 2017 WL 1366048

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Christopher J. Quinn, John J. Driscoll, Driscoll Firm, P.C., St. Louis, MO.

McDaniel v. Miller (WDTX)

Facts: this suit stems from Plaintiff's allegations in relation to a terrorist attack by

Al-Qaeda on a gas-processing facility in Algeria that took place in January 2013. (Doc. 42). Plaintiff worked as a Wellsite Leader for BP from January 2008 until he resigned in July 2014 and was stationed near the facility when the attack took place. *Id.* The facility was operated by BP, among other entities. *Id.* During the terrorist attack on the facility, several persons were killed and injured. *Id.* Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, argues he too suffered personal injuries. *Id.* Plaintiff first initiated a lawsuit in a Harris County, Texas state court raising similar causes of action against the BP Defendants and Defendant Cobb. *Id.* The state court issued a take-nothing judgment against Plaintiff on May 26, 2017. Plaintiff filed a Complaint in this Court on December 12, 2017), and thereafter a First Amended Complaint (Doc. 35). Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint asserts fifteen causes of action against Defendants: (1) civil damages under 18 U.S.C. § 2333, the Anti-terrorism Act of 1991 (ATA); (2) civil conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. § 2339B in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2333; (3) civil damages under § 806 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX), 18 U.S.C. § 1514A; (4) civil damages under the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO); (5) negligence and gross negligence; (6) negligent assumption of risk and negligent misrepresentation; (7) breach of contract; (8) premises liability; (9) fraud and fraudulent inducement; (10) fraud and breach of confidential relations; (11) negligent performance and undertaking to render services; (12) intentional infliction of emotional distress; (13) civil conspiracy to commit fraud; (14) civil conspiracy to commit

intentional infliction of emotional distress; and (15) defamation of character. *Id.* at 133–54.

Latest Opinion: On October 17, 2019, Judge Counts dismissed the case with prejudice. 2019 WL 13136763

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Miller v. Arab Bank (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs, American citizens who were either injured in terrorist attacks in Israel or surrounding areas or the relatives of American citizens injured in the attacks, brought action against Jordan-based bank, asserting causes of action under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) based on allegations that bank provided financial support for the attacks.

Latest Opinion: On March 3, 2023, Magistrate Kuo denied Defendant's Motion for a Protective Order and granted Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel. 2023 WL 2731681

Prior Rulings: On March 11, 2019, Judge Kogan granted in part and denied in part the bank's motion to dismiss. 372 F.Supp.3d 33

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Michael Jacob Radine, Gary M. Osen, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Elias Kohn, Pro Hac Vice, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Zahra Dean, Steven M. Steingard, Pro Hac Vice, Kohn, Swift & Graf, PC, Philadelphia, PA, Peter Raven-Hansen, Pro Hac Vice, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Shawn Patrick Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York,

NY. Edward MacAllister, Pro Hac Vice, Perles Law Firm, PC, Washington, DC, Joseph Tipograph, Noel J. Nudelman, Richard D. Heideman, Pro Hac Vice, Tracy R. Kalik, Pro Hac Vice, Heideman Nudelman & Kalik, PC, Washington, DC, Patrick Louis Rocco, Fleischman Bonner & Rocco LLP, New York, NY, Susan Marlene Davies, Fleischman Bonner & Rocco LLP, White Plains, NY, Thomas M. Carocchia, Fleischman Bonner & Rocco LLP, Summit, NJ, James P. Bonner, Fleischman Bonner & Rocco LLP, New Brunswick, NJ.

Miller v. Akron Bar Association (NDOH)

Facts: Pro se Plaintiff Chadwick Lynn Miller brings this action against Defendant Akron Bar Association, Attorney Referral, pursuant to pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 2339A, 241, 242, and 2261A. Plaintiff claims to be a victim of thought-reading technology installed by terrorists to harm him. Miller alleges that Defendant deliberately aided the terrorists by using mind-altering tactics, including impersonating people from Plaintiff's past, lying, and misleading Plaintiff about attorney referral services in an attempt to ensure that Plaintiff's rights as an American were not upheld. Plaintiff seeks \$150 Million Dollars in damages.

Latest Opinion: On June 28, 2019, Judge Adams ruled that Miller failed to state a plausible civil claim for violation of § 2339A because, as a threshold matter, Plaintiff does not claim that the terrorist activity alleged in

the complaint is an “act of international terrorism. 2019 WL 2717964.

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Pro se.

Miller v. Cartel (DND)

Facts: On November 4, 2019, members of the Juárez Cartel and its violent armed wing, La Línea ambushed three women and fourteen children, murdering six of the children and their mothers in the Sierra Alta in Sonora, Mexico. All of the people ambushed were United States citizens.

Latest Opinion: On September 13, 2022, Magistrate Hochhalter issued a ruling on attorneys fees. 627 F.Supp.3d 1043

Prior Rulings: On June 24, 2022, Magistrate Hochhalter recommend a plainittfs award of damages to plainittfs. 2022 WL 2286952

Plaintiffs Lawyers: Tatum O'Brien, O'Keeffe O'Brien Lyson Ltd., Fargo, ND, Courtney Wolf, Pro Hac Vice, John Michael Eubanks, Pro Hac Vice, Michael Edward Elsner, Pro Hac Vice, Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, SC, Samuel Mitchell, Pro Hac Vice, Scottsdale, AZ, Steven Mitchell, Pro Hac Vice, Scottsdale, AZ.

Mugabo v. Wagner, Joan Family (WDNY)

Facts: Mugabo and the defendants are identified in the Complaint as residing in different apartments within 2415 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York. The Complaint

premises federal court jurisdiction on “18 USC. ch. 113B- Terrorism under Section 2334 terrorism Law”. Likewise, in describing the nature of suit, the Complaint states: “Domestic and international terrorism. Both instances of alleged terrorism by Mugabo's neighbors involve the use of electromagnetic radiation. Specifically, he alleges that on March 8, 2019 defendants “started terrorizing me with electromagnetic radiation”, and that on September 28, 2020, the “[n]eighbors ... [we]re breaking the walls facing me and discharging electro”

Latest Opinion: On January 9, 2022, Magistrate McCarthy recommend that Mugabo's motion for a default judgment [16] be denied, and that he be given an opportunity to move for leave to file an Amended Complaint, if he can do so consistent with his Rule 11 obligations. 2022 WL 958316

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Nahl v. Joaude (SDNY)

Facts: Minority shareholders, a Jordanian businessman and a Lebanese entity principally owned by him, brought derivative action on behalf of corporation, a Lebanese bank, under Alien Tort Statute (ATS) and state common law against, inter alia, corporation's former general manager, its former deputy general manager, and its former assistant general manager, two of whom were majority owners of corporation, alleging they were harmed by defendants' “aiding and abetting”

of terrorism by laundering money on behalf of Hezbollah, a Lebanese militant organization, through United States correspondent banks and used car dealerships, culminating in corporation's forfeiture of \$102 million to United States.

