```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
 2
                       DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 4
                    Government ) NO: 3:04CR301(JCH)
                                       3:06CR194(JCH)
 5
                                 ) July 16, 2014
     vs.
                                 ) 9:34 a.m.
 6
 7
     BABAR AHMAD
     and SYED TALHA AHSAN
                    Defendants. )
 8
 9
                                   141 Church Street
                                   New Haven, Connecticut
10
                    SENTENCING HEARING
11
12
     B E F O R E:
13
                      THE HONORABLE JANET C. HALL, U.S.D.J.
14
     APPEARANCES:
15
     For the Government :
                              Stephen Benjamin Reynolds
                              Raymond F. Miller
16
                              U.S. Attorney's Office
17
                               157 Church Street
                              New Haven, CT 06510
18
     For the Defendant
19
     Babar Ahmad
                              Terence S. Ward
                              Kelly M. Barrett
20
                              Federal Public Defender's Office
                               10 Columbus Blvd., 6th Floor
21
                              Hartford, CT 06106
                              Joshua L. Dratel
22
                              Law Offices of Joshua L. Dratel,
23
                              P.C.
                              29 Broadway
24
                              New York, NY 10006
25
                         - Continued -
```

1	For the Defendant Syed Talha Ahsan	:	Richard A. Reeve	
3			Anand Venkata Balakrishnan Michael Sheehan	
4			Sheehan & Reeve 350 Orange St., Suite 101	
5			New Haven, CT 06511	
6				
7	Court Reporter	:	Terri Fidanza, RPR	
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
2425				
د ک				

THE COURT: Good morning. We're here this morning in the matter of the United States of America versus Babar Ahmad, Case Number 304CR301, and the matter of the United States of America versus Syed Talha Ahsan, 306CR194.

If I can have appearances, please.

MR. REYNOLDS: Good morning, your Honor. Steven
Reynolds and Ray Miller on behalf of the government. And
also with us at counsel table is Special Agent Craig Bowling
of the Department of Homeland Security and Special Agent Mike
Bush of the FBI.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you.

MR. WARD: Terrence Ward from the federal defenders office, with me is Kelly Barrett from the Federal Defenders Office, Joshua Dratel from the New York City. And Babar Ahmad who is present.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you.

MR. REEVE: Richard Reeve along with me is Anand Balakrishna and Michael Sheehan and Mr. Ahsan.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you.

Today the Court intends to proceed to the sentencing in these matters. Before I do that, there are a number of preliminary matters, I guess, that I need to address because they relate to what facts I will find.

First is the question of whether and what of the testimony of the cooperating witness the Court credits. The

witness obviously testified to a great amount of evidence. A significant portion of it related to Mr. Ahsan and his travels to Afghanistan, which I understand in principal part, Mr. Ahsan acknowledges as roughly accurate. By roughly, I mean given the fact that it's been over 15 or 14-years period of time and that people's memories are not perfect, that essentially I understood Mr. Ahsan to say that the recollections of the cooperating witness are essentially consistent with his recollections. And so in that respect, I accept the testimony of the cooperating witness. And I do so primarily because it is corroborated by and accepted by Mr. Ahsan.

With respect to the rest of his testimony, the Court is in the difficult position of having no record of what was shown to the witness and when it was shown to the witness.

In making that statement, I mean to suggest no improper conduct by anyone at any time. It is just a function of the fact that when a person sees a document after incidents that are accounted in the document, it is very easy for one's memory to become the document and not the incident recounted in the document — at least as to specifics.

Further, the Court notes that none of what corroborates, as claimed by the government, the testimony of the cooperating witness, relates to the question of whether Mr. Ahmad was in Afghanistan. I don't believe that there --

in other words, I understand the argument of the government is I should believe him about that subject because he is corroborated in his testimony on other matters. Those other matters being matters as to which there are documents. And again, that brings me back to my initial observation of not knowing when and what was shown to the witness before he ever made a statement as to whether the documents are his memory or whether his memory is consistent with, but not supplemented or supported in his memory by the documents.

2.

With respect to the travel of Mr. Ahmad to

Afghanistan, my understanding is there are no travel

documents despite the fact that he's alleged to have gone on

two occasions and for more than a few days on each occasion.

Further, there are records that he was in London in early

January of the year in question that the witness says -- now

says he saw him in Afghanistan in January.

Finally, in the course of the examination of the witness, he testified most recently that he saw Mr. Ahmad at the House of Pomegranates in Kandahar for less than a week in January of 2001. Prior to that testimony, he gave the --well, I should correct myself. We don't know what he said previously because there either are no transcripts or the transcripts were not turned over for various security reasons, or because the UK government wouldn't turn them over to the United States, and they, therefore, could not turn

them over to the defense. The bottom line is, we do not have transcriptions of what he said about Mr. Ahmad in '04 and '08 as to being in Afghanistan. What we do have, and which the government properly turned over given they finally got access to them, are the summaries by law enforcement of what was said by this witness in various debriefings.

And what was said by him in various debriefings is that he saw Babar in Kandahar in December of 2000, and that Mr. Ahmad spent one to three months training there, which it is not clear was three months before December or after. But if after, that has problems with Mr. Ahmad's conduct and appearance in London in the first week of January of 2001. When questioned about that testimony at the deposition, however, the witness said it was incorrect. In effect, he disavowed the law enforcement officer's summary of what he said in 2004. In another debriefing in '04, the witness is reported to have claimed that Mr. Ahmad was in Julaybib in 2001, which city is hundreds of miles away from Kandahar, the city in which he testified most recently to have seen Mr. Ahmad in 2001.

Again, at the deposition, the witness denied that he said that Mr. Ahmad was in Julaybib but, again, there are no transcripts available to the defense or the Court to see if, in fact, his recollection of what he said is accurate or that law enforcement's recording of what he said is accurate.

At yet another debriefing in 2008, the witness claimed to have seen Mr. Ahmad in January of 2000, which, of course, is a year off of his most recent testimony. The witness denies that statement, claims that he interchanged the dates. Again, there are no transcripts to show whether, in fact, he said 2000 or that's a mistranscription by someone else or he misspoke. The agent's notes reflect the 2000 date. Also at other 2008 debriefings, the witness claimed to have seen Mr. Ahmad in Afghanistan in February of 2000. And again in 2008, the witness claimed to have seen Ahmad in the spring of 2000, none of which is consistent with his most recent testimony in this case. On cross-examination, the witness again denied saying any of those things despite the fact they are recorded by law enforcement as things that he said.

Now the Court understands, I have seen too many times, a situation where a witness gets on the stand and says he was there on Monday and the defendant gets up and cross-examines with the FBI 302 report, or the debriefing, in which the witness said he was there on Tuesday. The witness says, I didn't say Tuesday. I said Monday. So I understand there can be inconsistencies between what somebody listening to a person hears and what he hears and then writes down versus what the witness actually said. But without the benefit of transcripts, which I gather there were transcripts

but were not provided to us, us being anyone in the U.S.

Then they -- and the number of times in which it appears,
this misrecording of what this witness claims to have said in
relation to what he now says is the case, is quite a lot. I
don't know that I can ever say I have seen somebody disavow a
law enforcement summary this many times.

Further, at a trial before a jury and under oath as well as during the deposition in this case, the witness claimed that he had been on the front lines near Kabul for six weeks, from December 2000 to the middle or end of January 2001. If that's the case, and if Mr. Ahmad was in London on January 7 and 8, it strikes the Court as impossible for the witness to have seen him in Afghanistan. I believe at some point the witness, when pressed about these inconsistencies, indicated that he would really need a three-month window, plus or minus three months, to be able to testify about when things happened. That may be the case. We are talking about events which occurred 15 or 14 or 13 years ago.

It does strike me that someone either is or isn't in a place, that's a pretty simple fact, and that's pretty easy to recall. But I can only judge credibility based on what's in front of me. And it strikes me that from the various versions given by the witness, at least as recorded by law enforcement as to what he saw or didn't see or when he saw it and where he saw it in relationship to what he's now

testifying to, that without further basis, i.e., transcripts of the interviews and the debriefings, the Court is unable to accept the testimony of the cooperating witness that he, absent any other corroboration, as I say, that he indeed saw Mr. Ahmad in Afghanistan. And absent any other evidence about that fact, the Court finds that he was not in Afghanistan.

I accept what the cooperating witness has said about Mr. Ahsan, but I do not accept his testimony that Mr. Ahmad was in Afghanistan or that he funded the witness to go to Afghanistan. I find credible the evidence of the monies withdrawn, the limited discovery the defendants had about monies withdrawn by the cooperating witness from his own account just on the eve of going to Afghanistan, and lastly, I do not find what I think the witness claimed is that Mr. Ahmad ordered the cooperating witness to go to Afghanistan. Do I find that Mr. Ahmad was aware he was going to Afghanistan, that he thought it was a good idea that he go to Afghanistan, that he encouraged him to go to Afghanistan to get training for Jihad? Yes, I find those things.

The other issues that remain open relate to the six documents that have been the subject of discussion over a series of several days. With respect to the explosives document which was found in the common room in a hard drive at the Imperial College area where Mr. Ahmad had his office,

the Court does not find by a preponderance of the evidence that it is either his document or even that it is jointly undertaken activity as that's defined in the Chapter 1.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

First of all, it was not in his possession. And while it is in an area near him and while I don't have any evidence of anybody else there that might like to talk about explosives at the Imperial College computer facilities, I do have a suggestion from the defense that people drop off computer hard drives and other equipment and that it isn't necessarily Mr. Ahmad's. To be honest, though, the thing that persuades me about it is that I see nothing else in all of the thousands of pages that I have reviewed that ever suggests that Mr. Ahmad was talking about explosives, or there's nothing on the website about it, it's not in any e-mails. I'll refer to the classified record yesterday in which there's something that might suggest he wasn't because he didn't respond to a request. So for all of those reasons, I don't see how it is reasonably foreseeable to him, let alone jointly undertaken.

With respect to the org chart, I find that is his document. It's not jointly undertaken, it is his. It was found in his parent's, it was created in January of 2000. I'm not sure I know who everybody is on the chart, but I certainly think that if he didn't actually create it, certainly it is ascribable to him. It involves names of

people, including himself, and activities, manning the dowa to sell the videos, all of which is consistent with the activity in the case.

With respect to the equipment document, that was in the common room, however, it is consistent with equipment which he's acknowledged he caused sent to Chechnya. I do not find it relates to anything to do with Al-Qaida. I believe he sent two sat phones and an encrypted laptop, and I read the document to be involved in discussing that. So in that respect, I do ascribe that document to him, if not directly, then as reflecting jointly undertaken activity because it does reflect something he has acknowledged that he did.

With respect to the dec one document written in 2001, that was found in his locked office and I see no way not to find that's his document. However, I do not read it the way the government wishes me to read it. I went back last night and again this morning and read it. And I do not find the reference to Abdullah to be to Osama bin Laden, both by the absence of the Abu and also by the context of the reference to the Abdullah. I don't think it makes sense that it's Osama bin Laden. And the reference to the first Saif, I do not believe is the number three Al-Qaida person because later on that name is spelled out fully and properly. So in the beginning of the documents where I think the government wishes to argue this is evidence of Al-Qaida connections, the

Court does not accept that argument.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Lastly, on the details and briefing documents. I'm not really sure why I spent so much time worrying, I quess, quote, unquote, over these. There's a lot in these documents that is similar to what Mr. Ahmad has admitted. I do not find them to be his personally. One is definitely, by just the whole context and how he's referred to, was not written by him. They are not found in his home or his parent's home or his office, so they are not his in that They are not prepared, I think, by him personally. So the question really becomes, are they jointly undertaken activity and reasonably foreseeable to him? They talk a lot about getting people into Afghanistan. About being careful in terms of getting people through Pakistan because Pakistani's didn't want people going into Afghanistan. of that is consistent with other documents about Mr. Ahmad corresponding with his cousin, having contacts over there. believe I date the document some time in 2000. I don't know if that's accurate. I believe late 2000. I'm going to find that it is jointly undertaken activity. I cannot find that he wrote it. I find he didn't write it. I find he -- I'm not even sure he was aware of it, but it is consistent with some things that Mr. Ahmad, I find, was engaged in. therefore, I will find it to be jointly undertaken activity because it was reasonably foreseeable to him.

At this point, I intend to begin the process, which will be very painful, of going through the PSR.

I suggest you have a pen ready and you mark it up because when I'm done, I'm going to ask what objections, if any, are there to the court's findings. The court adopts the cover sheet except that the sentencing date is altered to be today's date, July 16 at 9:30. There are three pages to the cover sheet. The court adopts paragraph 1. The court adopts paragraph 2 except the sentencing date is altered. The court adopts paragraph 3 except it inserts in the sixth line after the reference to 3A1.4(b) of the sentence, the guidelines are 25 years.

Further, the next sentence two lines down refer to the parties agree to. I would insert in a maximum sentence of 25 years. With respect to the fourth line, the date for the sentencing of Mr. Ahsan needs to be amended, otherwise I adopt it. I adopt paragraph 5. I adopt paragraph 6. I adopt paragraph 7 except that there's a typo in the seventh line. There's a reference to the undersigned counsel. Undersigned should not be there. I adopt paragraph 8 except I delete the last reference referring to an attachment that doesn't exist. Adopt paragraph 8 -- I'm sorry. Paragraph 9, paragraph 10 except in paragraph 10 at the top of page 7, line 3, I delete the word attached which is not attached. I adopt paragraphs 11, 12, 13, and 14. I include paragraph 15

except that I alter the sentence about the probation office considers the government's version to be insert the word largely factually accurate. I adopt that is not the court's adoption. I'm stating what the probation officer's view is. I adopt paragraph 16. I next adopt paragraph 2 of the defendant's version of the offense and relevant conduct. Is that right? Just a moment. Strike that please. I meant to say I adopt paragraph 3 of the stipulation. I then adopt paragraphs 17 through 27 of the defendant's version which appears at pages 4 and 5 of their 64 page version.

With respect to what is in paragraph 18, I first adopt stipulations three through nine. I then adopt a portion of paragraph 18 beginning at approximately line 9 which reads among other things, the Azzam websites, colon, then it iterates six things. So in effect, paragraph 18 is stipulation paragraphs three through nine and then the second half of what is there. I adopt paragraph 19. With respect to paragraph 21, I adopted edited as follows: only Ahmad was involved with individuals who traveled to Afghanistan to train for Jihad.

I adopt paragraph 24 except it will read edited as follows: Ahmad asked an individual to join and become a member of Azzam Publications, who assisted with orders submitted from around the globe for Azzam Publications products promoting Jihad. The individual also attended a

weekend camping trip with Ahmad. The spelling should be correct of Mr. Ahmad's name, in the United Kingdom period. Ahmad subsequently helped this individual to go to Afghanistan to train for Jihad, period. This individual received and observed Syed Talha Ahsan in training camps in Afghanistan. Other than the individual and Talha Ahsan, the court does not find that Ahmad was involved in sending other The individual observed Ahsan attend persons to Afghanistan. training camps together with Ahsan -- twice in Afghanistan. The individual took an explosive training course together with Ahsan during one such period that they overlapped. The second time he saw Ahsan in Afghanistan, Ahsan was ill. The individual took him to get medical care. The individual who is cooperating witness testified that Ahsan was 19 years old in Afghanistan, was not in any Al-Qaida camp, was taken to the front, it was not his choice, that he was naive and not supportive of Al-Qaida or its actions, all of which the court finds true.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Further, this cooperating witness testified that Mr.

Ahmad was there for one to three months and at a time when

Ahmad was in London, as I previously said, the court does not accept the witness's testimony in this regard.

The court adopts paragraph 25, except that it amends the fourth line of text there to read employed violence in military action to kill, injure and maim Russians in an

effort to promote the political goals of its members which included driving the Russians out of Chechnya and establishing Chechnya's independence over Russia or from Russia.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Paragraph 26 is adopted except it is edited at line four as follows: It is the Chechen Mujahideen that eventually, paren, '02 to '03 and later, end paren, employed violence in military action to kill, injure and maim civilians, to damage and destroy property, in an effort to promote the political goals of its members at the time Ba-si-aad (phonetic) engaged in this conduct, Mr. Ahmad was no longer supportive of him. Paragraph 27 I adopt. Paragraph 28 I adopt. In line 4, it should read steps which he carried out against the United States both in the United States and against U.S. abroad through Al-Qaida and its affiliated organizations. Three lines below that a sentence begins during the time relevant to the indictment despite, insert despite requests by the United States to turn over Bin Laden, the Taliban allowed territory under its control in Afghanistan to be used as a safe heaven and base of operations for Bin Laden and Al-Qaida and continuing as it is written.

Paragraph 29, 30, 31, and 32 are adopted. I believe that 33, 34 is duplicative so I'm not adopting them. 35 is adopted. I believe 36 is duplicative as what I have done as

is 37. 38 is adopted. 39 is adopted except at the end, the court adds the following: the court does not find any evidence sufficient to support the conclusion that Babar Ahmad was involved in these websites such as Waagiah after 2002.

I next would insert the defendant's versions paragraph 37 through 41 in part as follows: I would adopt the second sentence in 37, the second sentence in 38, the entirety of 39, the entirety of 40 and the entirety of 41.

Next the court adopts 42 at the end of which the court asserts the defendant's version paragraph 47, which I'm having trouble finding, a footnote at the bottom of the page reads, quote, Azzam Publications is solely engaged in the publication of material and the distribution of news. It is not linked in any form or manner whatsoever with any Mujahideen group anywhere, end quote.

The court adopts paragraph 43, 44, 45 and 46. The court adopts 47 except it inserts at the beginning of the paragraph the Azzam website, as did many Main Street media, also publish the full content of Bin Laden's 1996 declaration et cetera.

The court adopts paragraph 50, 51, 52, all the way down through 63, the court adopts 66 through 73. After 73, the court inserts the following: the court finds that these postings on the Azzam dot.net, Qogaz dot.net are attributable

to Mr. Ahmad and he's responsible for either directly or indirectly these postings.

