

Three Raymond Buildings is grossly misleading here. As the judges quoted in paragraph 30, the US in fact said, "The United States will not impose Special Administrative Measures (SAMs) on Mr Assange, pretrial or post-conviction. This undertaking is subject to the condition that **the United States retains the power to impose SAMs on Mr Assange in the event that, after entry of this assurance, he was to commit any future act that met the test for the imposition of a SAM pursuant to 28 C.F.R. §501.2 or §501.3.**" Further, other prison regimes in the US might reasonably be described as "highly restrictive". Matt Berkley, [globalfactcheck.org](http://globalfactcheck.org)

<https://3rblaw.com/2021/12/the-high-court-reverses-the-decision-to-extradite-julian-assange/>

**THREE  
RAYMOND  
BUILDINGS**  
BARRISTERS

BARRISTERS LEGAL EXPERTISE CLERKS & ADMIN INSTRUCTING US NEWS CONTACT US

+44 (0)20 7400 6400



## The High Court reverses the decision to extradite Julian Assange

In a judgment released on Friday, 10th December, the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Justice Holroyde overturned the decision of Westminster Magistrates' Court, ruling that WikiLeaks founder, Julian Assange, can be extradited to the US to face charges relating to the publishing of classified documents.

The judgment was given following assurances from US authorities that Mr Assange **would not** face **highly restrictive** prison conditions upon his extradition, either pre-trial, or post-conviction should he be found guilty.

**James Lewis QC** and **Clair Dobbin QC** appeared on behalf of the US Government, instructed by the Crown Prosecution Service.



**James Lewis QC**

Call: 1987 / QC: 2002



**Clair Dobbin QC**

Call: 1999 / QC: 2021

Three Raymond Buildings is making a false claim about an invented "assurance". It is misleading the same public who are paying for its barristers. It is in effect interfering, through this falsehood, in the political matter of the public's attitudes to extradition in this case. It is supplying a false basis for inferring the merits or otherwise of claims by Mr Assange, Amnesty International and others that the "assurances" are vague and/or unreliable.

The judgment is at: <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/USA-v-Assange-judgment101221.pdf>

The Code of Federal Regulations referred to is here: <https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-28/chapter-V/subchapter-A/part-501/section-501.2>