Latest Opinion: On July 30, 2020, the 2nd Circuit reversed and remanded, holding that assuming, without deciding, that the prohibition against financing terrorism was a universal, specific, and obligatory norm of international law that could, in some circumstances, support a cause of action under the ATS, plaintiffs' effort to amend their complaint was futile because any such international norm prohibiting terrorist financing did not confer a cause of action on plaintiffs for the harm they allegedly suffered. 968 F.3d 173

Prior Rulings: On December 2, 2018, Judge Schofield granted plaintiffs motion to amend complaint. 354 F.Supp.3d 489

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Anthony Herman, Pro Hac Vice, Andrew E. Siegel, Dennis B. Auerbach, Covington & Burling, LLP, Washington, DC.

Nakanwagi v. Central Arizona Shelter Services Incorporated (D. AZ)

Facts: Pro se Plaintiff Sarah Nathreen Nakanwagi filed a complaint against Defendant Central Arizona Shelter Services, Inc. ("CASS") seeking various forms of relief

for an alleged violation of her state, federal, and international rights. She included a 2333 claim.

Latest Opinion: On March 3, 2017, Judge Campbell granted defendant summary judgment motion. 2017 WL 2351665.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Offise v. BNP Paribas SA (DDC)

Facts: Victims and family members of victims of the 1998 terrorist bombings of the United States embassies in Kenya and Tanzania brought action against international bank headquartered in France and Sudanese bank asserting claims under civil liability provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), the Alien Tort Statute (ATS), and for various common law torts, based on allegations that they conspired with Republic of Sudan, Sudanese banks, and terrorist organization that perpetrated attacks, to defeat United States sanctions against Sudan.

Latest Opinion: On July 7, 2023, the DC Circuit affirmed the lower court's dismissal of complaint. 77 F.4th 667

Prior Rulings: On March 19, 2019, Judge Bates dismiss the ATS claims (Counts III and IV), order jurisdictional discovery consistent with the limitations and instructions described herein, and at this time deny without prejudice [57] Al Shamal's motion to dismiss plaintiffs' other claims. On January 11, 2018, Judge Bates denied motion for reconsideration of prior dismissal. 2018 WL

396234. On September 29, 2017, Judge Bates dismissed the case. 278 F.Supp.3d 84

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Michael Joseph Miller, Miller Firm, LLC, Orange, VA, Gavriel Marione, MM-Law LLC, Chicago, IL.

O'Sullivan v. Deutsche Bank AG (SDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs, members of the United States armed forces who were injured in terrorist attacks in Iraq between 2003 and 2011, as well as estates and family members of deceased military victims of such attacks, bring this action against seventeen financial institutions¹ pursuant to the civil liability provision of the Antiterrorism Act of 1992, 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a) (the “ATA”), as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 854 (2016) (“JASTA”) (codified at 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d)(2)).

Latest Opinion: On February 5, 2020, Judge Swain: Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file their proposed Amended Complaint is denied. The original Complaint is hereby dismissed with prejudice in its entirety as against Defendants Deutsche Bank AG, HSBC Bank USA, N.A., HSBC Holdings Plc, HSBC Bank Plc, HSBC Bank Middle East Limited, HSBC North America Holdings, Inc., Commerzbank AG, Commerzbank AG, New York Branch, Barclays Bank Plc, BNP Paribas S.A., Standard Chartered Bank, Royal Bank Of Scotland N.V., Royal Bank Of Scotland Plc, Crédit Agricole S.A., Crédit Agricole Corporate & Investment Bank, and Credit Suisse AG.

Prior Rulings: On March 28, 2019, Judge Swain granted defendants 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. 2019 WL 1409446. On April 26, 2018, Magistrate Gorenstein granted motion to stay proceeding. 2018 WL 1989585

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Bena N. Ochs, Gavriel Mairone, Pro Hac Vice, Talya Woolf, MM-Law LLC, Chicago, IL, Chad Ethan Ihrig, Michael Bryan Angelovich, Nix, Patterson & Roach, Austin, TX, Christopher C. Dyer, James Magazine, Law Offices of Lucas Magazine, New Port Richey, FL, Christopher Paulos, Jeffrey Gaddy, Troy Alan Rafferty, Winston Troy Bouk, Levin Papantonio Law Firm, Pensacola, FL, David Kendall Teselle, Seth Alan Katz, Burg Simpson Eldredge Hersh & Jardine, P.C., Englewood, CO, Howard Lynn Nations, Howard L. Nations, P.C., Houston, TX, Jeremy Aaron Tor, William Hawal, Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber, LLP, Cleveland.

Owens v. Taliban (SDNY)

Facts: On August 7, 1998, al-Qaeda killed more than 200 people and injured thousands in terrorist attacks on the U.S. embassies in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania and Nairobi, Kenya (“Embassy Bombings”). Although al-Qaeda was responsible for the attack, several countries and groups provided assistance that made the attacks possible, including Iran, Sudan, and, allegedly, the Taliban, a fundamentalist Islamic organization that then controlled, and now again controls, Afghanistan. In 2021, about 20 years after being ousted from Afghanistan, the Taliban effectively reseized control of Afghanistan,

after which it laid claim to funds held by the Afghan central bank at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (“N.Y. Fed.”). In February 2022, President Joseph R. Biden issued an Executive Order blocking the Taliban from moving or using those funds; that Executive Order also designated some of the blocked funds for payment of civil judgments that have been obtained by victims of the Taliban's acts of terrorism. See McGill Decl., Ex. 1, Dkt. 6-1. The Executive Order prompted approximately 200 surviving victims, estates of victims who did not survive, and family members of the victims of the Embassy Bombings, both domestic and foreign, to sue the Taliban for its alleged role in the attack. See generally Compl., Dkt. 1. To preserve their chance of collecting on a future judgment, they have filed an ex parte emergency motion seeking pre-judgment attachment of the funds

Latest Opinion: On April 11, 2022, Judge Caproni granted plaintiffs’ emergency motion. 2022 WL 1090618

Plaintiff’s Lawyers: Crowell & Mourning; Gibson Dunn & Crutcher.

Owens v. BNP Paribas(DDC)

Facts: Victims of terrorist attacks at United States embassies in Africa brought action against French bank under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), alleging that bank provided financial assistance to Sudan, which in turn funded and otherwise supported terrorist organization.

Latest Opinion: On July 27, 2018, the DC Circuit affirmed the dismissal. 897 F.3d 266

Prior Rulings: On January 27, 2017, Judge Bates granted bank’s motion to dismiss. 235 F.Supp.3d 85

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Jane Carol Norman, Bond & Norman Law, PC, John Vail, John Vail Law PLLC, Thomas Fortune Fay, Fay Law Group, P.A, Washington, DC.