Paragraph 75 through 83 are adopted, paragraph 84 is adopted to read that Babar Ahmad stipulated that he personally helped to operate and administer Azzam

Publications which the two websites Azzam dot.net and Qogaz dot.net.

Paragraph 89 is adopted except the second sentence is amended as follows: while -- strike going to great lengths to. It should then read while concealing his involvement.

Paragraph 90 is a adopted. Paragraph 91 is adopted. Paragraph 95 is adopted. Paragraph 106 is adopted except the word locked is deleted in the last sentence. Paragraph 107 is adopted in part as follows: the first sentence is adopted. The fifth sentence is adopted except -- and the sixth sentence is adopted except it is edited to read in short in at least 2001 Ahmad was found in possession of, control of and use of the private encryption key necessary for administration of the Azzam dot-com website. Accordingly, as he admitted, had control over the very sign register for the website.

Paragraphs 110 through 117 are adopted. Paragraph
121 is adopted except it is amended to say Hassan Abu-Jihaad,
the man who sent the battleship document, was eventually
convicted.

Paragraph 122 is adopted. Paragraph 125 is adopted except the phrase over 50 is deleted. The paragraph 126 is adopted and the following is added. The battleship document was found on a floppy disk at his parent's home. The court finds that Mr. Ahmad did receive it at sometime. opened, the last being August of 2001. The court cannot find who opened it. It could have been opened before it arrived at Mr. Ahsan's parents' house or after. I do not know. There's no evidence from which the court can reasonably In addition the court adds to that paragraph. conclude. Sorry, I lost what I wish to add. I believe that what I wished to add there was that the evidence that has just been adopted by the court as to the battleship document and in particular Mr. Ahsan and Mr. Ahmad's treatment of it, causes the court to conclude that neither of them had interest in operational terrorist activities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The paragraph 131 is adopted. Except that -paragraph 131 is adopted. While I'm not sure it is
particularly relevant to the case, I do adopt 132 to 143.

144 is adopted with the additional language at the end that
the suits in question were meant for and sent to Chechnya.

145 is adopted except that in the middle with the reference
to the textured body armor plates should be inserted that
they were sold by Mr. Ahmad on Ebay in England and further
should be added that Mr. Ahmad acknowledges that in addition

and encrypted laptops also went to Chechnya. The kevlar helmets were sold to Ebay, the vests were still in his possession at the time of the search. As to anything else, there's no evidence other than the encryption laptop that went to the Afghanistan. There's no other evidence of supplying material to the Chechens or the Afghanis.

Paragraph 146 is adopted. The reference to locked is struck and it should be edited to read recovered from computer median in the outer office to Ahmad's office at Imperial College, the equipment document was found.

Paragraph 147 is adopted. Paragraph 148 is adopted.

Again the court has indicated that it does not find the reference to Abdullah to be Bin Laden because he's referred to as Abu Abdullah.

Further, the first reference in page one to Saif that's not recounted on the PSR. It was not included in the government's version is not the number three head of Al-Qaida at the time because he's later referred to by his full name. The court does not find this document to suggest support for other participation with Al-Qaida other than in connection of reporting news.

The court adopts paragraph -- as I previously indicated, I believe I found that the details and briefing documents were jointly undertaken activity and therefore, I

will adopt the PSR except that in paragraph 150 again I don't find that he wrote the documents, but they relate to matters in which he was generally involved and foreseeable to him.

2.

However, I would strike the references to fight in in the two lines 3 and 4 where they appear. I do not adopt that. I adopt 151 because they continue at long length to recite and 152 the document in question. 153 is adopted.

163 is adopted. 164 is adopted. Not really sure it is relevant conduct. It is background perhaps however the word disguised at end of the first sentence is not adopted and struck. 165 is adopted except the first sentence will read as follows: the investigation also determined that Ahmad organized a camping trip in the UK, period.

as follows: the second line where it reads Ahmad's Tooting Circle where he was asked, strike recruited by Ahmad to take on an ever increasing role and work of the Azzam Publications. 157 is stricken as a typo. The next sentence is adopted up to the words cassette. The rest is stricken until it begins according to the individuals. 167 is adopted, 168 is adopted. 170 is adopted as follows: the individual also described him having personally traveled after discussing it with Ahmad to Bosnia to hear firsthand from Bosnian veterans, period. The individual described detailed instructions Ahmad gave to him and others about how

they were to travel to Bosnia. What gear they should bring with them. While in Bosnia the other individuals received very limited training on a number of different weapons, etc. 171 is adopted as edited as follows: The individual testified that he discussed going to Afghanistan with Ahmad beginning in late 1998 and to attend the training camp. Ahmad in his discussions with the individual talked about him being his representative in the sense that, for example, he would receive Syed Talha Ahsan when he planned to go for training The individual identified Ahsan, who according to at a camp. the individual, was a recruit that Ahmad sent and who attended camps in Afghanistan on one occasion and on the second visit, did nothing because he didn't remain due to illness.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The court adopts 172 except the court does not adopt the last sentence of 172. The court adopts 175, 176 and 177. Similarly the court adopts part C. All the paragraphs in part C which are personal history which are personal history and background, part F and part G. I will take the government's objections to the court's findings.

MR. REYNOLDS: All I would say I think we made a clear record of opposition. We respectfully acknowledge the court's findings.

THE COURT: Attorney Ward.

MR. WARD: Ms. Barrett is going the handle this part

of the proceeding, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BARRETT: We have no objection just with the clarification on part G, the probation officer's evaluation we had received an updated.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. The officer asked me to deal I didn't even address that section. I don't know that I technically adopt part G. It is the officer's evaluation but he has asked me to indicate that he has made revisions to paragraph 240 and 244 so if you have the original report in front of you, he has revised the sentence that begins about nine lines down, the probation officer, he know wants it to read the probation officer, like defense counsel, has reviewed the government's version of the offense and relevant conduct and essentially agree that the content, specifically the Taliban postings available on the website, cannot be discounted from overall intent and purpose that being to provide material support to the Taliban who supported Al-Qaida will further at the end of that paragraph, instead of the last two sentences, those would be deleted and he would have it read the parties agree the defendants in this case cannot be directly connected to any specific acts of terrorism. However, the operation of the Azzam Publications was in support of the Taliban who supported Al-Qaida and as such, their efforts to raise money and material for the Taliban renders them indirectly connected to

Al-Qaida. That's a part of the criminal conduct in this case. Further at the paragraph 44, he would delete the first sentence and the word -- the first two sentences and the word regardless all the way up to the word regardless. He would keep the last portion of 244 beginning with the court is required to sentence. I'm sorry. Thank you for reminding me of that. That was Officer Lopez's request with respect to his recommendation. Is there anything else, Attorney Barrett?

MS. BARRETT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I will proceed to determine the guidelines I think.

I should say what I always say in connection with the sentencing. It's my obligation to determine the sentence here today, Mr. Ahmad, after considering all the material that I have in front of me and all that I accept as true, and considering the factors that our Congress has identified as relevant to the issue of sentencing. I will go over all of those with you before I announce your sentence. But we first start with something known as the sentencing guidelines, which are a device created by Congress to create a range of sentence which it thinks is appropriate based on various criteria for particular crimes committed by people with certain criminal histories.

In this case, the guidelines have what I would call

automatic adjustments, which alter what would normally be the 1 2 guideline calculation. So I'm just going to state them on the record. I will ask counsel if there's any objection. I 3 4 will have some comments about the quidelines as I get to the 5 issues of unwarranted sentencing disparities and the guidelines generally in connection with all of the factors. 6 Under the quidelines, because of the nature of the offense 7 with which you were convicted of two counts, Mr. Ahmad, 8 Section 2X2.1 sends me to Section 2A1.1 because it involves a 9 conspiracy to commit murder. That becomes a 28 point level. 10 11 There is then under Section 3B1.4A, have I got that right? 12 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: A 12 level enhancement because the crime 14 that you pled guilty to qualifies as a terrorism crime as 15 defined by Congress. In addition, the Court finds under Chapter 3 that, 16 17 in fact, you were a leader of the activity at issue here, and 18 there were more than five people involved. 19 organizational chart, I guess, would be the first piece of 20 evidence to look to to support that finding. That takes you to a level 44. 21 22 Does the government recommend a two-level reduction 23 for acceptance of responsibility and move for the third point 24 under 3E1.1B?

MR. MILLER: We do, your Honor.

25

THE PROBATION OFFICER: I'm sorry, your Honor, just to be clear, Paragraph 182. 3A1.4A, that's the Chapter 3 terrorism increase.

THE COURT: My brain is not working at hyperspeed, so let's start with what you were referring to.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: I think you made a reference to 3B1.4A.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE PROBATION OFFICER: The Chapter 3 adjustment for the 12 level increase is 3A1.4A.

THE COURT: Thank you.

On the government's recommendation and on the defendant's guilty plea and admission that he committed the two crimes to which he plead guilty, because of his support of the Taliban at a time when the Taliban was protecting an individual who was committing acts of terrorism and murdering and maiming individuals around the world, the Court -- because of his guilty plea, the Court awards Mr. Ahmad a two-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

Further, based on the government's motion under 3E1.1B, that Mr. Ahmad agreed to enter into a guilty plea at a time that allowed the government to put its resources to other investigations and criminal prosecutions, the Court agrees and grants the motion and awards Mr. Ahmad a further one-level reduction. That results in a criminal history

level of 41.

In addition, because of the characterization of the crimes Mr. Ahmad pled to as terrorism crimes, I believe, again, 3A1.4 causes the criminal history to automatically become VI. Therefore, the guideline sentence applicable here under level 41 and criminal history VI -- I should find first that Mr. Ahmad has no criminal history personally. He has never been convicted of a crime. But the guidelines call for him to be treated as if he's in a Category VI, which typically is a person who has committed, at a minimum, three and up, could be more, serious felonies. Treating him as a Category VI and a Level 41 results in a guideline range of 360 months to life.

However, because he pled guilty to two counts, each of which carry a maximum -- statutory maximum of 15 years each, his maximum sentence is 30 years. Therefore, by operation of the maximum, that sentence of 30 years becomes his guideline sentence.

However, the plea agreement called for under 11C1C, the parties had agreed that his maximum sentence would be 25 years. And the Court accepts -- has accepted that agreement. And therefore, I deem that, in effect, a Fernandez departure of the guideline sentence from 30 down to 25.

Does anyone disagree with the guideline analysis, calculation or conclusion stated at the end as to what the

guideline sentence and departed guideline sentence is?

MR. MILLER: The government agrees with the Court's analysis and agrees with the Fernandez departure.

THE COURT: Attorney Ward.

MR. WARD: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: I must now turn, Mr. Ahmad, to all the other factors that I alluded to very briefly a moment ago, which Congress has identified as relevant to a judge's consideration of what would be a fair and just sentence in this case. Before I turn to those factors, which I will outline, I wish to make a few preliminary remarks about your case in general.

In this case, the government has expressed a view of what was involved and indeed has argued that you have falsely denied some measure of your responsibility, or perhaps put another way, minimized what you did and in some respects accused Mr. Ahsan as well of shaving around the corners or minimizing what he did. On the other hand, the defendants have spent quite a bit of time, in effect, seeking to minimize what their clients have done -- and I don't mean that in any way as a criticism -- but effectively criticizing the government for imprinting on this case the term "terrorism" then attempting to imprint terrorism upon the defendants when, in the defendant's view, that's not supported by evidence or reasonable inference. I have spent

a lot of time looking at what was put in front of me, what evidence the government has, what arguments each side wishes to make, what inferences you want me to draw. And I have to say that it has not -- it has been an extremely difficult task. And I'm not sure I have come close to succeeding in fully understanding Bosnia and its impact on Mr. Ahmad, or Chechnya and what was, at times, and at other times -- at one time maybe people acting for the good and at other times people becoming evil. Or in Afghanistan, where I will never understand the views of the Taliban, particularly their views towards women. And yet they occupied their land, and they were fighting to defend their land.

But that isn't why you are here, Mr. Ahmad. You are here because of what they then went on to do beyond that, which was to protect a man who, even if it wasn't understood by the world or by you, was responsible for two horrific acts of terrorism, was in Afghanistan being enabled to proceed to commit what, at least in the United States's view, is the most heinous act of the terrorism of 9-11. The problem I feel as I've spent weeks going over this material is that we're standing here in 2014, looking back through the glasses that we own in 2014, at facts that occurred, in some respects, more than 20 years ago, some of which are highly contested as to what they mean and who did what. We have almost too much, in some respects, information. And I

really, in my self sense, a limited ability to be able to understand what was happening in the context of when it was happening. I look back in the context of what I know now. But I don't feel that I have been capable of looking back and saying to myself, this is what Mr. Ahsan was thinking when he said I will help the website, or Mr. Ahmad was thinking when he put up an appeal to Pakistanis to fund the Taliban who had enabled Osama bin Laden to blow up 3,000 people including someone he knew. That I cannot understand.

I guess my final remark will be that I think that in, as is often the case in an adversary system, which is what our system is, and the job of both lawyers on each side, that the government argues, and I find sort of too wide, in describing what Mr. Ahmad did. And in some respects the defendants, especially Mr. Ahmad, seeks to have me view this too narrowly. And so I will undertake the job that is assigned to me in this system of justice, which is to attempt to decide the facts that are applicable to the sentencing, to draw reasonable conclusions from the same, and then to that take all of that into consideration to address the factors Congress has identified to arrive at a fair and just sentence.

There are two -- there's always a challenge sentencing any human being. I effectively have the power to take away someone's liberty. Obviously, these two men have

had their liberty taken away for a long time, but they can continue to have their liberty taken away by what I do today. So it's always the most difficult thing we do as judges. But here, today, it seems to me the challenge -- there's two other aspects to this that I want to mention just so that the defendants, I guess, in the first instance, and the counsel also understand that it is my goal that neither of these challenges will affect my judgment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One is that I don't believe I can sentence these two men out of a fear of some general notion of terrorism and an assumption that because these two men have been charged with a crime that we categorize as terrorism, that they will somehow be involved in the future in terrorism. Of course, as I say that, it causes me great pause. I always think about, when I sentence anyone, will I wake up 5, 10, 15, whatever the sentence is I give someone, I wake up some morning and read in the newspaper that the drug dealer that I let out in that time period just killed a three year old in a drive-by shooting. That's not the only reason sentencing is difficult, but that's something that weighs on judges' minds. If you make a mistake, what are the consequences of your misjudgment of the character of the defendant or his likelihood of repeating what he did in the past?

Of course, in this instance with the mantle of terrorism, that concern is enormous. If I wake up, I don't

know, whatever time it is, whatever sentence I give Mr.

Ahmad, five years after he's out and on the front page of the New York Times is his name associated with, I don't know, the bombing of something, the sense of responsibility for that on me is enormous. And I'm only human. I can only make the judgments as best I can, but I understand, and I have to be conscious of this, that if I misjudge these defendants, that it could be the cause of great harm. But I don't think it's right to act on what I would call an unfounded fear that a defendant might do something, like a terrorist act, and therefore we should just lock that person up forever.

In this case, even the government doesn't seek that. Doesn't view, I think, these defendants as people like the Blind Sheikh or Ramzi Yousef, or I guess I could name a few others, whom I don't think anyone would release because there's no question that have committed -- the nature of the acts they committed is such that we can't allow the risk that they might do the same thing. In a moment, I'm going to discuss the nature of the acts that Mr. Ahmad and Mr. Ahsan committed, but they don't come close to those types of acts. And so, merely because the word "terrorism" is associated with this case, I think I need to be conscious of assessing the nature and circumstances of what the defendants did and not merely react to that title as ascribed to this case. It seems to me there must be distinctions between and among

people who do acts which make them guilty of material support under 371, 339A, 956, even 2332B, we can't treat all of the material support cases the same.

This is not an operational case. I believe the government agrees that there were never any plots even discussed by these defendants. There was never any aid given by these defendants to effectuate a plot. By plot, I mean a terrorist plot. A plot to go out and purposely harm civilians.

What these defendants did is that they gave material support, or they sought to raise and get material support, they wanted material support to flow to the Taliban at a time when the Taliban was protecting Osama bin Laden. Which, of course, allowed Osama bin Laden to be protected and to proceed to plan for and carry out the 9-11 attacks. But the defendants, I should say, never, that I can see, had any knowledge of that. I'm not even sure they had knowledge of the true nature of Mr. bin Laden. Perhaps by the summer of 2001, which makes the posting in the fall of '01 more troubling as to Mr. Ahmad, but certainly did not know what was being planned at the time.

The other aspect I think I mentioned, too, in connection with the challenge I face, it has been mentioned in some of the papers, it seems to me it would be inappropriate for me to sentence these two defendants out of

a fear that somebody observing this court would view my action as unjust and that, therefore, I should sentence in a certain way so I wouldn't be subject to that criticism. There's a reason they give me life tenure in this country. And the brilliance of our constitution is that I don't care about that. What I care about is that my sentence reflect my best judgment after considering all the factors I'm required to consider and weighing them in my best judgment and explaining them to the public as to why I sentence a defendant the way I do. It's my hope that if I do that right, if I perform my job responsibly, then my sentence will be seen as reasonable and just. Doesn't mean everyone will see it that way, but I cannot -- how can I put this? cannot let my judgment be affected by the fact that someone or another -- and this could be from either side of the aisle which isn't quite an aisle in this courtroom -- but will be critical of what I do. So, Mr. Ahmad, we'll turn to those factors that I talked about that I need to address. I should state, I think I said this earlier -- I'm sorry, there's another The addendum to the Presentence housekeeping detail, Ray. Report should contain Attorney Barrett's letter. THE PROBATION OFFICER: It should, your Honor, to add to that, getting back to the PSR real quickly, Paragraphs

229 and 230 which deal with restitution, those will be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

amended to state that restitution is not applicable in this case.

2.

THE COURT: That would be correct. Thank you.

Mr. Ahmad, I'm going to start with the nature and circumstance of what you did to commit this crime. You obviously were very actively -- you don't need to stand, this is going to take awhile I'm afraid, apropos of my desire to have people understand why I'm doing what I'm doing.