Page v. United States Agency for Global Media (SDNY)

Facts: Former unpaid informal advisor to presidential campaign filed pro se suit against media company and federal agency overseeing public service media networks, claiming terrorism transcending national boundaries and financing terrorism in violation of Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), violation of Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), defamation, and tortious interference with business relations, based on publication and funding of publication of articles allegedly containing false statements concerning advisor and his connection to Russian officials.

Latest Opinion: On December 2, 2019, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal. 797 Fed. Appx. 550

Prior Rulings: On March 26, 2018, Judge Schofield denied plaintiffs’ motion for an injunction preventing future defamatory statements. 2018 WL 1474620. On March 20, 2018, Judge Schofield granted dismissal.

2018 WL 1406621. On March 20, 2018, Judge Schofield granted dismissal. 2018 WL 1406622

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Pescatore v. Palmera Pineda (DDC)

Facts: Frank Thomas Pescatore, Jr., was kidnapped in 1996, held for ransom, and ultimately killed by the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC). Members of the Pescatore family (Plaintiffs) sued FARC and senior FARC commander Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda under the Antiterrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 et seq., and this Court granted default judgment and damages. Plaintiffs now seek to enforce the Court's Order for damages against Samark Jose Lopez Bello and his company, the Yakima Trading Corporation, as agents or instrumentalities of FARC. Mr. Lopez and Yakima, neither of which was a party to the underlying lawsuit, move to intervene so that they may defend themselves against execution of the judgment order

Latest Opinion: On May 20, 2019, Judge Collyer granted motion to intervene. 2019 WL 2173835

Prior Rulings: On November 1, 2018, Judge Collyer granted plaintiffs motion for default judgment. 345 F.Supp.3d 68

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Nathaniel A. Tarnor, Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP, Peter G.

Safirstein, Pro Hac Vice, Safirstein Metcalf LLP, New York, NY.

Palmucci v. Twitter Inc. (NDIL)

Facts: Plaintiff Mandy Palmucci brings this action against Defendants Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter"), Google, LLC ("Google"), and Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook"). Palmucci was injured in the November 13, 2015, attack carried out in Paris, France, by the terrorist organization ISIS. She alleges that Defendants, in violation of the Antiterrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333 ("ATA"), knowingly and recklessly provided ISIS with social media accounts that ISIS used as a tool for spreading propaganda, raising funds, and attracting new recruits, ultimately enabling it to carry out the Paris terrorist attack. Defendants now move to transfer the case to the Northern District of California, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

Latest Opinion: On June 14, 2018, Judge Lee granted defendants' motion to transfer to ND CA

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Cushi Keith Altman, Pro Hac Vice, Excolo Law PLLC, Southfield, MI, Bryce Thomas Hensley, Romanucci & Blandin, LLC, Chicago, IL

Pennie v. Twitter, Inc. (NDCA)

Facts: Police officer, who was one of first responders to mass shooting in Dallas, Texas, and father of one of officers killed in shooting, brought action against three online social networking services, seeking to hold

them liable for allegedly providing material support to Palestinian entity, designated as foreign terrorist organization, primarily in form of access to defendants' online social media platforms.

Latest Opinion: On December 4, 2017, Magistrate Spero recommended dismissal under Communications Decency Act. 281 F.Supp.3d 874

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Keith L. Altman, Ari Kresch, Solomon M. Radner, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Retana v. Twitter Inc. (NDTX)

Facts: Police officer injured in mass shooting and his husband brought action under Antiterrorist Act (ATA) and state law alleging that social media platforms provided material support to foreign terrorist organization (FTO), which enabled it to radicalize attack's perpetrator.

Latest Opinion: On January 16, 2021, the 5th Circuit affirmed the dismissal. 1 F.4th 378

Prior Rulings: On December 5, 2019, Judge Boyle granted platform's motion to dismiss. 419 F.Supp.3d 989

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Michael D. Richardson, Richardson Koudelka LLP, Dallas, TX, Ari Kresch, Keith L. Altman, Pro Hac Vice, Excolo Law PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Richardson v. Lopez (EDNC)

Facts: In his complaint, plaintiff alleges that defendants "did willfully & deliberately, feloniously cause Property Damage to [his] 2002 Mitsubishi Montero Sport XLS." Id. at 2. Specifically, he alleges the following: On 12-16-20 after Raul Lopez & the two other defendants had been idiotically stalking me by driving by my home, in his White Dodge Truck within the neighborhood, attempting to harass & Intimidate me .. [sic] When the defendants drove by my home, sublimanially [sic] Stalking me, I was on my way out leaving in my automobile, so I ended up driving by the defendants home OUT OF SELF DEFENSE. After the defendants arrived at their address within the neighborhood, I simply drove in the rode [sic] & spoke about their staking, [sic] after I drove down past the defendant's house, they then walked down to my automobile & deliberately caused property damage while I was about to drive away ... [sic] Raul Lopez & the two other "hispanic" males willfully caused felonious property damage to my SUV's front bumper, Windshield, door & side panel with some Large Stone in which they hand-smashed & threw at my automobile.

Latest Opinion: On June 26, 2022, Magistrate Meyers recommended plaintiff's complaint be DISMISSED as frivolous. 2022 WL 3337151

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Riley v. HSBC Bank PLC (MDFL)

Facts: Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint alleging a claim against the Defendant foreign

banks pursuant to the Anti-Terrorism Act (“ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a).

Latest Opinion: On September 7, 2018, Magistrate Flynn recommended dismissal of complaint. 2018 WL 4761590

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Rosenberg v. Lashkar-e-Taiba (EDNY)

Facts: The plaintiffs, Shimon Rosenberg, Nachman Holtzberg, Moses Shvarzblat, Maribeth Jeswani, Kia Scherr, Emunah Chroman, Andreina Varagona, Linda Ragsdale, and Autumn Gilles (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) are American and Israeli citizens who were injured or whose relatives were killed during the 2008 terrorist attacks in Mumbai, India. Dkt. Entry No. 66.)¹ Plaintiffs assert claims pursuant to the Alien Tort Statute (ATS) 28 U.S.C. § 1350, and the Antiterrorism Act (“ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333, against the terrorist organization Jamat ud Dawa (“JuD”), a/k/a Lashkar-e-Taiba, a/k/a Markaz ud Dawa, a/k/a Idara Khidmat-e-Khalaq, a/k/a Tehrik-e-Tahaffuz-e-Qibla Awal (collectively, “LeT”), and several of its alleged leaders, including Mohammed Hafiz Sayeed (“Sayeed”), Zaki ur Rehman Lakhvi (“Lakhvi”), Sajid Majid (“Majid”), Azam Cheema (“Cheema”), Major Iqbal (“Iqbal”), and Major Sameer Ali

Latest Opinion: On March 3, 2017, Judge Irizarry accepted the magistrate’s recommendation and dismissed case.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: James P. Kreindler, Andrew J. Maloney, III, Kreindler & Kreindler, LLP, New York, NY.

Sankari v. Khamiss (WD Texas)

Facts: Plaintiff alleges that he has been wronged by Defendant Eyhab Khamiss in myriad ways, including Defendant “entering numerous slandering on [Plaintiff’s] phone message” including vulgarities, leasing Plaintiff’s car and returning it “missing 7 dollars gas,” and failing to pay Plaintiff the complete lease payment Plaintiff alleges was due. Plaintiff also alleges an on-going dispute between Plaintiff and Defendant involving Defendant borrowing Plaintiff’s car but returning it with a stain in the rear passenger seat. Contemporaneous with this matter, Plaintiff filed three additional causes of action

Latest Opinion: On February 19, 2018, Magistrate Lane dismissed 2333 count.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Schansman v. Sberbank of Russia PJSC (SDNY)

Facts: Family of airline passenger, who was killed when terrorist group based on ideology of Russian supremacy filed missile at civilian passenger plane, brought action on behalf of passenger under Antiterrorism Act (ATA) against Russian banks and two money transfer companies based in United States,

alleging that defendants provided material support and financing to group

Latest Opinion: On September 30, 2021, Judge Carter denied the defendants motion to dismiss.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Andrew Joshua Lichtman, Jacob D. Alderdice, Lee Scott Wolosky, David Jason Pressman, Jenner & Block LLP, New York, NY.

Shaffer v. Deutsche Bank AG (SD III)

Facts: Plaintiffs Charles James Shaffer, Charles J. Shaffer, Jr., and Rhonda Kemper filed suit against Defendant Deutsche Bank AG alleging that Deutsche Bank conspired with Iranian financial institutions to transfer U.S. currency to Iranian banks in violation of U.S. economic sanctions, giving the Iranian government access to currency necessary to fund terrorist activities in Iraq. By doing so, Plaintiffs assert that Deutsche Bank engaged in a conspiracy to provide material support for international terrorism and to a foreign terrorist organization in violation of the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), specifically 18 U.S.C. §§ 2333(a), 2339A, and 2339B. Charles James Shaffer, David Schaefer (son of Rhonda Kemper), and other United States citizens were severely injured and killed as a result of terrorist attacks in Iraq orchestrated by groups like those funded by Iran

Latest Opinion: On December 7, 2017, Judge Reagan granted bank's motion to dismiss. 2017 WL 8786497

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Michael J. Radine, William A. Friedman, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, C. Tab Turner, Turner & Associates, North Little Rock, AR, Douglas P. Dowd, Dowd & Dowd, St. Louis, MO

Shrier v. Qatar Islamic Bank (SDFL).

Facts: On December 31, 2012, our Plaintiff—Matthew Schrier, an American journalist—was kidnapped in Syria. For the next 211 days, he was held captive and tortured by several groups of Islamist terrorists. After he escaped through a window, he made his way to the Turkish border and, from there, to the United States. Now home, Schrier came to suspect that the Qatar Islamic Bank (QIB)—a Qatar-based financial institution (and our Defendant)—was complicit in the fundraising efforts of the groups that tortured him. Seeking redress, Schrier sued QIB for providing financial services to clients it knew, or should've known, were supporting terrorist activities—including, as relevant here, the groups that kidnapped him. Now, after months of jurisdictional discovery, Schrier has identified six transactions on QIB's U.S.-based correspondent accounts and several credit-card purchases his captors made in the United States—including two in this District. Based on these transactions, Schrier asks us to exercise personal jurisdiction over QIB

Latest Opinion: On September 30, 2022, Judge Altman dismissed the case. 632 F.Supp.3d 1335

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Carrie A. Tendler, G. Scott Hulse, Pro Hac Vice, Kobre & Kim LLP, Washington, DC, Kevin T. Carroll, Pro Hac Vice, Wiggin and Dana LLP, Washington, DC, John H. Rains, IV, Kamal Ghali, Pro Hac Vice, Matthew R. Sellers, Pro Hac Vice, Bondurant, Mixson and Elmore LLP, Atlanta, GA.

Shatsky v. Palestine Liberation Organization (SDNY)

Facts: On February 16, 2002, a suicide bomber detonated an explosive device inside a crowded pizzeria in the West Bank village of Karnei Shomron. The blast killed two people, both U.S. nationals, and wounded thirty others, including four other U.S. nationals. The U.S. victims and their personal representatives initiated the instant suit against the Palestinian Authority and the Palestine Liberation Organization alleging that the bombing was enabled by those entities and asserting violations of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2331-2339D, and related common law torts.

Latest Opinion: On March 18, 2022, Judge Vyskocil granted defendant motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. 2022 WL 826409

Prior Rulings: On April 14, 2020, the DC Circuit vacated the district court's judgment and remand with instructions to dismiss the case without prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

955 F.3d 1016. On June 20, 2017, Judge Leon granted the defendant's summary judgment motion. 2017 WL 2666111

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Mark Stewart Cohen, Stephen Matthew Sinaiko, Cohen & Gresser, LLP, New York, NY, Abbe David Lowell, Winston & Strawn LLP, Washington, DC, Erica Courtney Lai, Washington, DC, Ronald F. Wick, Cohen & Gresser, LLP, Washington, DC, Sofia Roa Arguello, Winston & Strawn LLP, New York, NY, Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY.

Sinclair for Tucker v. Twitter, Inc (NDCA)

Facts: The instant action arises from the tragic death of Jared Tucker ("Decedent"), who was among a number of individuals killed in a horrific terrorist attack carried out by alleged ISIS member, Younes Abouyaaqoub ("Abouyaaqoub"), in Barcelona, Spain, on August 17, 2017. Plaintiffs, the children of the Decedent, bring the instant action against Defendants Twitter, Inc. ("Twitter"), Google LLC ("Google") and Facebook, Inc. ("Facebook"), all of which operate social media platforms allegedly used by ISIS to promote its agenda. The operative pleading is the First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), which claims that Defendants provided material support to a terrorist organization in violation of the Antiterrorism Act of 1990 ("ATA"), Pub. L. No. 1-1-519, § 132, 104 Stat. 2240 (1990)

(codified at 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a)), and aided and abetted and/or conspired with a person who committed an act of international terrorism in violation of the ATA, as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (“JASTA”), Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 852 (2016) (codified as 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d)).

Latest Opinion: On March 20, 2019, Judge Armstrong granted defendants motion to dismiss with prejudice. WL 10252752

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Keith L. Altman, Excolo Law, PLLC, Southfield, MI.