In my view, the nature and circumstance of what you did, Mr. Ahmad, starts with the fact that you were very involved with and actively engaged in Azzam Publications and the two websites we have spoken about, Azzam.com and Qogaz.net. The two websites and as well as the products from Azzam Publications appear to have been extremely popular, likely because they were in the English language. They disseminated information that was of interest to Muslims who were in the English-speaking world, and they provided information, and unfortunately, at some times, propaganda to that audience about what was happening in what you view to be the struggles that Muslims were engaged in in both Bosnia, Chechnya and then Afghanistan.

I believe that the two websites were principally comprised of material relating to the struggle in Bosnia by Muslims against the Serbs and their efforts to ethnically cleanse Bosnia of Muslims. And then later, in Chechnya, in

what were really a two-step attack by Russians on Chechens and the response by Chechens supported by foreign Mujahideen, including General Khattab, to fight back or to drive out Russians from Chechnya.

And then lastly, of course, it eventually turns to Afghanistan where the Taliban, of course, if we go back with our history, was initially fighting the Russians with support by the United States. That eventually evolved into an internal struggle between the Taliban and the Northern Alliance as to who would be in control of which parts of the country, then finally evolved into a dispute with the United States and the Taliban, in particular surrounding the fact that the Taliban allowed Osama bin Laden to return to Afghanistan and, in effect, protected him, allowing him to continue his operations and to develop and grow Al-Qaida.

The period in question that I look at is roughly from 1997 to 2002. It followed the time that you had spent in Bosnia as a young man, which I understand is really not the relevant conduct in this case. I mention it, though, because of the impact I believe it had upon you in deciding what it is you wanted to do when you returned to the United Kingdom. And, in my view, you determined that you would try to use media, videos, recordings, website publications as a way to communicate with your fellow Muslims about what was happening in Bosnia and then in Chechnya, and then eventually

in Afghanistan, and to encourage your fellow Muslims to fulfill their -- I'm not going to use the right word here, it will reflect my ignorance, Mr. Ahmad -- but to address Jihad and what it means to a Muslim.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I have to say, and I say this as an American citizen who firmly believes in the First Amendment and people's rights to say what they want to say as far as expressing their opinion, there is much content on the website and as published by Azzam Publications that I find offensive. I think I could say it's fair to say it's disrespectful of other people, people who aren't Muslims. don't agree with it. But I can't say you didn't have a right to say it. I wish you hadn't. I mean, to show a picture of a Chechen Mujahideen holding the liver of a Russian soldier in the context of what you think is a righteous war, I don't know. I don't see that as righteous. I don't see killing an unarmed prisoner of war and then displaying that to the public, I don't see that as right or righteous. Publicizing to the world the atrocities that occurred in Bosnia, yes. Yes, they are graphic. And yes, they are harsh, but they were wronged by the other side and the world needed to know about it.

As to the Taliban aspect, which is really, I think, why you are here in front of me convicted of two counts of material support, I don't know to what extent you were

uninformed or you didn't want to accept the truth or you really just bought into the propaganda of much of what's on there about Osama bin Laden, but that's sort of the nature of what you had on your website. Now most of the material you had up there was about Bosnia and Chechnya, which I don't think relates to your offense of conviction conduct. say, it might be offensive, but I don't believe it's what makes you guilty of the crime that you are front of me on of. And a lot of the material you had up there was just reproduction of other people's material. At the same time, however, for example, Osama bin Laden's declaration from '96, yes, it was published in popular media, but you made it available at a site that attacked Muslims readily available and available for a long time. Now, again, it's First Amendment, I have a right to read it, to possess it, but to the extent of what it represents and what it calls for people to do, it's an abomination. I did want to mention, I have mentioned briefly, but I do not accept the government's view that the postings about Chechnya are somehow related to material support. Fortunately, we don't have to resolve the issue because I find material support that satisfies the statute and makes Mr. Ahmad guilty of the crime that arises from what he did

vis-a-vis the Taliban and their protection of Osama bin Laden

and their fighting against the United States. To the extent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

he provided camouflage suits and two sat phones and two laptops and he provided "news reporting on videos extolling what was happening in Chechnya," I find that this support occurred at a time prior to when the Chechen Mujahideen, became what really were terrorists akin to Osama bin Laden. They were banned, this group was banned by the United States in '03. They were a splinter group of the Chechen Mujahideen. They engaged in the horrific acts, which you all may remember, the Moscow Theater hostage and murder situation and taking of a school in a town whose name I'm not going to remember. But this is not what Mr. Ahmad was covering. Ιt didn't occur at a time he was involved in the websites. while I appreciate that it's in the case, it's background because it's what was on the websites and what -- the videos that were being sold. Again, I don't view that as part of his offense conduct. Maybe I'm influenced by the fact that I believe that at various times, the U.S. supported the rebels against the Russians in Chechnya, that we spoke about how the Chechens were not terrorists at the time they were trying to expel the Russians, which is the time that Mr. Ahmad was doing what he was doing on the web with respect to Chechnya. There's nothing on the web to extol the terrorist acts that the splinter group engaged in in '03. And I don't find that Al-Qaida was any part of the Chechen rebels.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In that regard, I just wish to make a general

observation, this is really out of order, but after reading the various expert reports, it's my conclusion that there were many Muslims from the United Kingdom who traveled to central Europe, Bosnia, Chechnya and Afghanistan at various times in the '80s and '90s and into 2000, to either fight for or to attend training camps. It's this Court's view, I hope I'm not mistaken, I believe I'm correct, that of those thousands of U.K. Muslims, a very small number of them ended up in Al-Qaida. That for the most part, they, like Mr. Ahsan, went to Afghanistan, for example, went to a training In Mr. Ahsan's case, I do not find he went to an camp. Al-Qaida training camp, but even those who went to Al-Qaida training camps, not all of them joined Al-Qaida. In fact, the Court's view is that very few did. Most of them returned home and went back to what I would call normal lives.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So there has been the use in this case of the phrase "violent Jihad" and the use of the word "terrorism" and the use of the word "Jihad." In my view, the Jihad does not equal terrorism. All terrorists appear, over the last 20 years, to carry out acts under a banner of Jihad. They claim that. In my view, they misappropriate that phrase. And indeed, their use of the word "Jihad" is a perversion of what Islam teaches.

As I understand it, and I could be very wrong, but my understanding is that the concept of Jihad in Islam is

struggle, and it's both an internal and a defensive struggle, but it's never what happened on 9-11.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So turning back to the nature and circumstances of what Mr. Ahmad did, it really brings us to Afghanistan. he has admitted responsibility, I'm going to ask him later to confirm that I'm accurate in this respect, for various postings on his websites for which he was an administer and for which he admits responsibility and control. I'm going to point to two in particular, one on February of 2001, what I can do to help the Taliban. More importantly, one in the fall of 2001, the appeal to Pakistanis, which was up from late '01 to the middle of '02, and which called for people to funnel substantial amounts of money into the Taliban to support them in their fight against the United States and in their fight which was, in effect, on behalf of Osama bin Laden in the sense of protecting him. All of this after it was clear that Al-Qaida was responsible for the terrorist acts of the embassy bombings, the terrorist attack on the Cole, and the terrorist attacks of 9-11.

These sites were very, as I said, popular. They were a source of information for English-speaking Muslims.

They contained propaganda, they contained religious information. And they had rants against, among others,

Zionist crusaders. But relevant to this case, those two postings, I think, are sort of Exhibit A and Exhibit B of why

Mr. Ahmad is guilty of the crimes he has confessed to.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's no question that by 1999, which predates these postings by two years, the United States government had demanded that Osama bin Laden be turned over by Afghanistan. Now, just a way of background, Osama bin Laden was a hero in Afghanistan for his fighting in the first war that the Taliban waged against the Russians to expel them from Afghanistan. He subsequently appears to have fallen a bit out of favor and went to -- I think I misspoke the other day -- not Yemen but the Sudan. But he was thrown out of there. My sense is nobody really wanted to take him except the Taliban took him. The Taliban continued to protect him for several years. After having committed the Cole and embassy bombings, even though he had not publicly acknowledged that, but it became known that he accepted responsibility for those bombings by the middle of 2001. Again, before the posting in the fall appeal to Pakistanis.

The Taliban refused to turn over Osama bin Laden the -- which was a subject of writings on the website for which Mr. Ahmad is responsible, in fact, applauds the Taliban for not turning him over and denies that bin Laden was responsible for the first two of the terrorist attacks I keep mentioning and then goes on to seek to raise money and to encourage people to go fight shoulder to shoulder with the Taliban in their fight against the United States, and against

the United States because Osama bin Laden would not be turned over.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As to the defendant's claim that there's no evidence that money ever flowed as a result of his conduct. Given the instructions provided on the website, the Court does not find it surprising that there is no evidence. The whole nature of the instructions given to people who wish to give money is to proceed in a highly secretive manner, independent of banks or other traditional manners of carrying and transporting and transferring money, but rather to do it secretively, personally, without trusting anybody and not telling anyone about it. The fact is, I have nothing in front of me to show whether Mr. Ahmad was successful and he raised \$20,000 for the Taliban or he raised \$2 million for the Taliban. know. What I do know, though, is that Mr. Ahmad wanted to raise money for the Taliban. He wanted the Taliban to have money. He wanted them to be supported so that they could continue to protect Osama bin Laden, and they could continue to fight the United States of America.

We spent a lot of time yesterday and last week and in the hundreds or thousands of pages that have been filed with the Court over the issue of whether Mr. Ahmad directly supported Al-Qaida. And I'm really not sure where the government is right now on that position, whether it's still their view that he did that. If it is, it's not this Court's

view. To the extent he wrote about Al-Qaida and he sought support for the Taliban who would protect Al-Qaida, the way I read his writings and postings and appeals are he was supportive 100 percent of the Taliban. He was supportive of them when they protected Osama bin Laden. He was supportive of them when they fought the United States. But I don't see in that any support for Al-Qaida in the sense of he believed in, subscribed to, wanted to write about, never wrote about, what I would call Al-Qaida views of the world.

He knew the relationship between Al-Qaida and the Taliban in 2000, 2001, into 2002, and despite knowing that and despite knowing what Al-Qaida had done, his support for the Taliban did not flag. But I don't see that as fairly representing that he supported Al-Qaida. In my view, his material support was support for the Taliban in the form of seeking to raise money for them and urging people to fight alongside them at a time when they were fighting the United States after 9-11, and at a time when they were here harboring Al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden.

As to other aspects of the nature and circumstance of Mr. Ahmad's conduct, the Court does find that he engaged in, as did Mr. Ahsan, operational security. They used code names, they encrypted things, they had passwords. They avoided the use of things that most people use every day like checking accounts and bank records and deposits. There was a

double connection in terms of the P.O. box, a double step and it led to a person that -- in the name of Mr. Ahmad's classmate in university. The government urges that I view this, in effect, consciousness of guilt. The difficulty I have with that is that they were engaged in these kinds of activities when most of what they were talking about was Bosnia and Chechnya, and much of it was not illegal. other words, they didn't just start doing this when they started supporting the Taliban. I think in my view, that yes, they had concerns and that's why they acted the way they They didn't wish to be detected, but I do not see that did. as evidence that they, from '98, thought they were committing I see it -- and again, this is part of the struggle crimes. of trying to look back in hindsight and figure out what was going on -- but there's no question, for example, the Pakistanis would not have rolled out a welcome mat to allow people to move into Afghanistan through Pakistan. would not have allowed that, would not have been happy with There's evidence that he was approached by Russians who weren't happy with what he was doing about Chechnya. was the British government who, rightly so, was nervous about terrorist attacks on their own land and might be inclined to want to question people, much like the United States did, and holding people as material witnesses because they thought they knew something. I don't know whether I would call it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

paranoia, but many paranoids are right. In my view, what -the whole operational security was not evidence of
consciousness of guilt. It was evidence of consciousness
that what they were doing, while not necessarily illegal, was
conduct that would cause people to pay attention to them and
then ultimately hassle or harm them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It doesn't necessarily mean that what they were doing was good, but I don't draw from it sort of the negative inference of consciousness of guilt that the government wants me to draw from it. I guess I just don't view it as so nefariously covert. I mean, it's not exactly James Bond. Some of the covert steps are easily defeated, not very sophisticated. But I think -- again, I may have time wrong, but I know now if I write an e-mail and it says -- have the word "bomb" and "World Trade Center" or the "Brooklyn Bridge" in the same e-mail and I wrote that in Scandinavia, that someone somewhere is probably going to take a look at that e-mail, and I don't want them to take a look at the e-mail. Because maybe I use the word "blast" and really what the sentence says is, I had a blast when I visited the Empire State Building. It was a wonderful time. Maybe I will think that I better pick a different word for "blast" because somebody might think I mean something else.

I don't see that what they were trying to cover up was so illegal at the time that their covert or secrecy steps

were clearly undertaken and should cause me to draw the conclusion that it shows that everything they were doing, they were guilty of something.

I also don't find the government, uses the phrases frequently, "recruiting and radicalizing people." As to the recruiting -- again, it's very hard for me to be confident of how I understood the relationships, and I will talk a bit when I get to Mr. Ahmad and his history and characteristics -- but recruiting to me is a fairly strong and specific word. It includes kind of overwhelming a person's individual decision-making. It includes conscious activity to cause them to come to view what you want them to do as being the thing they should do.

If what the government means that Mr. Ahmad believed that every Muslim should fulfill his responsibility under the concept of Jihad to be trained to defend themselves and their family and he spoke about that, I would agree with the government. In that sense, yes, he recruited Muslims to fulfill their responsibility. But in the same sense, I suspect we could say he recruited Muslims -- I'm not familiar with the practices of Islam -- but in terms of praying so many times a day or in a certain way and in a specific attitude, he probably recruited them to do that as well.

As to whether he radicalized anyone, I don't understand that. I think that the only person radicalized in

this case is the cooperating witness. It's pretty clear to me that Mr. Ahsan is not responsible for radicalizing him. He may have played a role in getting the cooperating witness to go to Afghanistan to get training, but even the cooperating witness acknowledges that, unlike what Mr. Ahmad wanted him to do, which was to return to England to complete his education, he turned away from that and was, in fact, radicalized by colleague Sheikh Mohammed and Osama bin Laden whom he met in Afghanistan.

Now you could say that, well, Mr. Ahmad wanted him to go to Afghanistan, so it's his fault he met those people there and he became radicalized by them. I don't think that would be fair. Mr. Ahsan went to Afghanistan and I don't believe he was radicalized by his experience or the people he met there. So I think to say that Mr. Ahsan is responsible for radicalizing people is to mischaracterize his conduct.

As to whether other people went to Afghanistan, the Court, I don't think, has a basis for it other than the cooperating witness assuming that when certain people showed up who were from the Tooting Circle, that Mr. Ahsan must have sent them.

I'm sorry. Mr. Ahmad, I apologize.

With respect to the battleship -- the Battle Group

Document about which we spent a lot of time and which was the subject of the case previously in front of Judge Kravitz.

The Court has found that -- obviously, I will get to Mr. Ahsan about the Battle Group Document later -- but I have also found that Mr. Ahmad had the floppy disc which had that document on it. I don't have any evidence in front of me as to his opening it, reading it, what he thought about it. What I do know is that nothing was done with the information. And I don't even know if he opened it. And if the government wishes me to find that he opened it, then I would suggest that from that finding would follow the next finding: that is that the Battle Group Document, besides showing that the Navy enlisted man was a traitor to his country, it also shows that Mr. Ahmad and Mr. Ahsan had absolutely no interest in operational terrorist actions that would harm the United Because in their hands was what appeared to be, and what the government proved at Abu Abu-Jihaad's trial, was highly classified information, sensitive, movements of what could be vulnerable battleship and related vessels through the Straits of Hormuz, with a suggestion of how to take one of the ships down. And yet what we have in this case is neither defendant does anything with it. I can only draw the conclusion that it supports what I have concluded and will conclude generally, that neither of these two defendants were interested in what is commonly known as terrorism.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess in conclusion I would say, as to the nature and circumstances of Mr. Ahmad's conduct, that he did support

the Taliban. He supported the Taliban knowing that they protected a terrorist, Osama bin Laden. He supported the Taliban after Osama bin Laden engaged in 9-11. He didn't shut down or disavow or walk away from the appeal to the Pakistanis until, the middle at least, of 2002.

What the nature and circumstance of his offense is not is that he never supported or believed in or associated with Al-Qaida or Osama bin Laden. He never fought in Afghanistan at a time when they were fighting the Americans or protecting Osama bin Laden. And he never engaged in operational planning or operations that could fall under the term "terrorism."

There's some question -- the government argues that while the defendant claims by mid to late '02 he was out of this, out of Azzam Publications, out of the website work, that the government questioned that. As I thought about that last night, I was struck by something. We have, thanks to Agent Bowling, a tremendous amount of material recovered from what are deleted files, files that were wiped. Files that shouldn't have been able to be retrieved, or were encrypted and thus were retrievable in limited fashion. Nonetheless, we have all of that material from the period around 2000, 2001 and into 2002. I did not see anything from mid to late '02 to the time he was first arrested.

Now, it could be my fault, I overlooked it. I don't

know. But it strikes me as odd that somehow in the middle of 2002, Mr. Ahmad would become so capable at destroying electronic data that he could completely wipe and eliminate everything he ever touched or wrote about or put on his computer from then until the moment he was arrested. In other words, he didn't know he was going to be arrested. It means he's constantly deleting and destroying and writing over and throwing into fire cans to burn up electronic media every day of his life from mid '02 to '03 when he's first arrested, and yet he leaves on his computers all of these fragments, I will call them, of data and electronic material that can then be found by Agent Bowling. The conclusion I draw from that is that's not what happened, but rather what happened is that he did indeed step away from this activity in the mid to the third quarter of 2002.

I next, Mr. Ahmad, need to turn to the need for your sentence. In the country, we sentence people because we think it will serve a purpose. We don't do it just because we wish to be mean, we wish to ruin their lives, keep them from their families. We do it because we think that it will serve certain purposes.