Siegel v. HSBC Holdings, plc (SDNY)

Facts: On November 9, 2005, terrorists affiliated with al-Qaeda in Iraq (“AQI”) perpetuated coordinated bombings of three hotels in Amman, Jordan. Certain victims of that cowardly attack and their representatives² now allege that Defendants HSBC Holdings, plc (“HSBC–Holdings”), HSBC Bank USA, N.A. (“HSBC–U.S.”), HSBC Bank Middle East Limited (“HSBC–Middle East”), HSBC North America Holdings, Inc. (“HSBC–North America”), and Al Rajhi Bank facilitated AQI's access to American financial markets, thereby aiding and abetting AQI's terrorist activity in violation of the Anti–Terrorism ActL

Latest Opinion: On August 8, 2019, the 2nd Circuit affirmed Judge Cote dismissal of complaint for failure to state a claim. 933 F.3d 217

Prior Rulings: On August 14, 2017, Judge Blakey: Rajhi Bank's Motion to Dismiss or To Transfer is granted without prejudice. The Motion to Strike, Dismiss and Transfer filed by the HSBC entities is denied in part and granted in part. Plaintiffs' claims against HSBC Holdings, plc and HSBC Bank Middle East Limited are dismissed without prejudice for want of personal jurisdiction. The remainder of this action, consisting of Plaintiffs' claims against HSBC North America Holdings, Inc. and HSBC Bank USA, N.A., is transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. 283 F.Supp.3d 722. On July 27, 2018, Judge Cote dismissed the complaint. 2018 WL 3611967. On January 19, 2018, Judge Cote: The plaintiffs' September 13, 2017 motion for leave to file a second amended complaint is denied to the extent that the proposed second amended complaint seeks to name HSBC Holdings and Al Rajhi Bank as defendants. The claims against HSBC Holdings and Al Rajhi Bank are dismissed with prejudice. 2018 WL 501610.

Plaintiffs Attorneys: William T. Gibbs, Corboy & Demetrio, Chicago, IL.

Singer v. Bank of Palestine (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs are an alleged group of American citizens, or their relatives, survivors, or heirs, who have been killed or injured by 12 devastating terrorist attacks in Israel perpetrated by the infamous terrorist organization Hamas. Plaintiffs have filed suit against Bank of Palestine (“BOP”), claiming

that it is civilly liable for their injuries because it aided and abetted Hamas in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2333(d) of the Anti-Terrorism Act (“ATA”). Id. They contend that BOP has knowingly and purposefully provided financial services to Hamas by maintaining accounts for and facilitating payments on behalf of Hamas's leaders and prominent institutions

Latest Opinion: On April 30, 2021, Judge Vitalinato the defendants motion to dismiss. 2021 WL 4205176

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Michael Jacob Radine, Dina Gielchinsky, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Aitan David Goelman, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, Washington, DC, Clyde T. Turner, Pro Hac Vice, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Pro Hac Vice, Kohn Swift & Graf P.C., Philadelphia, PA, Shawn Patrick Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York, NY, for Plaintiff Sarri Anne Singer.

Sokolow v. Palestine Liberation Organization (SDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs brought action against defendants, Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian Authority (PA), alleging state-law claims and claims for international terrorism under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Latest opinion: On June 5, 2022, Judge Daniels ruled exercise of jurisdiction under either of the PSJVTA's two jurisdiction-

triggering prongs would violate due process. The statute is therefore unconstitutional. 607 F.Supp.3d 323

Prior Rulings: On March 10, 2022, Judge Daniels ruled that The PSJVTA of 2019 is applicable to this case. The statute is unconstitutional

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Kent A. Yalowitz, Ken Laves Hashimoto, Arnold & Porter, LLP, New York, NY, Robert Joseph Tolchin, The Berkman Law Office, LLC, Brooklyn, NY, Philip W. Horton, Pro Hac Vice, Arnold and Porter, Washington, DC, Rachel Weiser Weiser, Pro Hac Vice, Milano Law Offices, Rocky River, OH, Stephen Wirth, Washington, DC.

Sotloff v. Qatar Charity (SDFL)

Facts: Estate and family members of United States journalist who was kidnapped and beheaded in Syria by Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) filed suit, under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA), as amended by Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA), against Qatar National Bank and Qatar Charity, acting at behest of and in concert with government and Royal Family of Qatar, that allegedly wired \$800,000 to ISIS judge so he could establish militant brigade, join ISIS, and destabilize Syria which was Qatar's regional rival, by committing acts of terror, such as execution of United States hostages including journalist ten months after receiving wired funds.

Latest Opinion: On May 30, 2023, Judge Middlebrooks denied the charity’s motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 3721683

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Edward MacAllister, Emily Amick, Joshua K. Perles, Pro Hac Vice, Steven R. Perles, Pro Hac Vice, Perles Law Firm PC, Washington, DC, George Albert Minski, Law Offices of George A. Minski, P.A., Hollywood, FL.

Spetner v. Palestine Investment Bank (EDNY)

Facts: American victims of terrorist attacks in Israel, their families, and their estates brought action against foreign bank, alleging that it violated several provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) by facilitating the transfer of United States dollar-denominated funds to terrorist groups that incentivized and rewarded suicide bombings by making “martyr payments” to families of terrorists killed in suicide missions

Latest Opinion: On October 16, 2020, Judge Komite granted banks motion to dismiss. 495 F.Supp.3d 96

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Gary M. Osen, Aaron Schlanger, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Dina Gielchinsky, Michael Jacob Radine, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, Aitan David Goelman, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, Washington, DC, Clyde T. Turner, Pro Hac Vice, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Steven M. Steingard, Pro Hac Vice, Kohn, Swift & Graf,

PC, Philadelphia, PA, Shawn Patrick Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York, NY.

Stansell v. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (SDFL)

Facts: In 2003, members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (“FARC”) targeted a reconnaissance airplane carrying Plaintiffs, forcing the aircraft to crash land in the Colombian jungle. FARC forces immediately executed Plaintiff Thomas Janis on the day of the crash,¹ and held the other Plaintiffs in captivity for the next five years. In 2013, seeking justice for all they endured, Plaintiffs sued the FARC in federal court; FARC never appeared. The Middle District of Florida entered default judgment against the paramilitary group, and Plaintiffs were awarded \$318,030,000 in damages. Plaintiffs have been enforcing a \$318 million judgment they obtained against members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (“FARC”) by seizing “blocked assets” owned, maintained or operated by Samark Jose Lopez Bello “(Lopez Bello)”, a Venezuelan national, purported billionaire, and current fugitive-at-law. To do so, Plaintiffs utilize language found within the Terrorist Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (“TRIA”) and the Antiterrorism Act (“ATA”), 18 U.S.C. § 2333. Six families seek redress for the harms caused by Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (“FARC”), the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (the “ELN”), and the El Norte del Valle Cartel (the “NDVC”). Each family has obtained

judgments against these groups under the Antiterrorism Act (“ATA”), and each now seeks to satisfy those judgments, bringing the families into conflict. Four families whose claims arise from FARC’s shooting down of an airplane over Colombia (collectively, the Stansells) have combined collection efforts with the family of a kidnapping victim of FARC (the Pescatores). The Stansells and Pescatores registered their judgments in this District and, through the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (“TRIA”), sought the turnover of assets of purported FARC agents and instrumentalities. Antonio Caballero, whose father was killed by FARC and the ELN, intervened, seeking to satisfy his judgment with the same assets. In response, the third parties holding those accounts sought interpleader relief, naming the Stansells, the Pescatores and Caballero as Defendants. The judgment holders, in turn, answered and crossclaimed against each other. In brief, each judgment holder seeks a declaratory judgment finding that their ATA judgment is valid while their opponents’ is not. Samark Jose Lopez Bello and the Yakima Trading Corporation (together, “Lopez Bello”), third party asset holders affected by the turnovers, intervened to challenge the enforcement of the judgments.