The first need for the sentence is to reflect the seriousness of what you have done. Because if I were to sentence everyone to the same sentence regardless of what they did, whether they stole a loaf of bread or they murdered

a three-year old child, and I gave both of those people the same sentence, no one would view that as just and therefore there would be no respect for our criminal justice system.

So I have to start in the need for this sentence in addressing and considering how serious is the crime that you committed.

I will start by saying that I view what you did as very serious. It's not the most serious crime that can be committed. There are others, even within the range of material support or even beyond that, actually committing acts of terrorism, that are much more serious and probably at the very end of the spectrum. Nonetheless, I think what you did is serious because -- and, again, I cannot lay -- I think Attorney Reeve stood up early on last week and made some remark about mixing up intentions with consequences, was it something like that? But you can't walk away from the fact that what you were doing was enabling bin Laden to be protected in Afghanistan and to train the men who actually boarded the flights that drove into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

Now if I'm to believe you, you agree with me that that is among some of the most heinous acts ever committed.

And I don't believe that you knew that was going to happen, that you wanted it to happen, you intended it to happen, but it's a consequence. There are a lot of other people who did

things that allowed that to happen. Yours is a very small piece of it, but nonetheless is a piece. You were, both by your voice and by what you were asking people to do, encouraging the Taliban to protect bin Laden. And indeed to fight against the United States who were trying to get bin Laden.

On the other hand, it's not the same as fighting for Al-Qaida, being a member of Al-Qaida. It's not saying what you did is not equivalent to joining Al-Qaida and doing what it is we now know they did. But as the government has said, and I don't disagree with them, the power of your website, given -- I mean, the nature of websites, there's so much out there now. It's kind of like, how does anybody ever find anything? But clearly your websites, people found them, English-speaking Muslims found them. And they were a source of information to those people unlike anything that had been on the web before. And in your website, you were encouraging people to do whatever they could to support the Taliban and acknowledging that all levels of support are important.

So while you didn't fight with Al-Qaida, while you didn't send a check to Al-Qaida to pay for the plane trips of Mohammed Atta to come to the United States or get flight training, as you yourself said in the web posting, anything anybody does is needed to help support, in your view, Jihad. I guess at the end of day, even though there are more heinous

versions of the crimes that you pled to, the material support crimes, doesn't mean that your crime is not a serious one.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another need for the sentence is to provide deterrence, and that has several meanings. One is if the sentence is known to people and they were thinking of doing what you did, they would, if the sentence serves the purpose of deterrence, they would say to themselves, well, it's not worth it to have happen to me what happened to Ahmad or Ahsan, so I'm not going to do this. I will be deterred by the fear that I will suffer the same consequence, this sentence.

I have to say that I have little to no confidence that the sentence I impose today will deter people who are terrorists. I think that's why we give life sentences to terrorists, people who blow up buildings because we don't think that they can be deterred. As to whether this sentence can deter people like yourself and Mr. Ahsan who provided support to people who became terrorists, I think that's possible. As to another aspect of deterrence, that's really a specific aspect of deterrence in deterring you, Mr. Ahmad, from engaging in criminal conduct in the future. In effect, protecting the public from you until you are deterred, that's another need for the sentence. I have to say I think that's probably the most difficult question I face here today. And I am going to put it off until I speak first about your

history and characteristics and draw some conclusions from that.

2.

There's also a need to provide you whatever appropriate treatment or educational or programming that's appropriate, and I don't see that as relevant in this case.

Among the other factors I'm supposed to consider are the guidelines and avoiding disparities between and among cases that are similar to yours.

First of all, I find the guidelines are not helpful here, and indeed I find the plea agreement entered into by the government and the defendant agree with me, that the guidelines are not helpful. The guidelines called for 30 years to life. And the government, and you agreed, that a sentence of no more than 25 years was appropriate.

I think that at the risk of causing someone in

New York to be unhappy with me, I will make a few comments on
the guidelines. The Second Circuit I'm mindful of in

Meskini, has commented that the automatic six level of
criminal history is appropriate in terrorism cases because it
reflects the fact that terrorists recidivate. Again,
language is important here. Time and language in this case
is a challenge every time I open my mouth. But while this
case is categorized as a terrorism case by definition, and
therefore this Category VI applies to Mr. Ahmad and to Mr.
Ahsan, I don't believe that it is appropriate in the sense

that I don't believe that people who provide material support like Mr. Ahmad will necessarily recidivate. I believe that I have the government in my corner on that because if they did believe that he would recidivate, like the Blind Sheikh or like Yousef Ramzi, then they would not have pled to the maximum sentence of 25 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, as Attorney Reynolds said yesterday, he and I may disagree as to how much time is necessary to protect the public in the sense of recidivism, but my view of people who are terrorists is if I lock them up for 10 years or 25 years or 30 years, they will still be terrorists. And as long as they are physically capable when they get out, they will still seek to blow someone up. So to the extent that the Meskini case talks about terrorists, I agree with them if it's that type of terrorist. I do not agree that anyone who is quilty of a material support count is in that category of terrorists. And therefore, I view the guidelines to the extent they put someone like Mr. Ahmad, who has no criminal history into a Criminal History Category VI, which drives him up to 360 years to life, is mistaken in that the principle that terrorists will recidivate I do not believe applies to all people providing material support. If nothing else, the 600 defendant summary provided by the defense in sentencing cases, when you look at the material support cases, I would suggest that there are a lot of courts that agree with me.

Also I understand that Congress and the guideline commission can make judgments, as they do, with Category VI or the 12-level enhancement, but I will note that I do not believe there was any empirical basis for what they did, that Meskini recognizing specifically that there is discretion to depart under 4A1.1, and of course now under Booker.

So I guess to the extent that I understand the guideline right now, departed to under Fernandez to be 25 years, in a general sense as to the guideline originally being 360 to life, I do not find that a helpful measure of what a reasonable sentence is, nor do I find it helpful as I usually do in applying guidelines to address the question of disparities between and among people. Normally, the guidelines can be helpful in that regard. And I guess all of what I have just said about the guidelines is to say that the guidelines are not helpful in the avoidance of disparity.

I have -- in connection with the cases that are out there in determining and attempting to avoid disparities between and among person's with similar records and similar conduct, I read quite a few cases, I reviewed the defendant's summary chart. I read the cases the government has pointed me to. It's times like this when I realize my inadequacies. I try to analyze or rationalize the cases that are out there. I thought if I looked at Al-Qaida versus -- not Al-Qaida cases, I looked at acts on U.S. soil or against U.S. citizens

versus acts against other people. If I looked at, like, cooperating witnesses, you know, where you get someone to say they want to blow up the Brooklyn Bridge but it's because some undercover officer is working with them and it's never going to really happen versus actually planning an actual event and it being discovered, fortunately, by law enforcement. I tried to look at the cases in all of those lights and many more.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have to say that no matter how I looked at the cases, there's absolutely no way to rationalize the sentencings that have been imposed around the country, on persons who have given material support or committed acts of I mean, there's no question that when the terrorism. courts are faced with the worst of the worst, pure terrorists who kill innocent civilians or who cause that to happen, Blind Sheikh and Ramzi Yousef are two good ones to start with, that it is very easy to know what to do, and there are no disparities. It's life in prison; and if not, life plus something else. Or if we have people who are trying to plan to blow up metro stations or other locations in Washington D.C. like Farooque Ahmed; or a person by the name of al-Kassar, whom I had never heard of before, but who was associated with FARC and who was trying and exchanging large amounts of drugs to obtain surface to air missiles and grenades. He received 360 months.

There are people who met with Osama bin Laden and Sheikh Mohammed and who conspired to blow up things like the Brooklyn Bridge and the shopping mall who received 240 months, less that the government seeks in this case against Mr. Ahmad. There are people like Khalid Ouazzani who transferred money, actually did the transfer of the money to terrorist groups and attempted to recruit people, to train them in bomb making who received 14 years. There is Syed Hashmi, again a material support case who conspired to send money and military gear to Al-Qaida. He received 15 years. Or Syed-Haris Ahmed, again material support who used Internet web forums. There we have one that's similar here, using the web to reach many people. In his case, inciting and conspiring with others in an active web forum to provide military support. He tried to join a training camp, and he videotaped landmarks around D.C. apparently for the purpose of blowing them up. He received 13 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I could go on. I think someone said there were 600 of these cases listed. Someone who was videotaping, went to Canada, met with people who wanted to do violent Jihad, made videos of potential targets, traveled to Pakistan to train. He received 156 months. Ali Saleh Kahlah al-Marri in Illinois. He attended training camps, he offered his service to Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. He was ordered by the Sheikh to enter the United States before 9-11 and await instructions.

He received 100 months. Mohammed Sulumna Alnalfi created a company at bin Laden's request as a cover for getting explosives, chemicals and weapons. He conspired to destroy national defense materials. He may have turned against bin Laden, which may explain why his sentence was 121 months, but that's not clear from the record.

I have Ilyas Ali for Al-Qaida, was attempting to get four stringer missiles to sell to the Taliban, 57 months. I have Khalid Awan who introduced an inmate while in custody on a fraud count as a recruit for the Khalistan commando force, raising money to go India intending for it to be used to build bombs to blow up and murder people. Received 168 months, which obviously with a prior criminal history.

Lastly, someone by the name of Begolly from the Eastern District of Virginia, who was an active administrator of an English forum, which was an internationally used Islam extremist internet forum. He solicited Jihadists to use firearms and other weapons against police forces, post offices, Jewish schools, and day care centers. He wanted people to write their legacy in blood and promised a special place in afterlife for violent actions in the name of Allah. He posted a comment praising the shootings at the Pentagon and the Marine Corp museum in the October 2010 and expressed hope the shooter had followed his previous advice encouraging similar acts of violence. When arrested, he assaulted an

agent and attempted to shoot. He received 102 months.

I cite those not because they are purely representative in some respects. They are, in many respects, below what the government seeks for Mr. Ahmad. I can't say, I don't mean to say that they are comparable to Mr. Ahmad because they are all sui generis. These cases are all different. But I do know that many of the ones I just cited, even the ones who received 10 years or 15 years or 20 years, engaged in or thought they were engaging in, wanted to engage in actual acts of terrorism themselves.

And so it's difficult, I guess, to address this aspect that I'm required to address, Mr. Ahmad, to avoid disparities between and among people who have committed the same crime as you with your same history. I don't really know of anyone who's committed the same crime as you with your same lack of criminal history. I do know the person I just mentioned who maintained a violent Internet forum encouraging terrorist acts, I know what his sentence was, and I do not equate your conduct to that. But I can't say that the review of the cases has been of much help in informing me about consideration of avoidance of disparities. Again, my inability to correlate sentences with conduct, either as to Al-Qaida versus other terrorist groups, what part of the country the sentence was involved in, whether it was action or encouragement, it's very difficult. But I think generally

I would say that, at least of the cases that I just surveyed just now and many others that are in that summary and many others that I read, that in certain situations certainly people have received lower sentences than the government seeks in this case for conduct which, at least as sparsely written about as I'm aware of what it is, I don't know all of the details, but would appear to be more serious than what you did.

I'm going to turn now to your history and characteristics, which I have adopted findings from the Presentence Report, but I wish to sort of highlight and mention the things that will then cause me to come to certain conclusions.

I will note that you were born in London and you were a first generation Brit. Your parents, I believe, came from Pakistan. Have I got that right? You have one brother and two sisters. You were raised in a very loving family. You were not wealthy, but you were well enough off. You were well provided for by your hard working father and mother. You received your primary education and you were encouraged in your education by -- particularly by your mother, but I would say generally supported by your entire family, which continues to be very supportive of you.

You demonstrated a strong work ethic early. You engaged in activities such the Cadet Force which is sort of a

junior ROTC from the ages of 12 through 18. You did very well in school likely due the encouragement of your mother, but also probably due to your own innate abilities. You attended an extremely prestigious public school and did very well there, the Emmanuel School. That led to your admission to Imperial College, another highly regarded institution in the United Kingdom where you received a bachelor's and a master's degree. The last in 1996 in aeronautical engineering. It almost goes without saying that you are, by all accounts and by anyone who has met you, described as a very intelligent man. You are very bright. You are well thought of, and you appear to -- I will stop at that.

In terms of your personal background, you were married. You were divorced. It appears to be because of the fact you have been incarcerated, and you have no children.

You have no criminal record. As far as your mental health, you do suffer from posttraumatic stress disorder which followed your arrest in 2004 in England.

As a child, you grew up in Tooting Circle, which sounds to me like a very poor area of London. I'm not familiar with it myself. It's not, you know, on the guide tours probably of England, or of London, but nonetheless, again, as I said, you grew up surrounded by a loving family and by relatives and friends of your family who, I suspect, were supportive and protective of you in that neighborhood.

You do appear to be a leader. It developed that you had, I think, what was originally a Sunday night group of friends that met, I think, in someone's living room that eventually out grew. But as a midteen, 14 or 15, and some of these other boys, who might have been a year or two younger than you, in addition to hanging out, in addition to talking about your religion, you also engaged in, and probably you caused them to engage in, what I would call good acts. You helped an elderly woman in cleaning out her yard. You helped to bury an elderly man who had no family, which was described, I found quite interesting, in the description of the gentleman who apparently was younger than you who ended up in a precarious position with the casket.

So the picture that emerges from the hundreds of letters that I received and the videos that I watched and your relatives who spoke of you and your friends who spoke of you, is that you had this circle, it was a very supportive thing. It eventually, it appears, developed into what became known as the Friday circle after prayers, Friday prayers, in which religion was discussed and in which you socialized. You are also -- it was reported that you spent what seems to me to be an enormous amount of time, I have a little difficulty comprehending how you found the time to do this, but it appears that you spent a lot of time tutoring other younger students. There are many letters and videos which

mention this. By tutoring, I mean supporting them, encouraging them, helping them learn and study for exams which would make the difference in their lives between whether they would end up at a prestigious school like you did and like Mr. Ahsan did, or whether they would end up in some mediocre institution which would mark their trajectory, or lack thereof, of their life from that point forward.

So what I see is that through your efforts you are the cause, at least as claimed in these testimonials, of a very large number of people who were the beneficiary of your tutoring and encouragement and support and, indeed, they went on to very productive lives. I think one of them made the comment that if it weren't for you, he would either be dead or a drug addict, because those were the choices in Tooting Circle at that time.

So I don't know whether they are engaging in hyperbole, Mr. Ahmad, because of the circumstance you are in and they're desire to support you, but I certainly do credit that you did what they said you did. That is, that you took your time and generously gave it to other people to help them become better. Indeed you succeeded because they did become better. They became very productive, successful members of British society. They, at least, attribute that success to you. I have written down just two names, the Abasee (ph.) brothers -- I don't know why I wrote those down -- and the

Malik family.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Also people speak of your empathy. distinguished it between people who are sympathetic, people who can feel sorry for you when you are in a bad situation, but they say that you were more than that, that you actually identified with and were empathetic to them when they faced difficult situations. That you were caring and thoughtful. I'll mention only two, I don't mean to diminish all of the other circumstances that were recounted, but I'll mention two that particularly struck me. One was the Ali family that lost -- the woman who lost her sister, and the mother that lost her daughter in the 9-11 bombing. The girl was on the 106th floor of the, I think the North Tower, I could have that wrong. You reached out to that family as soon as you heard about it, which, of course, is consistent with the reports that you also denounced the 9-11 bombings. But the nature of the support that you gave to this family in -- both in helping them try to find out what happened to their sister and daughter and in supporting the mother, for example, while the daughter traveled to the United States to try to find out what happened, and your constant remembrance of the anniversary and letting them know that you are still thinking of and remembering this murdered sister or daughter is evidence to me of what others have generally categorized as your caring, thoughtful and empathetic nature.

The other situation, I think, arose while you were in prison. And there are a lot of prisoners who take up correspondence with people because I guess there's not a whole lot else to do. But I believe it's the Pagani (ph.) family, in particular, that the mother I found very moving in speaking of how she felt that your support of her daughter as she struggled through cancer and eventually lost her fight with cancer was so very important to that girl, and indeed important to the surviving mother. Those were both very powerful stories to the Court in carrying home sort of the general theme that pervaded the hundreds of letters and videos that I received on behalf of Mr. Ahmad. And I guess at the end of the day, I would say that it appears to me that he is a generous, thoughtful person who is funny and honest. He is well liked and humane and empathetic. He was described as a nice man, a generous man, a soft-hearted man. selfless. And despite his circumstances, continues to be happy for people when good things happen to them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In that respect, and I think this is an important aspect of deciding the sentence here today, Mr. Ahmad has been in prison for what is now almost 10 years. I think we're short by a matter of a couple of days or weeks. And he has been in prison that long because, as was his right, he fought his extradition which eventually he lost.

Nonetheless, at the end of the day, he has spent 10 years in

prison.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I never asked the government about this, maybe I wished I had, but I will just say my reaction to that. will say essentially the same thing about Mr. Ahsan. it remarkable that Mr. Ahmad appears to have kept the characteristics that everyone speaks of him as having despite having been in prison for 10 years, including the last two under circumstances that I'm not sure I could keep whatever good I have in me over that period. People report that from prison he has, at least when allowed to in England in his custody, to correspond and to telephone others, to express his happiness for what they are going through, his concern for what they may be suffering or on enduring without, in any way, dwelling on or focusing on his own circumstances. in the United Kingdom, he worked in prison. He served on a key committee, which included the warden, in attempting to maintain dialogue between and among what I can only assume are warring factions within the prison, if they are anything like U.S. prisons. He participated in the Dr. El Sharkawy's course, which I view to be a course designed to educate and to enlighten people about the things I spoke of at the beginning, that is the hijacking by some people of Islamic principles of Jihad and using them to justify acts of terrorism. And Dr. El Sharkawy reports that he was a good student and reported upon his views and the development of

his views in this regard.

He's obviously extremely well read and has kept himself constructively busy in prison, including his work in creating masterpieces made out of matchsticks, one of which is quite impressive looking and received a prize.

I say all of this because -- and I guess when I hear from the defendant and the government as to their positions, I would ask the government to address whether there's anything within the last 10 years that would suggest that Mr. Ahmad would do this, this being what brings him before this Court again.