Latest Opinion: On August 22, 2023, the 11th Circuit reversed the turnover judgments because there are issues of fact as to whether Mr. López and his companies are or were agencies or instrumentalities of the FARC.

The case is remanded to the district court for further proceedings consistent with our opinion. 45 F.4th 1340

Prior Rulings: On August 26, 2019, Judge Kelly (DDC) granted Plaintiffs motion for writs of attachment against blocked assets belonging to four purported agencies or instrumentalities of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia. 2019 WL 4040680. On December 21, 2022, Judge Schofield adopted the Magistrate Report’s recommendations in full. 2022 WL 17830551. On December 21, 2022, Judge Schofield ruled Lopez Bello’s objections are OVERRULED. The Report’s recommendation is ADOPTED IN FULL. 2022 WL 17830551. On July 19, 2022, the 11th Circuit held that correction sought by third parties was not clerical or ministerial in nature and thus not within scope of rule providing for relief from judgment based on clerical mistake, oversight, or omission. 40 F.4th 1308. On March 29, 2022, Magistrate Netburn The Court recommended entering a declaratory judgment that (1) the full \$318,030,000 award of Stansell I is for compensatory damages; (2) Caballero’s ATA judgment is not void as a matter of law for lack of subject matter jurisdiction or personal jurisdiction; and (3) Caballero is entitled to collect both the economic and non-economic compensatory damages awarded in his judgment. To the degree that the Stansell, Pescatore, and Caballero crossclaims are inconsistent with this declaratory judgment, it recommends that they be dismissed. It recommends that the outstanding issues raised by Lopez Bello and the Yakima Trading Company be addressed in a subsequent

opinion. Lopez Bello and the Yakima Trading Company are permitted, however, to address the issue of treble damages in the ATA as part of any objection to this Report and Recommendation. 2022 WL 2530359. On July 6, 2020, Magistrate Torres denied one of defendant's motion to strike execution writ. 2020 WL 4464409. On October 5, 2020, Judge Honeywell (MDFL) issued its written order denying the Motion to Amend. 2020 WL 13469704. On July 16, 2020, before Judge Scola is the Plaintiff's expedited motion for an order determining that the Plaintiff's Antiterrorism Act ("ATA") judgment is for compensatory damages and enforceable in full is granted and Lopez Bello's motion is denied. 2020 WL 4692748. On July 6, 2020, Magistrate Torres: motion to declare Florida's post-judgment garnishment statute unconstitutional, or in the alternative, waive the bond provisions of such statute filed by SAMARK JOSE LOPEZ BELLO ("Lopez Bello") and LEUCADENDRA 325 LLC ("325 LLC", and together with Lopez Bello, "Movants"). Keith Stansell, among others ("Plaintiffs"), filed a response to the motion on April 9, 2020 to which Movants replied on April 16, 2020. After reviewing the arguments set forth in the motion, response, and reply and consulting the governing legal authorities on the dispute, and for the reasons stated below, we RECOMMEND that Movants' motion be DENIED. 2020 WL 5552778. On March 23, 2000, Magistrate Torres issued an Omnibus Report and Recommendation pertains to five pending Motions filed by SAMARK JOSE LOPEZ BELLO, YAKIMA TRADING CORPORATION, EPBC HOLDINGS, LTD., 1425

BRICKELL AVE 63-F, LLC, 1425 BRICKELL AVE UNIT 46B LLC, 1425 BRICKELL AVE 64E LLC, and 200G PSA HOLDINGS LLC (hereinafter, "Lopez Bello" or "Movants"). These Motions seek entry of final turnover judgments on writs of garnishment issued to five separate banking/investment institutions: UBS Financial Services, Inc., RJA Financial Services, Inc., Branch Banking & Trust Co., Morgan Stanley Smith Barney, LLC, and Safra National Bank of New York. [D.E. 116, 120, 155, 168, 170]. These Motions are fully briefed and ripe for disposition. For the reasons stated below, we RECOMMEND that the Motions be GRANTED. 2020 WL 5547919. On January 21, 2020, the 11th Circuit affirmed denial of defendant's motion to dissolve writs of execution. 802 Fed.Appx. 445. On March 10, 2020, Judge Carter denied the motions to dismiss and dissolve the writs of garnishment are DENIED without prejudice and this case is STAYED pending resolution of the outstanding turnover motions in the Southern District of Florida. 2020 WL 1158086. On June 20, 2019, Judge Honeywell adopted Magistrate Judge Sansone recommendation that the Plaintiffs' Motion for Turnover Judgment under the Terrorism Act be granted and the Court enter final judgment in garnishment against Ocean Bank for \$928,756.29, subject to certain conditions. 2019 WL 2537791. On August 26, 2019, Magistrate Torres recommended denial of motion to strike writ of execution. 2019 WL 10378257. On August 21, 2019, Magistrate Torres recommend deny motion to dissolve garnishment. 2019 WL 5291044. On November 13, 2018, Magistrate

Sansome (MDFL) granted The plaintiffs' motion for a writ of garnishment under the Terrorism Act against Ocean Bank and to lift stay. The court lifted the stay on execution previously entered against assets blocked under the Kingpin Act. 2018 WL 5920629

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Newton Patrick Porter, Tony P. Korvick, Porter & Korvick, Miami, FL.

Strauss v. Crédit Lyonnais, S.A. (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs Moses Strauss, et al., and Estate of Bernice Wolf, et al., who were injured, or represent persons who were injured, in terrorist attacks in Israel and Palestine in 2001-2004, allegedly committed by Hamas, jointly appeal from a March 31, 2019 judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York in these consolidated actions, Dora L. Irizarry, then-Chief Judge, (A) dismissing the complaints seeking damages against defendant Crédit Lyonnais, S.A. ("CL"), under the Antiterrorism Act of 1990 ("ATA"), see 18 U.S.C. §§ 2333(a), 2331(1), and 2339B, for providing banking services to a charitable organization that * allegedly had ties to Hamas; and (B) denying leave to amend the complaints to allege aiding-and-abetting claims against CL under the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act ("JASTA"), see id. § 2333(d). The district court granted CL's motion for summary judgment dismissing the complaints, relying principally on this Court's

decision in *Linde v. Arab Bank, PLC*, 882 F.3d 314 (2d Cir. 2018), and concluding that plaintiffs failed to adduce evidence sufficient to permit an inference that CL had committed an act involving violence, danger to human life, or an appearance of intent to intimidate or coerce a population or a government-elements of an international terrorism claim under the ATA.