So I've gone a bit out of order, but because I have listened you to folks for so long, I determined to address the factors that I needed to address. Now I would like to hear from the defense first, then from the government as to what -- I guess whether you disagree with my assessments in this respect. And then secondarily, what you think the appropriate sentence is.

And I would want to specifically tell Mr. Ahmad that it is his right in this proceeding to address the Court directly, and I would be pleased to hear from you. I have read your very lengthy letter to the Court. If you don't wish to address the Court, I understand it, but I would like to hear from you if you do.

Attorney Ward.

MR. WARD: Yes, your Honor. No objections to the Court's findings, your Honor.

Let's start with the crime. Mr. Ahmad supported the Taliban. He tried to raise money for the Taliban. He conspired to get equipment, such as gas masks and nuclear biological suits for the Taliban. He published appeals of people to defend the Taliban. He gave support to the Taliban at a time when they were giving shelter to Mr. bin Laden.

Mr. Ahmad admits all those things. He's sorry for all of those things. He was entirely wrong in all of those things. It was a crime. No excuses. It was a crime.

This man, as the Court has found, is not Al-Qaida. He's not going to fly a plane into our buildings. He does not believe in that. He's not advocated for that. He's never been part of that.

He spent a quarter of his life now in prison. You have seen the classified material. What were his goals, what were his concerns, what were his priorities? Look at his record, and we're not talking obviously about a criminal record because he has none, but not even an arrest prior to this case. Not a even a point off his driver's license.

How has he spent his time incarcerated? As the Court pointed out, he acted as a go-between between inmates and wardens. He spent his time studying, reading, taking a course that he didn't have to take. And, in fact, he had to

petition to get into from Dr. El Sharkawy, a religious scholar who runs a course in anti-extremism. He's re-examined his views, he's read Gandhi. He's read Mandela. This is not a person who is inflexible in his thinking. He's thoughtful. He's reflective.

How else has he spent his time in jail. Again, despite 10 years in various forums of isolation, including two years in solitary confinement in our horrendous super max facility at Northern. If you haven't been there, you should go there. Sensory deprivation is in the design of the building. I swear, years from now people will look back at places like Northern and marvel at how we could have ever been so heartless as to house human beings in such a place.

Again, look at his record. How has he lived his life? Letter after letter after letter. He's a person who has demonstrated he deeply cared about the misfortune of others. And again, as a young teen he organized boys, boys, in his community to go out and help those in need. You recounted a couple of incidents. It ranged from helping elderly people who couldn't care for their yards and were having problems with their neighbors because their yards were overgrown to go in and clean those things up. To attend a funeral where there wasn't -- I don't know if minion is the right word, but there weren't enough people to have a funeral.

THE COURT: Minion is definitely not the right word.

MR. WARD: I know, but an equivalent -- but to bury the casket. Going to weddings where there weren't -- wasn't enough money to pay for servers or dishwashers and volunteering to do that. Not for money, he didn't ask for money. He didn't get paid. He did it because he wanted to do something good for other people. It was in the hearts of these kids to do something good for others.

Again, these letters, remarkable letters, from people from many different walks of life commenting on all stages on Mr. Ahmad's life. Ms. Barrett and I met most of the people that wrote these letters. They were eager to write. They welcomed us into their homes and offices. It was like they were coming out the woodwork in London wanting to talk to us, wanting to help, being eager to help, talking about this man that they love. You don't get this kind of response unless you have earned it.

The letter writers told us one after another about acts of kindness, charity, little things he did to help others. Again, even when he had a mountain of his own problems to deal with. Mrs. Dan (ph.) sat there through -- alternating through tears and through smiles about him, talked about the importance of those letters that he wrote to Nash Pagani (ph.) during her illness. She told us how those

letters brought her daughter comfort and made her feel "not so alone" when she endured those painful arsenic treatments.

Another mom told us about how he tutored her children during the time when the family was going through a terrible divorce with lots of domestic violence, where they were thrown out of their house and they were homeless and that Babar would take the children to his home. He would take them on little outings, go to museums, anything to make their lives a little less unpleasant at that point. And one of those kids who was in the video, now grown, came to court last Friday and sat here because she could not bear the idea that he could be alone in his time of need.

The theme of all of these letters is consistent, there's true kindness in this man. There is true empathy for other people. He's gone out of his way to care for others, to do work for others, to work on humanitarian projects, big and small, because that's who he is. Ms. Barrett and I attended Friday circle. It's still going on after 25 years. He started that. The two brothers, the Abasee brothers, the doctors, they did a video reference, they wrote letters, a lengthy video. Consistent with our experience, we sat with them for over an hour. They wanted to tell us -- it was hard to get them to stop talking, but they wanted to tell us how much they learned from him as teenagers. And the one that heads the health service in South London says that he learned

early on from Babar that there is great satisfaction in helping others. Those are the easiest letters and interviews I have ever tried to get. Again, people wanted to talk about him. What they most wanted to say is how much they want him back.

Again, this is a deeply empathetic person who was shaken to his core by the slaughter of Muslims in Bosnia. He went there at the age of 18 to bring relief. He brought clothing, he brought toys. He brought whatever he could to help. He collected all of those things himself. He paid for his own way. He went by himself. He wasn't part of a group. He just did this and went by himself. When he was there, he saw the suffering, he heard these pleas. He was still just a teenager himself, impressionable, emotional, and just full of the youthful desire to take some action.

The government has said all along that this case is not about Bosnia. They have been educated about Bosnia now. But they put Bosnia in their indictment. They point to the videos about Bosnia, that these were terrorist recruiting tools. This is the place where an a 18-year-old Babar Ahmad decided that he could not sit by and watch what was going on. It changed his life. The world community had turned a deaf ear to Muslim cries for help. Incidentally today is the 19th anniversary of Srebenica. It occurred in the presence of U.N. peacekeepers who did nothing. He put his life on the

line to stop ethnic cleansing. He has the scars and he has the shrapnel in his body to prove it. He spent much of the next six years telling the world about Bosnia. He spoke at his university, he spoke at his mosque. He spoke in Tooting. Many of his publications were about Bosnia. His website is overwhelmingly about Bosnia and Chechnya. The U.N., through the findings of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, has apologized to Bosnia. The government wants you to forgot about Bosnia and punish him for 25 years as if Bosnia played no role in his life. 3553(a) commands that you look at his history and characteristics. This was the most significant event in his life. They want you to pretend it didn't happen and give him 25 years.

Fresh off of Bosnia, the Russians invaded Chechnya. The Russians imposed and enforced a total media blackout so that their atrocities would not come to light. They were a major super power sending one of the most fearsome armies in the world against guerrilla fighters. Putin directed the army. And the savagery and the brutality were overwhelming, thousands upon thousands of people were killed. Babar didn't fight in Chechnya, but he was moved no less by the plight of the Chechens. So he took to the internet to publicize what was going on.

Our own neocons, our former high-ranking political figures, urged our government to get involved. Who were the

terrorists in Chechnya? Are we going to say that Putin was wearing the white hat here? Thousands died in Grozny, they devastated the city. Khattab killed a Russian soldier who was wounded. That was a war crime. Again, no excuses. Wars make people hardened. It was a terrible act. Mr. Ahmad should never have sold the video that had that act in it.

When you add up the postings on the websites, I think the calculation is somewhere close to 98 percent of the postings were about Bosnia and Chechnya.

The crime here was supporting the Taliban. Mr. Ahmad lost his way. He got caught up in the idea that the Taliban would fix Afghanistan. He lost sight of the principles that he had always believed about in defense of Jihad. He supported the Taliban despite U.N. sanctions, despite the cruel acts that the Taliban committed against other Muslims, despite the fact that the Taliban was not then engaged in the defense of Jihad. He's sorry for that support.

As a young man, he thought he knew everything. He was young. He was wrong. You should sentence him for supporting the Taliban. But, again, bear in mind, he's not Al-Qaida. He did not advocate for Al-Qaida. He thought that the Taliban would create the Muslim equivalent of the State of Israel. He thought the Taliban could be a force for good. He didn't appreciate the complexities of the situation. He

didn't see the Taliban for what they were.

Again, the government's theory is that by supporting the Taliban, he directly supported Al-Qaida. That ignores the differences that the experts have pointed to between Al-Qaida and the Taliban. The Taliban was also about Afghanistan and Al-Qaida was all about global issues.

So what would 25 years represent? Is it in the ballpark of cases resolved by plea? The government says I have cherry picked. We gave you over 600 cases to look at. That's a boat load of cherries here. You won't find any 25 year sentences for cases analogous to this like you have already said.

Even the deposed witness says that Mr. Ahmad was not about operational plots or attacks on civilians or advocating that others join Al-Qaida or support Al-Qaida. Babar wanted the deposed witness to get training and come home. He wanted him to go to university and to finish there. He was horrified to learn what the deposed witness agreed to do. That's not what he stands for. That's not what he's ever believed. He wanted different things. He's already served 150 percent of what the deposed witness got for a sentence.

Now, you asked yesterday, your Honor, about martyrdom, would he support something look the U.S.S. Cole or encourage suicide bombings. No. He doesn't support that kind of martyrdom, he never did. The sites didn't have

planes flying into buildings or anything similar to that. No attacks on civilians. His idea was always martyrs on the battlefield.

2.

He would go even further now, I think, having gone through Dr. Sharkawy's class, having thought and reflected on this. Wars are for nations to declare, not for individuals to declare.

In short, your Honor, he never thought there was anything heroic, religious or moral about flying planes into buildings, about killing noncombatants or civilians. That is not what Islam is about. This man wanted to live, not to die. He wants to be with, to enjoy -- to be with his family. He wants to make life better in his community. He wants to be the person again that all those people wrote to you about, to affect people's lives as he did in the past. All those letters, that's the person he wants to be. Again, there's genuine goodness in this man. He's being wasted sitting in a jail cell.

Here's what I think, I think here you have a person who, as a very young man, was moved to his very soul to try and help suffering people, but he failed ultimately to distinguish the complexities of the developing conflicts. He thought he knew all the answers. He didn't. For the past 10 years, he's learned a very hard lesson. But even so, he's tried to learn and to understand. Two counter-terrorism

experts, Dr. Sageman in the United States, Dr. Hassan in the U.K. believe he's a very low risk of recidivism. His conduct for the last 10 years supports that assessment. He has been a model prisoner. He's studied, he's thought, he's learned. He's not young anymore. He matured. He re-examined his views. I think he's been punished enough. The good in this man, I think, far, far outweighs the bad. He cares about others. He can be an asset to his community. Think what he's lost, 10 years in harsh conditions of confinement. Lost his spouse. They loved each other. She's now remarried, and moved on. What a terrible loss for both of them.

He took a terrible beating in his arrest. There's enough punishment here. He's lost his career, he's lost his youth. There simply has been enough punishment here.

There's no terror case exception to the idea that there has to be proportionality in sentencing. We look at the history and characteristics of the person, not just the offense. We do not punish excessively, only what is sufficient and not one day more.

This courthouse stands on the grounds -- it's the first United States Court. George Washington appointed Richard Law to be the first United States district judge in 1789 here. We stand for something. We stand for fairness. We stand for proportionality. It is really now time to send this man home.

Your Honor, his sister would like to address the Court briefly.

THE COURT: I would be pleased to hear from her. If she would come forward, please.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

THE WITNESS: Good morning, your Honor. My name is Ama Ahmad. I'm the sister of Babar Ahmad. I'm a medical doctor by profession, but currently I'm on break because I'm looking after my five beautiful children.

As you would have read from our letters and as you mentioned, we're a very loving family. We grew up very close to each other. And that's not abnormal of many loving families, but what was perhaps a bit extraordinary for us is the even when we grew up and went to university and got married, we still maintained that closeness with each other despite our other relationships. We lived within a few minutes of each other. We would visit each other. We would eat together. We would socialize with each other. We've always been very, very close.

When Babar was plucked out of our lives in 2004, we were completely shattered. And the last 10 years have been -- have been a very difficult ride, but we've supported him and he supported us throughout that 10 years. I had three of my children whilst he was in prison. And as soon as, you know, he would get the news of that baby in prison,

that we would immediately send him photos. And the moment I recovered from childbirth, I would make sure that we could make a trip to the prison and he could meet his new niece or nephew.

We visited regularly. I would take all the children. And through that process, my children, the eldest is -- which is 11 and my youngest is 14 months, have formed a deep love and bond with their uncle despite the circumstances. They write to him. They regularly pray for him. They like to tell him of their progress. And just as an example, like, my son who is 10, he's giving exams in September and Babar wrote him a beautiful letter just a couple of weeks ago, which he was really proud to read a few times over, and he's put it up on his wall.

So as a family, despite the circumstances, we have maintained that loving relationship. And more than anything, we just want him back in our lives. I feel that -- like my parents, they are getting -- excuse me.

THE COURT: Take your time.

THE WITNESS: I've been the only sibling looking after them, and it's been very difficult to see them go through the pain of not having their son. But we look forward to a time where we'll be able to be that family again together. We'll be able to have those dinners together.

We'll be able to laugh. When he comes home, he'll be able to

play with the children and be a part of their lives again. 1 I feel that once he gets out, that's the most 2 important thing to him, to be able to just make up for that 3 4 lost time with the family. And to hopefully go on and have 5 his own family because he absolutely adores children. a part of his personality. He absolutely adores children. 6 If I could have brought my children here today and brought 7 them all up one by one, they would have said the same thing 8 9 They love him and they adore him because he gives them that love despite have been in solitary confinement. 10 11 He'll speak on the telephone. He'll even speak to my little 12 That's really all I want to say. one. 13 THE COURT: Thanks very much. MR. WARD: Mr. Ahmad would like to address the 14 15 Court. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Good morning. 18 THE DEFENDANT: I would like to start by --19 THE COURT: You have listened to a lot of people say 20 a lot of things about you. As I indicated, I watched your interview because I felt like I don't know you in the sense 21 22 of I haven't heard from you. So I'm pleased that you have decided to address the Court. And I hope you know you don't 23 24 have to, but if you wish to, it's your right.

Thank you for that opportunity.

Ι

25

THE DEFENDANT:

also wanted to start by saying thank you for the courtesy with which you have addressed me. I wasn't quite sure what to expect when I came to the U.S. I mean, judges in the United Kingdom, they tend not to even look at the defendants, let alone say good morning to them or try to pronounce their name correctly.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't done very well on that.

THE DEFENDANT: You have, you have pronounced my name correctly. There's many different ways to pronounce it. You have said it correctly, so I appreciate that.

You and I are standing here today because I committed crimes. I committed crimes in supporting the Taliban, and calling upon others to support them at a time when they were not only engaged in a civil war against the Northern Alliance, but they were also giving sanctuary to bin Laden and failed to prevent him and his group from attacking other people and other countries; namely, the United States. And I continued to support them after the coalition invaded Afghanistan in October 2001.

In the next few moments I hope to -- I will try to explain how it is I came to commit these crimes, why it is that today, all of those years on, I'm sorry for committing these crimes. And how they went against everything that I stood for, or that I had stood for in my life, and how it is that I feel about them today.

1 THE COURT: Before you move on, may I ask a 2 question? You heard the government yesterday describe you as barely admitting to a technical crime. Is that how you feel? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Sorry to interrupt. Go ahead 5 6 then. 7 THE DEFENDANT: You mentioned, your Honor, you have read thousands of pages in this case. You read my letter, 8 9 obviously. I may touch upon a few things I mention in my letter, but I will try not to bore you with the same 10 11 repetition. Your Honor, as it's on the record, when I was 18, I 12 13 saw a news report about Bosnia. A few moments ago, I heard 14 you say about, you were interested to know perhaps how that 15 impacted on me. Up until that point, I had lived the life of a normal teenager. I saw this news report. And that 16 17 prompted me to go to Bosnia as an aid worker when I was 18 18 years and about six months of age. 19 When I went there, your Honor, I saw things that I 20 hope most people would never want to see or hope most people never see in their lifetime. I am -- sorry, could I take a 21 22 moment? 23 THE COURT: Take your time, sir. I understand it's 24 not easy.

THE DEFENDANT: I have traveled around the country,

25

your Honor, and I saw refugees -- refugee camps. I met survivors, I spoke to people who told me about -- I spoke to people who told me about the atrocities, and it was quite overwhelming. I mean, it's been 22 years now, but as I speak about it, the thoughts, they come back.

One of the things I realized when I spoke to
Bosnians that had been through atrocities, they had this look
in their eyes, which, I don't how to describe it, it's like
the eyes of someone who has been through unimaginable
suffering. They see straight through you. They're talking
to you, but their eyes are seeing straight through you. They
told me stories of how the men were being physically
castrated. How I met women that had been gang raped by up to
15 men. Children had had their throats slit.

There was one particular story that stuck out for me that was told to me by a man in a school in the City of Travnik that been converted into a refugee center. One evening he told me the story of what happened to a lady in his village where a three year old -- a woman and her three-year-old daughter, the three-year-old daughter was gang raped by the Serbs. After that, they slit the throat of the child and put the body of the child into a meat grinding machine. They then cooked the body of -- the meat, the ground meat of the child and forced the mother at gun point to eat it. I heard this and I went back to my room where I

was staying, and I was not able to sleep that night. I still have a memory of what I was wearing that night, where I was sleeping on the first floor of a house, a wooden floor in a sleeping bag. That was one of the longest nights in my life. And I was just thinking about what had actually happened, what had transpired in the last couple of weeks that I had been in Bosnia.

In the morning, I decided I wanted to do something to stop it. And I walked to the nearest Bosnian Army base, and I said I want to fight to defend what is happening, and I want to protect these people. I took up arms, and I took part in some battles. A few weeks later, I came back to the U.K. I continued with my college education. And over the next few years, I would return to Bosnia on several occasions.

A few weeks after the Srebrenica massacre, I returned to Bosnia again. And I met some survivors of the Srebrenica massacre. They told me stories and accounts about how the women and children had been placed on buses. And how most of the men had been told they were just going to be asked a few questions, and they would then be released. Your Honor, I won't go into the details of that. Over the last two decades, there's been reports and rulings and movies and documentaries and books written about Bosnia, about the Srebrenica massacre. Of course, my personal experience there

was quite different. I took part in more fighting to liberate the Muslim towns linked to Srebrenica. I received injuries. I return to the U.K.

Thereafter, major decisions that I took in my life over the next few years, at the back of my mind was how am I going to prevent the next Srebrenica from happening. I rushed head long -- perhaps I was -- at least in England, I was amongst the first people to respond. When I went to Chechnya the following year, I wanted to go there and to fight the Russians, but by the time I managed to get there, the war had ended. And I spent some time in an orphanage and I came back. I made audio and video cassettes of friends that I had lost in Bosnia. There was about 30 or so friends that I lost in the fighting in Bosnia. Books, websites, I set up the books -- I published books, I set up websites telling people about what had happened in Bosnia and about how Muslims need to stand up and defend themselves.

A couple of years later, war began in Kosovo. I tried to the help the Kosovo Liberation Army. A year later in 1999, the war began in Chechnya. I set up the Qogaz websites. I sent them satellite phones, encrypted laptops, other things that even haven't come in this case.

And then, your Honor, by the end of 2000, was -Muslim clerics began to issue appeals to support -- that
people should support the Taliban. And I called upon -- I

used the websites, I responded to that call, and I used the Azzam websites to call -- to solicit support for the Taliban regime.

Now, looking back, I do feel quite, in a way -- I mean, there's no other way to say them, dumb or stupid in terms of postings that were put on the websites saying that bin Laden himself had said that he didn't have anything to do with Embassy bombings, that he didn't have anything to do with the Cole -- this is after the Cole. And I find it quite stupid that I actually believed that. I genuinely believed that. If I believed that he had anything to do with those things, then I would not have supported the Taliban's failure to take action to prevent him from doing these things.

So these calls went out, and I was amongst the first. I was under this impression that just like the Muslims in Bosnia or the ones in Chechnya that were under attack, A, you have the Taliban, that they are being victimized by the international community. This man, all he did was fight the Russians in the eighties. He hasn't done anything to anyone. He's just making belligerent statements, and they are unfairly targeting him. And as a result, the international community is putting sanctions on the Taliban. This's not right. They need to be helped.

And, of course, with the benefit of hindsight and with the benefit of 9-11 and what happened, there was a -- I

mean, naive is the not the word. I mean, it's a pretty dumb thing to actually -- you know, I find it strange how I actually bought into that. That, A, you had the regime that was essentially allowing someone to go and attack other countries. And then you had the Embassy bombings, you had the Cole, and then when 9-11 happened, there was still that state of denial initially. He's denying, oh, I didn't have anything to do with 9-11. How can I do that? I'm sitting in a cave in Afghanistan. And there is all these -- I bought into the conspiracy theories, like the whatreallyhappened.com type stuff, which was, it was internal job and stuff like that.

THE COURT: So when you posted in the fall of '01, you still accepted that the Taliban was protecting someone who wasn't doing these things?

THE DEFENDANT: At that time, your Honor, I think once the coalition invaded -- I mean, I don't mean any disrespect, but for -- in the Muslim world, at least, people forgot about 9-11 and it all became upon, Afghanistan is about to be attacked.

Now looking back, they were attacked because Al-Qaida went and attacked 9-11 first. It wasn't like Muslims in is Srebrenica are just sitting there and living their lives and just someone came and just massacred them. Someone went from Afghanistan, they went, they attacked the

United States. Well, of course, the United States is going to invade Afghanistan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So at that time, I solicited -- continued to solicit support for Taliban regime and the coalition of troops -- not because I supported Al-Qaida or 9-11, but because it was a Muslim land and it was under attack.

Soon after that, obviously, your Honor, I mentioned 9-11. On 9-11, the world changed. As you said, it's sometimes difficult to imagine, a two-hours drive from ground zero, that there ever was once a world before 9-11, in which 9-11 had not happened. There's a lot of things that we I mean, when 9-11 itself happened, I remember when learned. I saw the screens on -- I was at work, and I went to the break room with my co-workers just to watch the news. remember one shot in particular. That there was one young woman and she was just describing about what happened, and she had this phrase, she said there was just people jumping out the windows. I remember that this woman had a look on her face which reminded me of the looks on the faces of the Bosnia Muslims that I had met on my first visit to Bosnia. She had that stare in her eyes which looks straight through And immediately for me, that wasn't -- there was no discussion about that. Whoever was responsible, whatever -whoever had done that, these were just people who went to work and who were on their way to work and someone had done

this to them. This was a crime.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It didn't even occur to me that any -- this was done in the name of Islam or it was somehow something to do with Jihad. That thought was much, much further away from me. Eventually, your Honor, the situation became more difficult to keep the websites open. Things became more clear. Things were in haze, who had actually done this. Initially, I thought that no -- you know, God knows who had done this. Ιt hadn't been these people in Afghanistan. And as time came out and they began to issue, like, videos of hijackers and the words of the 9-11 hijackers where they were effectively saying it was us. The websites, I shut down -- we shut down the websites in July of 2002. I had lots of other things going on personally in my life at that time as well. decided to just take a little step back with what was happening to try and digest everything.

I put my efforts, then, in the last couple of years before I was arrested, into -- my cause became obtaining rights for the detainees in Guantanamo Bay. There was some people from our community that had been caught in Guantanamo Bay that were later released without charge. There was a lot of hassle upon the Muslim community, what you would call stop and frisk. And lots of people, especially in that post 9-11 period, a lot of people were getting hassled in the Muslim community. I put in efforts to educate them about their

rights and the legal rights. I myself had a negative experience with the police. Thereafter I spoke to people in our community about what happened.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Then August 2004, I came to prison. Prison, your Honor, for me was a completely different world to what I had been living in. From working in a university, I was now living with criminals and drug dealers and murders and all types of people.

The 10 years I spent in prison have been the darkest years of my life. I did try -- I have tried to learn from this experience, from these last 10 years. You mentioned these committees that I sat on in prison. I learned from them about communication, about how people just need to talk. It's not difficult. It's not rocket science. There's two opposing people who have different views. They just need to talk. They might not agree with each other, but they will definitely stop attacking each other. I saw that happen over several years in the prison. I read many, many books. read books of people that had gone through previous struggles. I read Mandela's book. I read several books of Mandela. Ghandi. I've read books of the Northern Ireland troubles and their peace process. Your Honor, as you mentioned, the course by Dr. Sharkawy, which taught me -over nine months, I learned, in essence, I will say the biggest thing that I learned from Dr. Sharkawy was that not

every conflict in the world is Bosnia. The world is complicated. And it's not for individuals, like I would do, to head long rush into a foreign conflict and to get involved and to help because these things are just beyond one person or two or three or five or ten people to do, to resolve. And states have to resolve these problems.

Your Honor, you asked, I think it was on Friday, you mentioned earlier today as well, you spoke about recidivism, you spoke about -- I mean, obviously, these are one of the concerns, one of the questions that you need to address.

of course, your Honor, there's many things that I want to do in the future. I have lost a lot of time with my family, being away from my family, that's something that I want to make up the lost time for. But for me, another way of answering this question, as well as the way my thoughts have changed and as well as what I want to do with my family is, am I prepared to go through this again? By that, I mean, ten years of strip searches, humiliation, isolation, lockdowns. Ten years of picking up the prison phone to find out that my grandmother has died, or an aunt or uncle has died, or a friend has died and I am not going to be able to attend their funeral. Ten years of putting on a brave face and going and meeting my family on a visit only to come back and to count the minutes until the morning.

I remember, your Honor, one thing that Nelson

Mandela once said. He said, years pass like minutes in prison, but sometimes the minutes pass like years. And I spent a lot of these years and minutes in the last ten years.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Last night, your Honor, I did the same routine that I have done for the last two years at Northern. Northern is a place I have been living next to death row inmates for the last two years. I see them every day. The inmates bang and shout and scream all day, all night. And for me to sleep, my bedtime routine consists of five pairs of socks and an empty shampoo bottle. You might wonder what does five pairs of socks and an empty shampoo bottle have to do with sleep? Well, half an hour before I sleep, I will get the pairs of socks, I will fold them, and I have to make an airtight seal all the way around the door. It has to be done in a certain way with a plastic fork, which takes about 15 minutes in order to stop the noise. Then I will get the empty shampoo bottle and I'll balance it at a certain angle on the air vent so it has like a wind tunnel effect and makes like a white noise. Only then I can sleep. And several times throughout the night, if the shampoo bottle, if it falls, then the banging will wake me up. And I have to go and I need to go and balance it back before I can sleep. I did it last night and the night before, and it's been like that for the last two years.

So quite simply, one of the ways for me to answer

that question is, am I prepared to go through all of that again? No, your Honor, I'm not prepared to go through all of that -- I'm not prepared to go through all of that again.

Your Honor, there's not much, I guess, not much more left for me to say. There's just one last thing that I wanted to say, if I may, your Honor.

I wanted to say something about my representation.

Your Honor, it would appear today that the Federal Defender's

Office in Connecticut is on a furlough today, but they have

actually all come here with their friends and families to

come and support me.

Your Honor, over the last couple of years, Mr. Ward has spent his weekends and evenings, he's come to visit me all the way at Northern. He has -- he came to see me the day after Thanksgiving. I probably shouldn't say this, but I'm going to anyway, that -- that someone close to him told me that in his 25 years as a federal defender, they've never seen him work as hard on a case as he worked on my case.

Your Honor, Ms. Barrett here has spent, over the last two years, perhaps 5 or 600 hours in legal visits with me, driving up to Northern up to four times a week coming to see me. She came to see me the morning after Christmas. She even came to see me on a weekend on a surprise visit on my 40th birthday, which was just a few weeks ago. She said that I didn't want you to spend this alone, so I just came to see

1 you.

Your Honor, I'm not going to lie to you, I did not have a very positive opinion of America before I came here. But I must admit that my experiences with my attorneys and with the Federal Defender's Office here in Connecticut has completely changed the way I look at America.

And whatever sentence you pass upon me today, I shall remain grateful to them for the rest of my life.

That's all I have to say, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Attorney Reynolds.

MR. MILLER: With the Court's permission, Raymond Miller for the government.

THE COURT: Yes, certainly.

MR. MILLER: I will address the Court briefly.

Given the Court's rulings today, perhaps I have some heavy

lifting to do. I want to keep the government's remarks

short, your Honor. And given your Honor's ruling, we're

going to refocus our argument a little bit.

We made our points, and we respect your Honor's ruling. In many instances, advanced a different point of view. But I think, in your Honor's -- my understanding of your Honor's ruling this morning, your series of rulings on factual situations, the one thing I want to focus on is the comments and the import of your comments on the seriousness

of the crime when it comes to imposing what's a fair and just sentence in this case.

2.

What the Court has defined the crime here as is support of the Taliban who, at that time, was harboring Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. And --

THE COURT: At the time after he had committed two heinous terrorist attacks and was planning the third.

MR. MILLER: Exactly correct, your Honor.

And what you said, and this is a paraphrase of your words, your words control, but that the defendant's solicitation of funds, which I will talk more about in a minute, but contributed to the training of men and people who committed terrorist acts against the United States. He owns a piece of that for the rest of his life. That's the crime that he committed. I think everyone in this courtroom has agreement on that.

His provision of support to the Taliban, who was harboring then Osama bin Laden, is a serious crime that warrants a significant punishment.

THE COURT: Is it significant that he didn't -- in doing what he did, his intention or his objective was not to enable Osama bin Laden to blow up the World Trade Center.

His intention, as I understand it, which I wouldn't necessarily agree with, but was to support what he viewed as an Islamic state government. That his view, at the time was,

a good thing. I think he now would agree perhaps more with my view, that it wasn't a good thing, but that was his view at the time.

MR. MILLER: When you look at the support though —
I want to make sure I have my dates correct. I checked with
the agents in the interim after we started this morning.
That if you look at the attack on the World Trade Center,
which obviously occurred in September of 2001. The FBI
informs me, if I have this right, that in October 2001, a
video of Osama bin Laden, Sulaiman Abu Ghayth had taken
responsibility for the bombings on 9-11 and explained why the
U.S. deserved air populate. I believe I have that correct.
That's in October 2001.

And if you look at the Azzam website, and in November 2001, it was updated with the appeal to Pakistanis. Excuse me. It was updated in the Jihad in Afghanistan section. I want to make sure I have this right, too. That there's a link that -- that there's an update in the Jihad to Afghanistan. And with that was the link on the appeal to Pakistanis, which I think we're agreeing is the support to the Taliban of money and contributions. And in that link, that Afghanistan page which your Honor has focused on, what I'm going to call the World Trade Center bar graph. I don't know what to call it. Call it a box. I don't know if there's a particular apt word for its description. But what

that did is it compared civilian deaths I think in

Afghanistan to the civilian deaths in the World Trade Center.

In the appeal to Pakistanis, which was linked on this page, which was updated in November of 2001 -- excuse me, the page that was updated in November of 2001 contained the link to the appeal to Pakistanis. So in November of 2001, the website is continuing to support the Taliban.

When you think about material support cases -- and I agree with your Honor. When we looked at all of these cases, and like a lot of areas of law, quite frankly, there is sometimes not consistency. With the guidelines, the 3553(a), the guidelines tell us to strive against that.

If you look just at material support cases, one thing your Honor said I think was particularly important, this is not the material support case of an individual contributing material support. I forget the name of the defendant, but I think there is a case I think your Honor cited to. It was a cab driver in Los Angeles that provided a sum of money to Locke before Locke was killed.

That's not this case. And this case is obviously a website case, where a website is appealing to everyone else. But this is not just a website case. When it is updated in November 2001 saying that Jihad in Afghanistan with a link with the appeal to Pakistanis, hey, come support the Taliban, this is at a time when there weren't a lot of English

```
language websites. So it was a material support case in some
1
 2
     ways, as the government has said, is unprecedented in its
     scope. It's not an individual. It's not just a website.
 3
     It's one of the first websites in 2001. When I think about
 4
     the internet usage in 2001, it's very different than it is in
 5
            So this is a pioneering website. This is a website
 6
    reaching out across the world in English in November 2001
 7
     asking individuals to -- asking Pakistanis to support the
 8
     Jihad in Afghanistan given the difficulties the case brought.
 9
10
              It's a difficult case with a lot of factors, your
11
    Honor.
             And given your Court's ruling and the seriousness of
12
     the crime, the government believes should be an important
13
     consideration in whatever sentence you determine.
14
              Could I have one moment, your Honor?
15
              With that, the government has nothing further, your
16
    Honor.
17
              THE COURT: Could I ask you a question?
18
              MR. MILLER: Certainly.
19
              THE COURT:
                          I don't know how to put it. How do you
20
    view the last ten years of Mr. Ahmad's life? What does it
21
     say to what's before the Court today?
22
              MR. MILLER: Can I have another moment?
23
              THE COURT: Yes.
24
              MR. MILLER: Your Honor, the government doesn't have
25
     any evidence contrary to what's presented in the last ten
```

years of his life when he's been incarcerated. But I think we continue to believe strongly that the nature and seriousness of the offense warrants an appropriately significant sentence.

But as far as specific insight into what's going on in Mr. Ahmad's life in the last ten years, we don't have anything to add other than we've already argued in the last couple of days.

THE COURT: I guess I'll put it this way, do you think it's a charade? Do you think he's a really evil-intending man who when free will want to continue to act as he acted in 2001 in supporting the Taliban that protected the world's worst terrorist? If it is, it's an incredible act on his part. I guess I can't get around the last ten years. I honestly, if it were me, I would not be ticket free. I would be very angry. And I would have acted on that anger. Yet, I see a man who didn't. Maybe he has tremendous self-control. Maybe he's really some disciplined, secret, covert terrorist, and that once free, will spring free and become the next Osama bin Laden. But I -- if so, he's done a heck of a good job of pulling the wool over my eyes.

While I think the seriousness of what he does merits a serious sentence, I have to consider other factors. One of them is wrapped up and ultimately comes down the issue of recidivism. What will he do when released?

MR. MILLER: Your Honor, nobody has a crystal ball.

2.

THE COURT: No, I know. If I did, I wouldn't have spent the time I spent over the last three weeks on this case, if I had a crystal ball.

MR. MILLER: I know the government as well as defense counsel appreciates your comments. And the Court's struggle in every sentencing, not in set cases, unique cases like that. But every day, wire fraud, mail fraud, bank robbery cases and struggling with it. We don't have a crystal ball. I will stand by Mr. Reynolds's comment earlier. The government has concerns about this individual's return, not to the operational violent Jihad. That's not the government's argument. There's not that concern. That's not what he did before.

Systemic material -- significant material support.

And I can't get my head around why the World Trade Center's were attacked in September. In October, there's publication, wide publication according to the FBI, by bin Laden and his associates telling why the U.S. deserved it. And why you would post on a website, send help to the Taliban a month after that. Two months after 9-11. That, I think, is something that hasn't been addressed. That's something that the government has concerns about, this defendant returning to a material support position as Mr. Reynolds' explained

either yesterday or Friday. 1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I had one other question for, Mr. Ahmad. If he doesn't wish to answer it, he doesn't have to. 3

I happen to have made a note in looking through the piles of materials I looked at. I'm not sure why I'm bothering to ask the question, but it bothered me when I saw it.

Among the materials submitted as to his art work in Exhibit L of the plaintiff's submissions, one of them is a gift I think he gave to someone who worked with him in England. It's of a sailboat. The title of it is "Sailing Through Injustice." I would ask what injustice you were referring to.

That was a gift, your Honor, to my THE DEFENDANT: attorneys that represented me in the U.K And that was my attorney who represented the Guildford Falls. They have done a lot of cases. So that was just to -- it was like a gift to the office to appreciate their work.

> THE COURT: I see.

MR. WARD: Your Honor, the attorney he is speaking of is Garrett Pierce, the solicitor from London. She was actually here yesterday as well. She came just to support Mr. Ahmad.