Latest Opinion: On April 7, 2021, the 2nd Circuit concluded, for the reasons discussed in *Weiss*, that the district court did not err in granting summary judgment dismissing the Strauss and Wolf plaintiffs' complaints under the ATA or in denying their request for leave to amend in order to bring claims under JASTA. Accordingly, it affirmed the judgment of the district court; CL's cross-appeal is thus moot.

Prior Rulings: On March 31, 2019, Judge Irizarry granted bank's motion for summary judgment. 379 F.Supp.3d 148. On September 30, 2017, Judge Irizarry granted Defendant's motion for reconsideration only to the extent that Plaintiffs are collaterally estopped from arguing that Hamas committed the January 29, 2004 Attack, and is denied in all other respects. 2017 WL 4480755

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Aaron Schlanger, Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Cindy T. Schlanger, Michael Jacob Radine, Naomi B. Weinberg, William Adam Friedman, Osen LLC, Hackensack, NJ, David J. Strachman, McIntyre, Tate, Lynch & Holt, Providence, RI, Peter Raven-Hansen, Osen LLC, Oradell, NJ, Steven M. Steingard, Neil L. Glazer, Stephen H. Schwartz, Kohn, Swift & Graf, PC,

Philadelphia, PA, Andrew David Friedman, Wechsler, Harwood, Halebian & Feffer, L.L.P., Ramya Kasturi, Shawn Patrick Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, New York, NY, Clyde T. Turner, Turner and Associates, North Little Rock, AR, Peter R. Kolker, Aitan David Goelman, Zuckerman Spaeder LLP, Washington, DC, John M. Eubanks, Michael E. Elsner, Motley Rice LLC, Mount Pleasant, SC, Gavriel Mairone, Mann & Mairone.

Taylor v. Kings County (WDWA)

Facts: This suit is brought against King County WA under the torture act and ATA anti-terrorist act for conspiracy to infringe with the public and FBI on intellectual property of legislation of marijuana restate and the exclusive right on a software program and a patent and copyright on a water system

Latest Opinion: On February 14, 2019, Judge Martinez granted defendant motion to dismiss complaint. 2019 WL 630414

Prior Rulings: On June 20, 2019, Magistrate Creatura recommended granting defendants motion to dismiss. 2019 WL 2931320

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Tribin v. Herrera (SDFL)

Facts: On November 30, 2021, Plaintiff's Maria Tribin and Pablo Tribin filed their Complaint against Defendants' Alexander Beltran Herrera ("Herrera"), Diego Alfonso Navarrete Beltran ("Beltran"), and the

Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia ("FARC"), seeking civil damages for the kidnapping and hostage-keeping of Plaintiff Maria Tribin's father. The Complaint alleged a claim of international terrorism under 18 U.S.C. 2333(a) against Defendants

Latest Opinion: On June 15, 2023, Judge King denied defendants motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 5625745

Prior Rulings: On July 18, 2022, Judge King granted plaintiffs partial summary judgment. 2023 WL 5625615

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Martin Jorge Arias, Eric G. Zajac, Pro Hac Vice, Zajac and Arias, LLC, Philadelphia, PA.

Twitter v. Tammneh (ND Cal)

Facts: Victims and family members of victims of terrorist attacks in Paris, Istanbul, and San Bernardino, California, which were committed by persons associated with designated foreign terrorist organization, brought actions against operators of social media platforms, alleging that operators, through their platforms, provided material support to terrorist organization and aided and abetted the organization's attacks.

Latest Opinion: On May 18, 2023, the Supreme Court set the "consciously and culpably" standard under 230, dismissing the case against Twitter. 143 S.Ct. 1206

Prior Rulings: On October 29, 2018, Judge Chen granted defendants motion to dismiss. 343 F.Supp.3d 904

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Eric Schnapper, Seattle, WA.

Usoyan v. Republic of Turkey (DDC)

Facts: Protesters brought action against Republic of Turkey, Turkish security force members, and civilians, for claims including deprivation of First Amendment right to free speech and Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable seizure, as well as assault and battery arising from injuries they sustained from violent physical attacks by Turkish security forces and civilian supporters of Turkish President in two altercations outside Turkish Ambassador's residence and one altercation near Turkish Embassy during President's visit to District of Columbia, while protesters were standing on public sidewalk and were continually attacked even after they had fallen to ground or otherwise attempted to flee

Latest Opinion: On July 27, 2021, the DC Circuit affirmed denial of the motion to dismiss. 6 F.4th 31

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Agnieszka M. Fryszman argued the cause for appellees. With her on the brief were Steven R. Perles, Edward B. MacAllister, Joshua K. Perles, Douglas M. Bregman, Stephen J. Whelan, Jennifer M. Wiggins, Michael E. Tigar, Mark S. Sullivan, and Joshua Colangelo-Bryan. Andreas N. Akaras entered an appearance.

Waldman v. Palestinian Liberation Organization (SDNY)

Facts: United States citizens and guardians, family members, and personal representatives of United States citizens injured or killed in terrorist attacks in Israel brought action against Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Palestinian Authority (PA) alleging violation of Antiterrorism Act (ATA), wrongful death, battery, assault, loss of consortium and solatium, negligence, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress

Latest Opinion: On September 8, 2023, following verdict for plaintiffs, the 2nd Circuit held that because provision of PSJVTA providing for personal jurisdiction over defendants in suits under ATA was unconstitutional as violative of Due Process, provision could not serve as basis for recalling mandate

Prior Rulings: On June 3, 2019, More than two years later, and after denial of plaintiffs' petition for writ of certiorari, Congress enacted the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act (ATCA). Plaintiffs moved to recall the mandate issued after Court of Appeals' decision, which was rejected. 925 F.3d 570.

For Previous History, see Volume 1

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Kent A. Yalowitz, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY (Avishai D. Don, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, New York, NY, Allon Kedem, Dirk C.

Phillips, Stephen K. Wirth, Bailey M. Roe, Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, Washington, D.C., on the brief).

Watson v. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (NDFL)

Facts: On December 6, 2019, Mohammed Saeed Al-Shamrani committed a terrorist attack at Naval Air Station Pensacola. Before he was killed by law enforcement, Al-Shamrani murdered three U.S. Navy servicemembers. He also injured other servicemembers, as well as law enforcement officers. The terrorist organization al-Qaeda claimed responsibility for Al-Shamrani's attack

Latest Opinion: On May 11, 2023, Magistrate Bolitho recommended the dismissal of case. 2023 WL 4047586

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Andrew J. Maloney, III, Daniel O. Rose, James Paul Kreindler, Kreindler & Kreindler LLP, New York, NY, Matthew Scott Mokwa, Michael Charles Maher, The Maher Law Firm, Winter Park, FL.

Weinschenk v. Dixon (NDIN)

Facts: Charles Weinschenk, a resident of Hamilton County, Indiana, sued several state and local officials in two lawsuits that alleged a far-reaching conspiracy to harm him. The district judge assigned to both cases dismissed each complaint for failure to state a claim and warned Weinschenk that failing

to coherently plead his allegations would lead to dismissal. When subsequent complaints did nothing to clarify the claims, the district court dismissed the cases for being too frivolous to engage federal subject-matter jurisdiction.