THE COURT: All right. I had thought I would be able to finish Mr. Ahmad's sentencing. I'm sure he wishes I could before lunch, but I'm having a revolt by my reporter for the first time in 15 years. In addition, to having gone for three and a half hours without a break, she's freezing. So her fingers will not move. So I would have avoided the complaint about the lack of break, since this is Judge Dorsey's former courtroom, but I can't if she can't take down what's being said.

So unfortunately, we'll take a half an hour lunch recess. And come back after recess.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

01:32 PM.

THE COURT: Please be seated. And good afternoon to you.

Having heard from both sides and having considered and discussed the various factors the Court has an obligation to consider, the Court would like to just say a few final remarks before proceeding to impose sentence.

I think taking all of the factors into consideration, as I must and as I have. In my view, the two factors really which are the most significant here are the nature and circumstance in that respect, the seriousness of what Mr. Ahmad did which makes him guilty of the crimes for which he stands before the Court when balanced against his history and characteristics, which also go to the question of the need for deterrence, or put the way I have been putting

it, his likelihood, if any, of recidivism.

With respect to the crime which he committed, as I have already said, I view it as a serious crime, particularly as it related to his operation of and support of a website and support for a website which after Osama bin Laden took responsibility for terrorist acts, that website continued to call for support of the Taliban, which was and had been protecting Osama bin Laden. I suspect that but for that and the timing of that, we wouldn't be here today.

And it's a serious offense, as I have already said, and merits substantial punishment. Balanced against that, however, and I have already spoken at length about his history and characteristics, but what in sum amounts to a very upright, positive and well-meaning life lived by Mr. Ahmad.

It's this Court's conclusion, and I hope I am not wrong, that Mr. Ahmad has a low likelihood of recidivating, if any at all. I rest that very difficult decision, which is really the pivotal decision in my opinion in this sentencing, on a number of things.

One is the nature of what his crime was. It's not a crime of action. It's not a crime of murder or harm or attempt to cause harm to a person. It was a wrong support of bad people. Second, I look at what not only he did in his life before he became involved with the website and Azzam

Publication, but I also look at the last ten years of his life. As I said, unless one believes that Mr. Ahmad is engaged in the charade, which I do not believe, I doubt that I could have had the open heart and the lack of anger which he evidences here today and he has evidenced throughout the ten years in custody.

That's not to say he wasn't upset that he was being sought to be extradited. He wasn't unhappy about his circumstance, but as measured in the correspondence he maintained and the communications he had with his family and his friends, people he sought out to support in times of need, they all inform my judgment that this is a good person who does not and will not seek in the future to harm other people. Even people who are different than himself.

I guess finally, although I often get some letters of support from people in support of a defendant and they are almost always very positive about the person, I must say that the outpouring that I received on behalf of Mr. Ahmad and the nature of what they said and the examples that they cited and the history they told of Mr. Ahmad, both before he was incarcerated and after he was incarcerated, all of that supports this Court's judgment that he's not likely to engage in criminal activity again.

In my view, and I don't profess to have tremendous amounts of insight in this respect, but I think someone else

has, indeed himself, may have used the expression that colored by his experience in Bosnia and his view of things after that experience, and caught up in what was happening in the world, in Afghanistan and with bin Laden, and the world's view against this Islam state known as the Taliban, that he lost his way. In my view, I think he lost sight of what I understand to be basic Islamic principles. He lost sight of those and that those that he professed to be his beliefs. Ι think if -- and again, I -- you know, this is really two cents, it's not even worth two cents, but it's my two cents -- I think he got caught up in the concept that Muslims were struggling around the world, but unfortunately lost sight of and intended to help Muslims who were engaged in very bad conduct which, in my opinion, has nothing to do with Islam.

In my view, these people -- Islam was hijacked by Osama bin Laden. And the banner of Islam was waved to justify what he did and to engage in unspeakable acts, which I am persuaded this defendant believes has no place in Islam. As I said earlier, I think all terrorists wave the banner of Jihad, but not all Jihad is terrorism. I think that the terrorists, those who have acted out against this country, have done so by twisting and warping the Koran to provide a false doctrinal support for Jihad, terrorist Jihad, against people like Americans and around the world.

It's my conclusion that this defendant does not subscribe to those views. If I'm wrong, then I have failed in my job today. I do believe that there was a time, approximately 2000 to 2002, when Mr. Ahmad wrongly supported the Taliban. He did so at a time when he knew the Taliban was protecting Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaida. And he did it at a time when he had to have known that eventually what Osama bin Laden and Al-Qaida had done.

So I don't mean in any way to suggest that he hasn't done something wrong, and therefore doesn't have to pay a price for what he did wrong. At the same time -- and my sentence will reflect that. At the same time, the sentence must consider, and principally does, his history and characteristics, which, as I say, drive me to the conclusion that the likelihood that he would ever engage in anything like what brings him before this Court is small.

Mr. Ahmad, I would ask if you would please rise, sir, so that I might impose sentence.

It's the sentence of this Court to impose upon you a period of incarceration of 150 months on Count 1, and 150 months on Count 2 to be served concurrently with credit for time served from December 2 to December 9 of 2003, and from August 5, 2004 until today.

With respect to a period of supervised release, the Court imposes a period of five years on Count One and five

years on Count Two to be served concurrently.

The Court imposes no fine because it finds you cannot pay one. The Court imposes no restitution because I do not find it applicable, or if it is applicable, none has been proven or sought.

The Court imposes a special assessment on Count One of \$100 and \$100 on Count Two for a total of \$200.

With respect to the period of time designated to the Bureau of Prisons, it's strongly recommended to the Bureau of Prisons that you be designated to MCI in New York City to facilitate the agreed to transfer of supervision of your sentence, or what remains, to the United Kingdom. If you are not designated to MCI, the Court strongly recommends you be designated to either a minimum or medium security facility all in keeping with your safe keeping.

With respect to the period of supervised release, it's my understanding that you have agreed to supervision as required under U.K. law when you return to the United Kingdom. I'm going to impose conditions of supervised release, however as they would apply if you were here. The Court imposes the standard conditions of supervised release as well as the mandatory ones, that you not commit another crime, you not unlawfully possess a controlled substance, you pay the special assessment I have imposed, and you cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample.

Further, the Court imposes the following special conditions: That you be subject to your person, residence, office or vehicle to search conducted by a probation officer at a reasonable time and in a manner based upon reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure to submit to that search may be grounds for revocation of your supervision. The defendant shall warn any other residents or occupants that the premises or vehicles may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

Second, the defendant shall provide the probation officer with access to requested financial information.

Third, the defendant shall not possess ammunition or a firearm or other dangerous weapon. And fourth, as directed be the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with the same.

Is there anything about the sentence, Ray, that's unlawful or that I overlooked?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor. I know you intend to address appellate rights.

THE COURT: I'll do that in a moment.

MR. WARD: Your Honor, a couple of things, if I may.

The facility in New York is actually MCC. 1 THE COURT: Thank you. 2 I would ask the Court to please make --3 MR. WARD: in addition to the judgment, that says that all time spent in 4 5 United Kingdom custody was in relation to these charges, and that you intend he should have credit for that time. 6 I think that's it, your Honor. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that the 8 government wishes to comment on or add? 9 10 MR. MILLER: No, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Anything further, Attorney Ward, from 12 you? 13 Thank you, your Honor. MR. WARD: No. 14 THE COURT: Mr. Ahmad, you have the right to appeal 15 a sentence that's imposed by this Court. However, I believe that you gave up your right to appeal the sentence I have 16 17 just imposed because it's below the limits that you agreed to 18 waive your right to appeal. However, if you think you gave 19 up your right to appeal without knowing what you were doing 20 or because someone forced you to do so, you can try to 21 I would urge you to speak to your counsel today if 22 you wish to consider an appeal. If you do, to tell them or direct them to file a notice of appeal. 23 24 The reason I urge you to do that is because the time

to file such a notice is very short. It will be 14 days from

25

```
today. If it isn't filed by then, then it's as if you never
1
 2.
     filed it at all. It can't be extended at that time.
              Do you understand the short period of time to have
 3
 4
     the Notice of Appeal filed in the Clerk's Office?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT:
                          There is one other matter, the clerk
    advises me that the motion to preclude the unreliable
 7
     evidence having to do with the deposition of the cooperating
 8
    witness, Number 175, is still pending. I think I'm going to
 9
     terminate that as moot. I have addressed various aspects of
10
11
    his testimony. I think I indicated last Friday that I didn't
12
     intend to rule on the motion, per se, and I would address it
13
    as I made my findings.
              Is there any objection to proceeding that way?
14
15
              MR. MILLER: No, your Honor.
16
              MR. WARD: No, your Honor.
17
              THE COURT: Anything else that needs to be addressed
18
    with respect to Mr. Ahmad?
19
              MR. MILLER: Not from the government.
20
              THE COURT: Are there counts to be dismissed?
21
              MR. MILLER: Pursuant to the plea agreement, your
22
    Honor, the government moves to dismiss three and four of the
23
     indictment as they pertain to this defendant.
24
              THE COURT: With respect to the government's oral
25
    motion, the Court grants the motion to dismiss the remaining
```

counts in the indictment which I believe are numbered three and four.

Is there anything else, Ray?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor. I know it's clear that the sentence imposed is a nonguideline sentence.

THE COURT: It is a nonguideline -- I departed under Fernandez, but obviously it's below that. So it is a nonguideline sentence based upon consideration of all of the 3553(a) factors, which I think I discussed fully.

THE COURT: Is there anything further?

MR. WARD: No.

2.

THE COURT: I would like to thank the probation officer for all of the time he spent on this matter, and I thank counsel for all of their help in helping me reach a judgment in this case.

The Court imposed a sentence of 150 months on each of Count One and on Count Two to be serve concurrent. I previously indicated that that is with credit for time served, including all time spent, not only in the United States, but also in the custody of the United Kingdom in relation to these charges, the dates of which I understand to be December 2 of '03 to December 9 of '03, and August of '05, 2004 to the present.

It's this Court's view and its understanding in imposing sentence reflects its view that Mr. Ahmad will

```
receive credit for that time which the Court estimates,
1
     including good time credit, to be approximately 137 months.
 2
     I'm not -- the Court does not expect to be held to the
 3
 4
    precise calculus, but it wishes anyone who should decide to
 5
    read this transcript to understand that the sentence of 150
 6
    months is reflective of the approximate ten years Mr. Ahmad
    has been in custody and recognizing that good time credit is
 7
     earned in connection with time served.
 8
              I think that completes Mr. Ahmad's case. I don't
    know whether he wishes to stay -- I'm going to proceed to
10
11
     take up Mr. Ahsan at this time.
              THE COURT: You wish to be relieved and go back to
12
13
    New York?
              MR. DRATEL: I have a train.
14
15
              THE COURT: You don't like Connecticut, I guess.
              MR. DRATEL: It's been great.
16
17
              THE COURT:
                          There's -- nobody needs to stay.
18
              I need to know, or the marshals need to know what
19
    you are doing.
20
              MR. WARD: We would like to stay, your Honor.
21
22
              THE COURT: All right. I am prepared at this time,
23
    unless the parties wish to address the issues further, to, in
24
    effect, state what my findings are by of way of reference to
25
     the PSR and to the defendant's version. Obviously, I will
```

give you an opportunity once I have done that to object. But if you wish to be heard before that, now is the time.

MR. REEVE: Thank you, your Honor. I would only indicate that we obviously have been here and heard your Honor's findings, and I'm not requesting that your Honor make additional findings or go through every paragraph of the pre. Obviously, if your Honor feels like that's a necessary step, I'm not saying otherwise. I just think that your Honor's findings, in a large part, are applicable here. Obviously, your Honor has some different findings with respect to Mr. Ahsan's specific conduct, but in terms of addressing all the paragraphs, I would just simply accept the findings that your Honor has made with respect to Mr. Ahmad's case insofar as they apply to Mr. Ahsan.

If that expedites the proceeding, fine. If it just complicates it, I withdraw it.

THE COURT: Does the government have a view?

MR. MILLER: I agree with Mr. Reeve. If the most expeditious way is maybe to reference the other proceeding so that Mr. Lopez can amend the PSR, then address findings that are unique to this defendant.

I agree with Mr. Reeve, whatever is simplest.

THE COURT: I didn't do it that way, so it's not simple for me. What I will do is, Mr. Lopez made a separate PSR. It doesn't line up exactly with the paragraphs in the

first PSR. Then Attorney Reeve made his version, which, of course, isn't anywhere near like the version of Mr. Ahsan's counsel. So I'm inclined to do what I did the first time around.

So this is what I'm going to do. I adopt the cover page with respect to Mr. Ahsan's PSR except for the date of the sentencing should be today's date.

I adopt Paragraphs 1 through 5, except for Paragraph 2 should be changed to reflect today's date. I adopt Paragraph 7 except it should read that, from about early 2001, not from at least 1999.

Similarly, I adopt Paragraph 8 only insofar as it would read from approximately 1999 through September -- to mid 2002 Ahmad and others supported the Taliban, including indirectly their protection of Al-Qaida because the Taliban was protecting Al-Qaida by conspiring to provide and providing various assistance and seeking support for the same.

Paragraph 9 is adopted except that the word "Jihadi" is stricken in the second line. And the names of the websites Azzam and Qogaz .net should be added. The Court adopts Paragraph 10. The Court adopts Paragraph 11 beginning with the word Ahmad and other members of Azzam Publications, it does not adopt the first sentence and the beginning of the second.

Paragraph 12 should read that Ahmad and his associates made efforts to secure additional equipment, cold weather camouflage, combat uniforms for Chechnya, and GPS devices, Kevlar helmets, ballistic devices, none of which appear to have made it to Afghanistan or Chechnya. And satellite phones and laptops preloaded with encrypted software.

13 is adopted. 15 is adopted as amended, another individual joined and was a member of Azzam Publications. The language designed in part to groom and recruit individuals to be sent to train and fight violate Jihad abroad is stricken. The next sentence would read, the individual went to Afghanistan to train for the Jihad, and there he subsequently received and observed several other individuals from Tooting.

The rest of the next three lines is stricken. I would adopt the sentence that individual observed Ahsan down to the words medical care. The rest is stricken and not adopted.

Paragraph 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, is adopted. 24 is adopted with the introductory statement that its provided for background only and that Mr. Ahsan was not involved at the times recounted here.

Paragraph 25, 26, 27. Again, 28 is provided for background only, but adopted. 29 is adopted. 31 is adopted.

34 is adopted. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 through 46, 47 through 51 through 55. 59 is adopted, as I find that was on the website in early 2001. 60 is a adopted. 61 is adopted. 65 is adopted. 66 through 72 is adopted. 73 through 75 is adopted except that the last sentence should read, as previously stated, prior to providing the Battle Group Document to Ahmad, Ahsan removed the original until metadata and manually input a false name, John Green, as the author. 76, 77, 78, 79, 80 are adopted.

Abu-Jihad "who sent the Battle Group Document was eventually convicted." 85, 86, 87, 88 are adopted except the phrase over 50 in 88 is not adopted. 89 is adopted. 106 is adopted. 113 is adopted except that description of the additional material should be (120 gigabytes). Paragraph 15 is adopted except it should begin by reading, recovered from Syed Talha Ahsan's room were three pages on loose-leaf paper, obviously among others.

16 is adopted as amended as follows -- 116. There were 120 gigabytes of material found in Ahsan's possession during the February '06 search of his residence. The material was highly organized, unusually organized. Some of the material referenced Jihad. Some referenced violent Jihad. Some referenced what I would describe as moderate or peaceful views of Islam. Some referenced self or defensive

1 Jihad.

At this point I would insert the defendant's Paragraph 56, which describes material found in his room, which effectively rejects Al-Qaida's view of Islam as a justification for terrorist acts.

The Court adopts 117, which is the letter to his father. The Court adopts 120 as background because it predates his involvement, but he was involved with the publications that are mentioned there later on. 121, 126, 127. The Court also as adopts the defendant's proposed findings Paragraph 4 through 7, Paragraphs 10 through 11, except -- it adopts the first sentence of Paragraph 10. It does not adopt the introductory language in Paragraph 11. So my 11 would begin, Mr. Ahsan agreed to assist Mr. Ahmad.

I also adopt paragraph -- sorry -- 48, except I would amend it as follows, evidence of Mr. Ahsan's involvement in criminal activity ended as of September 21.

And strike to the time of his arrest.

I would also adopt Paragraph 56, which I have already mentioned, I believe. Paragraphs 64 through 68. And there are more that the defense offers. I'm only adopting or finding certain of these as an example of what was found in Mr. Ahsan's room being, I think, a broad spectrum of material and not necessarily focused on one, and certainly not an extremist focus on Jihad.

I adopt 68, which -- with the following addition,

Mr. Ahsan also had material in hard copy relating to various

prospectus on the Islamist concept of Jihad, including copies

of which are found in the library of the school he attended.

The school where he Oriental and African studies at the

University of London. In addition, the Court adopts

Paragraph 80, 81, 82, and Paragraph 83 and 86.

Further, the Court adopts Part B as to the lack of criminal history, which is up through Paragraph 150. The Court adopts all of the paragraphs in Part C without edit.

And the Court adopts Part D, sentencing options, Part E and Part F.

With respect to the probation officer's evaluation, the officer has indicated he wishes to amend his evaluation at Paragraph 168. The second sentence would be stricken and would read instead, what isn't contested is that Azzam Publications served to raise and provide material support to the Taliban who supported Al-Qaida, a terrorist organization.

Then he would continue through the next sentence unchanged. Then he would edit the remainder of the paragraph to read as follows: the probation officer, like defense counsel, has reviewed the government's version of the offense and relevant conduct and essentially agrees that the content, specifically the Taliban postings available on the website, cannot be discounted from the overall intent and purpose.

That is, to provide material support to the Taliban, who in turn supported or protected Al-Qaida. The parties agreed that the defendants in this case cannot be directly connected to any specific acts of terrorism. However, the operation of Azzam Publications was in support of the Taliban who supported Al-Qaida and, as such, their efforts, meaning the defendant's efforts, to raise money and material for the Taliban renders them indirectly connected to Al-Qaida. That's the probation officer's evaluation, Paragraph 188.