Latest Opinion: On April 29, 2022, the 7th Circuit denied consolidation and affirmed dismissal. 2022 WL 1285222

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro se.

Weinstock v. Islamic Republic of Iran (SDFL)

Facts: This is a civil action under the Antiterrorism Act ("ATA"), 18 U.S.C. § 2333, arising from the shooting murder of U.S. citizen Yitzchak Weinstock by the terrorist group Hamas – Islamic Resistance Movement ("Hamas") on December 1, 1993, near Jerusalem. The Plaintiffs are Yitzchak's estate, mother, and siblings, and the estates of his late father and maternal grandparents. Hamas carried out the terrorist attack in which Yitzchak was murdered. Defendant Hamas was served with process in this action as of August 31, 2018. (ECF Nos. 45, 46.) However, Hamas "failed to plead or otherwise defend" this action, Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a), and after the time to do so expired, the Clerk of the Court entered default against Hamas on November 26, 2018

Latest Opinion: On May 6, 2019, Judge Scola granted plaintiff's default judgment against Hamas. 2019 WL 1993778

Prior Rulings: On April 3, 2019, Judge Scola granted default judgment against Mousa Abu Maarzook. 2019 WL 1470245

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Asher Perlin, Hollywood, FL, for Plaintiffs.

Weiss v. National Westminster Bank PLC (EDNY)

Facts: United States nationals who were, or represented, victims of more than a dozen terrorist attacks in Israel and Palestine filed amended complaints against United Kingdom bank pursuant to civil liability provision of Antiterrorism Act (ATA), asserting that bank, by providing services to charitable organization with alleged ties to designated Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO), aided and abetted murder, attempted murder, and serious physical injury of nationals, knowingly provided material support to FTOs, and unlawfully collected and transmitted funds with knowledge that they would be used for terrorist purposes

Latest Opinion: On April 7, 2021, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal of complaint. 993 F.3d 144

Prior Rulings: On March 31, 2019, Judge Irizarry granted banks' motion for summary judgment. 381 F.Supp.3d 223. On September 30, 2017, Judge Irizarry granted in part and denied in part the bank's motion for summary judgment. 278 F.Supp.3d 636. On March 31, 2017, Judge Irizarry denied plaintiffs motion to consolidate bank cases. 2017 WL 10058916

Plaintiffs Attorneys: PETER RAVEN-HANSEN, Hackensack, New Jersey (Gary M. Osen, Ari Ungar, Michael Radine, Aaron Schlanger, Osen, Hackensack, New Jersey; Steven M. Steingard, Stephen H. Schwartz, Kohn, Swift & Graf, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Shawn P. Naunton, Zuckerman Spaeder, New York, New York; C. Tab Turner, Turner & Associates, North Little Rock, Arkansas

Wildman v. Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft (EDNY)

Facts: an action brought by or on behalf of Americans who were killed or injured by terrorist attacks in Afghanistan between 2011 and 2016, and their close family members. Plaintiffs bring a claim under the civil liability provision of the Anti-Terrorism Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2333, as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, Pub. L. No. 114-222, 130 Stat. 852 (2016), against Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas (together, "Deutsche Bank"); Standard Chartered Bank, Standard Chartered PLC, and Standard Chartered Bank (Pakistan) Limited (together, "Standard Chartered"); Danske Bank A/S ("Danske Bank");¹ Placid NK Corporation ("Placid Express"); and Wall Street Exchange LLC ("Wall Street Exchange") (collectively "Defendants"), for allegedly aiding and abetting the terrorist organization responsible for the terrorist attacks.

Latest Opinion: On December 29, 2022, Judge Gonzalez granted defendants motion to dismiss. 2022 WL 17993076

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Unlisted.

Williams v. Wright (EDTX)

Facts: Plaintiff's Complaint then proceeds to include allegations stating, for instance, that the Holly Tree Board "refused free speech in newspaper" and "reduced speaking time at meetings." (Id. at 6.) Plaintiff further alleges that "Alice Robinson as president verbally attacks plaintiff as a medical fake in a crowd. Leon Wakefield has video and recording. As do I." (Id.) Plaintiff also asserts, among other things, that defendants have "conspired to construct Plaintiff and 127 homes on oil toxic land contamination." (Id. at 7.) Plaintiff also includes allegations that he was fined in order to force him to move and "had a Muslim buyer and Yvonne and board said no. To religion."

Latest Opinion: On June 16, 2017, Magistrate Love recommended the dismissal of the complaint with prejudice. 2017 WL 9324471

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Pro Se.

Zapata v. HSBC Holdings PLC (EDNY)

Facts: Plaintiffs are American victims of horrific attacks by the Sinaloa, Juárez, and Los Zetas drug cartels in Mexico. They allege that defendants "knowingly laundered billions of

dollars for [the cartels], knowing or deliberately disregarding the fact that said funds would be used to support the Mexican cartels and their terrorist acts against Mexican and U.S. citizens.

Latest Opinion: On October 16, 2020, the 2nd Circuit affirmed dismissal for failure to state a claim. 825 Fed.Appx. 55

Prior Rulings: On September 30, 2020, Judge Garaufus dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim. 414 F.Supp.3d 342. On October 17, 2017, Judge Hanen the denied Defendants' motion to transfer and granted Defendants' motion to dismiss the claims against HSBC Mexico, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2). 2017 WL 6939210. On September 14, 2017, Judge may not exert personal jurisdiction over Defendant HSBC Holdings. Defendant HSBC Holdings' Motion to Dismiss was granted. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2), Defendant HSBC Holdings was dismissed from this case. 2017 WL 6939209

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Richard Elias, Greg Gutzler, Tamara Spicer, Pro Hac Vice, Elias Gutzler Spicer LLC, Saint Louis, MO, Benigno Martinez, III, Pro Hac Vice, Law Office of Benigno Trey Martinez, PLLC, Edward Michael Rodriguez, Pro Hac Vice, Atlas Hall & Rodriguez, LLP, Brownsville, TX, Geoffrey Graber, Pro Hac Vice, Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC, Washington, DC, Michael B. Eisenkraft, Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll PLLC, New York, NY.

Zobay v. MTN Limited (EDNY)

Facts: American citizens killed or injured by terrorist attacks in Iraq and Afghanistan, or their families, brought action against several telecommunications companies, seeking damages under Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA).

Latest Opinion: On September 29, 2023, Judge Amon granted in part and denied in part the motion to dismiss. 2023 WL 6304961

Plaintiffs Attorneys: Adam Goldstein, Geoffrey P. Eaton, Pro Hac Vice, Ryan Sparacino, Pro Hac Vice, Sparacino PLLC, Washington, DC, Eli Johnson Kay-Oliphant, Sparacino PLLC, Chicago, IL.



Program on
Extremism