Paragraph 90 has been amended to delete the first sentence and to delete up -- delete the second sentence and the beginning of the third regardless, and to continue the beginning of 190 would be to begin with, the Court is required to sentence the individual. Other than that, there's no further changes.

Are there objections by the government to the findings made as -- oh, I'm sorry. There's one other finding I wanted to make.

I intended to insert after Paragraph 129, which I believe is a place -- well. I intended to assert the following finding, the cooperating witness testified that when Mr. Ahsan traveled to Afghanistan, he was described by Ahmad on an encrypted disc as naive. He, the cooperating witness, was asked to take care of him. That's Mr. Ahsan. The cooperating witness also testified that Mr. Ahsan was not

particularly skilled at the matters being taught at the camps that he attended, which the Court finds were not Al-Qaida camps. He was not suited to the work in the view of the cooperating witness, the work of the camps. The cooperating witness also testified that Ahsan did not support Al-Qaida or its terrorist actions against civilians. And unlike the cooperating witness, Mr. Ahsan did not join Al-Qaida.

I know that we are going to mix the record up, but I actually meant to mention in sentencing Mr. Ahmad, that I was relying in part on my judgment about what might happen with respect to Mr. Ahmad in the future upon the matters we discussed on the classified record yesterday. And the comments that are reflected in that record, which I cannot repeat here today, as to his lack of involvement in certain things.

The same, of course, can be said about Mr. Ahsan, although that was not particularly said about Mr. Ahsan in those classified materials, but the cooperating witness said it about Mr. Ahsan.

I think the last thing I have to reference in connection with the facts that I have just found is in the classified materials. There's a reference to Mr. Ahsan in a certain time period that relates to a paragraph that I found as to Mr. Ahsan. And the Court is mindful of that in considering that finding.

Sorry that's so cryptic, but that's what happens with classified material, you can't talk about it.

Is there objection by the government to the facts as found by the Court by adoption of certain of the Presentence Report paragraphs and certain of the defendant's paragraphs?

MR. MILLER: No additional objection other than what's already stated, your Honor.

THE COURT: Attorney Reeve.

MR. REEVE: Your Honor, I'm not sure it's an objection, but I guess I would ask for a clarification. Your Honor had alluded to the date of September 21. There was no year when you referred to that. I think I misheard it.

THE COURT: Did I mean to say September 2001?

MR. REEVE: I think you might have meant to say September 1, 2001, but I hear September 21.

THE COURT: Can you tell me the context, what was I saying at the time?

If it relates to my finding of Mr. Ahsan's involvement in the matters at issue in the case, I find that he became involved with Azzam Publications and was responding to people who were placing ads for materials as seen on a website known as Azzam Publications from some time in early 2001, whether it's February or April, I'm not sure it matters much, and it ended, I think, by agreement with the government, no later than September 1, 2001.

```
1
              MR. REEVE:
                          Thank you. That clarifies it, and I
 2
    have no objections.
              THE COURT: Unless there's an objection, I think
 3
    what I'm going to do is what I did this morning with Mr.
 4
    Ahmad, which is a little different than the normal.
 5
    haven't heard quite so much from folks about Mr. Ahsan, but I
 6
    would proceed to deal with the quideline calculation and then
 7
     to talk about the factors before coming to a conclusion about
 8
     sentencing, then permit both sides to be heard.
 9
              Is that all right, or would you like to do a more
10
11
     traditional approach?
12
              MR. REEVE: That's fine.
              THE COURT: First the Court needs to calculate the
13
    guidelines. And again, under 2X2.1 referring over to 2A1.5A,
14
15
    a conspiracy to commit murder, the base offense level is 28.
    Because of the nature of the crime and how it's characterized
16
17
    under 3A1.4A, the enhancement for a crime of terrorism of 12
     is added.
18
19
              The officer -- the probation officer did not
    recommend a minor role, but I am considering that. And I
20
21
    would ask if the government objects to the awarding of the
     two-level reduction for a minor role?
22
23
              MR. MILLER: If your Honor is talking about the
     calculation for the conspiracy count?
24
25
```

THE COURT:

I guess.

MR. MILLER: There's no objection. The operation of the Azzam Publications, the defendant -- this defendant clearly had a minor role. No objection.

THE COURT: So I am going to award a two-level reduction, which results in a 38.

Does the government recommend acceptance of responsibility and move for the third point of reduction?

MR. MILLER: We do, your Honor.

THE COURT: The Court agrees with the government, that the defendant has accepted responsibility for his offenses, and further finds that he pled guilty at a time that allowed the government to avoid the expense of trial, prosecution, and therefore awards and grants the motion for the one-level reduction. That results in a total offense level of 35.

Once again, while the defendant has no criminal history points, because of 3A1.4B, he's automatically placed in a Criminal History VI. And if I'm correct, I believe a level 35, Criminal History VI results in a guideline range of 292 to 365 months.

However, I believe that based upon the offenses of conviction that Mr. Ahsan pled to, that the maximum penalties total 15 years. And therefore, the guideline sentence becomes 15 years.

Is there any objection or gently suggested

correction of the Court in that respect, that I made a 1 misstatement? 2. MR. MILLER: That's exactly correct, your Honor. 3 MR. REEVE: No, your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: We have a quideline sentence of 15 5 6 years. 7 For those of you who have been here since this morning, you are well aware, and I hope you are, too, Mr. 8 Ahsan, that it is my obligation to sentence you after 9 considering a number of factors that the law requires me to 10 11 consider, and it's my intention to do that now. I'm going to start with the nature and circumstances 12 13 of your offense. And as I view you, you served as a mail clerk for Azzam Publications. You did that from some time in 14 15 the first quarter, say, of 2001 until September 1 of '01. And by mail clerk, you undertook the responsibility for Azzam 16 17 Publications of going to the mailbox, getting the orders, 18 filling the orders and dealing with whatever appeared in the 19 mailbox. 20 And indeed, one day something did appear in the mailbox, I believe in April of 2001, and that is 21 22 correspondence from Mr. Abu-Jihaad and transmitting to you 23 what was or became what is known as the Battleship Group

Document. I find that you were not an administrator of the

I find you were aware of the website and what was

24

25

website.

on it, and that you were assisting Azzam Publications in furthering its work, but that you did not place anything on the website. And I don't think that you were involved, and the government can correct me later, in answering e-mail.

You did possess a document that described operational security. And indeed in connection the Battleship Group Document, you acted in a way which reflects a view that you should treat this in a secure fashion. I will get later to the question of perhaps why you did that. The Court also finds, although it's not really -- it wasn't a crime, but it certainly tells me something about the nature and circumstance of what you did, you traveled to Afghanistan.

You carried with you an encrypted disc from Mr.

Ahmad. You attended training camps, although I specifically find they were not run by Al-Qaida. You did not sympathize with Al-Qaida. You didn't want to fight for Al-Qaida. You were taken to the front, although I don't find that that was voluntary on your part. You certainly didn't fight in Afghanistan.

In my view, I think you went there to fulfill what you viewed as a religious obligation, but that you didn't intend to engage in the fighting that took place there.

I hope I haven't offended you, but as I have said on several occasions, it doesn't appear that you were very good

at this terrorist camp training or camp training and that you were, and it's not surprising given your age, fairly naive about things. You did go a second time, but apparently not much occurred there because of an illness.

So I guess in sum, the nature and circumstance of your offense is that you provided, you aided, you supported Azzam Publications and their websites at a time when they were supporting the Taliban, which I have already gone on a great length about what was wrong with supporting the Taliban, even up to September 1 of 2001. For example, the document that was posted, I believe, in February of 2001, it's what can you do for the Taliban, I think is the name of it, but it seeks money for the Taliban, to support the Taliban, to fight with the Taliban in their fight. And at that time, the Taliban was affirmatively protecting Osama bin Laden, who, at least by the summer of 2001 when you were still supporting Azzam Publications, had been identified and indeed in a recruiting video, was taking credit for terrorist acts.

I need to spend a little bit of time on the

Battleship Document. Again, I view that the person who sent
that document to have an extremely high degree of
culpability. He owed a duty to his country to safeguard that
information, and he did not. Indeed he placed it in the
hands of, mistakenly in my view, people he thought would do

something with it because of the nature of the videos that you were offering. It arrived in the mailbox and in your hands, Mr. Ahsan, unsolicited.

1

2.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I truly believe you never expected to open that document and find what you found. You then, rather oddly, spent ten days typing it up. I am not really sure what all of that is about, whether that relates to your mental health issues, or your mental issues, your attention to detail, which is evidenced in your materials organized in your room, whether it was you were just busy with other things and you didn't get around to it. I really don't know. You also changed the author's name to be other than you. And you affirmatively deleted metadata that would have shown things about the document to anyone like the agent here, not to me, but to people like that. I really cannot draw any conclusions about why you did that. The government obviously wants to argue that you knew how important this was, you didn't want anybody to realize you had it in your possession, it was a crime to possess it, even though you didn't solicit it. That's why you took all of these steps.

What I draw from it is that -- and there's part of it that I can't draw anything from, whether it's your excessive compulsive behavior that led you to do certain things, I don't know. What I do know is that neither you or Mr. Ahmad did anything with the information in the document.

To me, that tells me something important, which is that it evidences that you had, and have, a nonviolent, I guess, outlook on life. If your view had been to be a terrorist, to help Osama bin Laden, to join the violent Jihad, shall we say, in blowing up innocent people, and/or even in blowing up a target of military might of the United States of America like Osama bin Laden did with the Cole, you had within your power, information that could have made that much more likely to happen. And yet what you did is you spent ten days to type it up. You then put it on a disc and apparently gave it to someone, presumably Mr. Ahmad, because eventually it ends up in his possession, but you certainly didn't give it to anybody who made any use of it that can be seen. operations were planned based upon it. Nobody talked about There's no e-mails or anything that's suggesting that was a great find for Azzam Publications and something they would want to run with.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So to me actually, the Battleship Group, although it sounds bad, I guess, I don't know what other word to use, here you are in possession of classified military movement information. That's bad. But the fact is you did nothing with it. In my view, the conclusion I draw is that that's evidence that you never intended to be a part of what I will call the false Jihad of terrorism.

I also will conclude my discussion of nature and

circumstance of what you did by saying what you didn't do.

You never engaged in any violent actions. You never spoke
about, other than the letter to your father, which I will get
to a moment, which I'm not sure if it would fall into this
category, about engaging in any violence, certainly not any
terrorist activities. You didn't engage in any planning for
any of those things. You did not support the bombings at
9-11 or the July London subway bombings. Indeed, before you
were arrested, you are on record as denouncing them.

The question then becomes, sir, what is the need for your sentence? As I have already said to Mr. Ahmad, I start with really the seriousness of what you did because only in that way hopefully will I come to a just punishment.

There's really two aspects to analyzing that. Your support of Azzam Publications and the website given what they were doing in '01 vis-a-vis the Taliban is serious. Your involvement with that, however, was quite limited. You were not involved in posting things. You didn't write things. You didn't choose what went up on the website. I think what the government would say at this point, and I would agree with them, is you associated yourself with Azzam Publications. And therefore, in effect, vouched for or stood with those beliefs because you helped them to continue to operate and to exist.

But it has to be recognized that you did it for a

very limited period of time. That to the extent the government -- and rightly so, I think, when after Mr. Ahmad, as to what he did after mid 2001 and after 9-11, which makes his crime much more serious than Mr. Ahsan's -- that wasn't the case with Mr. Ahsan. Even his limited involvement ends in September of 2001.

The posting I mentioned, I think it went up in early '01, that would have been on at the time that Mr. Ahsan was supporting the Azzam Publications I think is, what can I do to help the Taliban, I think, if I have that correct.

I guess Mr. Ahsan left his engagement with this activity before 9-11, but the seriousness of what he did, even if his role was as minor as I've already said it is, is evidenced by -- and this is where Attorney Reeve's comment comes in -- is that there's a consequence to even this minor role played in support of a website and a publications organization that call for support of a Taliban, which in turn allowed Al-Qaida to exist and to then do what it did in September of 2001.

Again, please don't misunderstand me, Mr. Ahsan is not responsible for the World Trade Center, not by a very long shot. But as was said on a posting on the website, everybody can do their little bit will add up to advancing the cause. And I guess what I would say is, Mr. Ahsan did his little bit. It was relatively minor, even as compared to

the Mr. Ahsan, and certainly minor compared to people who actually sent money in large amounts to the terrorist or who actually went to fight with the terrorists or who actually became the terrorists. But I guess just because there are more heinous versions of the crimes that Mr. Ahsan pled guilty to, doesn't mean that his crime is not a serious one.

The next need for the sentence is deterrence. I've already articulated my view of the general deterrence here of what I would call true terrorists I think is probably zilch.

As to people like Mr. Ahsan, I think there is some measure of deterrence if they were to hear of what happened to him based upon the nature of his conduct.

As to deterring Mr. Ahsan, or the other factor is really the flip of that, protecting the public from further crimes by Mr. Ahsan until he is deterred, I will address in connection with my discussion of his history and characteristics.

As for treatment, it would be my intention to add a provision for that in his supervised release conditions.

If it is all right with everyone, I would adopt what I discussed about the guidelines in these kinds of cases as well as what I discussed about cases generally in comparing sentences that have been imposed in other cases from Mr. Ahmad's sentencing to here, if that's all right with everyone.

MR. REEVE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I would really just say the same thing, other than in this particular instance, again, I don't find the guidelines helpful. I don't think that the government found them helpful because the government has permitted the defendant to plead to a maximum sentence of 15 years when the guidelines indeed are approximately 25 years to 30 years.

And I think also in searching for cases that would be comparable to Mr. Ahsan, I have had difficulty finding any.

Turning to his history and characteristics. Mr. Ahsan was born in the London. Again, he's also a first generation Brit. His family was educated and caring and hard working. He was brought up in a religious home. He has, and continues to have, support of his family, who unfortunately are unable, I believe, to be with him today. But it's clear from the letters that I read and the materials that I received, the videos, et cetera, that he's very much still supported by his family.

Mr. Ahsan was a very good student, very intelligent. He took his exams and attended, again, like Mr. Ahmad, a very prestigious college. What we would call high school, but college, from the ages of 11 to 18. He then went on to study at the school of Oriental and Asian Studies at the University

of London. Graduating with a bachelor's in 2004.

He studied abroad to advance his skill and understanding of Arabic in Damascus. Then went for one year in pursuing a master's in linguistics, which he did not complete, which I understand because he decided it was not the area of study he wished to pursue. He was married but is divorced and has no children. He has worked at various jobs in his young life. He worked for such things as a telephone survey company and a security guard while he was in school. He has done private tutoring. He's volunteered at human right organizations. And most particularly has worked for his father in his business, which is, I would call, forwarding agent or shipping company.

Prior to his arrest, he was pursuing and interested in becoming perhaps a librarian. Since he has no criminal history prior to the arrest in this case, while in prison he worked. And also while in prison, he was a model prisoner. He's been in custody for approximately eight years. Has received no violations. I would, again, comment that he's conducted himself in a way which reflects well upon him while in custody. I'm not sure that, I, myself could have conducted myself that way.

He also applied for and completed the same course that Mr. Ahmad completed. Dr. Sharkawy's course in which he was described as a good student.

Mr. Ahsan has had some mental health issues. I'm not going to repeat them on the record. They are described in the Presentence Report, which I have adopted in Paragraphs 160 to 162. He does have some conditions and has suffered from some conditions in the past. Indeed I will reference material from the classified proceeding which has some bearing in terms of time on the matters before the Court today.

I will not draw a conclusion about the risk of recidivism until I hear from both sides, in particular about the letter to his father. There's other things to talk about, but that in particular. But I would say other than that letter, there is no sign that Mr. Ahsan's view of what is Jihad in an Islamic sense should be equated with terrorism. There is no evidence that he adopted beliefs of people who believe in terrorism, attacks on civilians. In fact, his own writings speak out against the attacks on the civilians in the tubes in London. He disagreed with 9-11. He felt that was wrong. He's rejected the views of Al-Qaida.

While the government focuses on materials in his room which have what I would call violent Jihadist content, it sounds like his room was packed full of material, period. He had material of all kinds of views. And I would say that certainly in the months going up to the time of his arrest, to the extent they are reflected in his personal, private

journal, they indicate a man who is interested in his poetry and writing poetry, who is a moderate person who has peaceful views, and that -- who is appreciating the fact that he's being recognized and meeting with people who regard his talent as a poet highly. Indeed he has won a prize for his poetry while incarcerated. He has been encouraged in prison by noted authors for his work in poetry. I have to say, I was a chemistry major and I wasn't a poet, by any means, Mr. Ahsan, but I found your poetry to be quite good. I don't know if you should take that as a compliment or not because I really have no talent to judge it, but I particularly was struck by the poem that you wrote about the prisoner and the guard.

In all, you appear and strike me as a man who is sensitive and curious, intelligent and talented. And as I say, there are many letters in support of you as well who speak about you and your character as one which is not violent and not aligned with the views of people who are violent.

I think at this point, I would stop and ask if the defense would like to address the Court, or would the defendant like to address the Court. Defense counsel.

MR. REEVE: Thank you, your Honor. I want to first say that Mr. Ahsan will not be addressing the Court today. I think that when he wrote his letter, we had lengthy

discussions with him. I think as a result of his mental health issues, but even more so his personality, there's a vast difference between Mr. Ahmad and his extroverted personality and ability to stand up in front of a large group like this. It's just something that Talha has indicated to us from the outset, he just doesn't feel like he can do.

So when he wrote that letter, he spent many, many hours. And I have to say that sometimes I find myself in a situation where I have asked a client to write a letter, and I might travel to Wyatt or Northern and the letter is not at all what I had hoped that they would say. That's not the case here.

What Mr. Ahsan said, I think, describes and defines who he is. And looking at it last night, Pages 7 and 8 where he addresses the offense, I think he talked about the nature of his offense in a far more elegant -- eloquent and focused way than his attorney did yesterday afternoon at the close of business.

THE COURT: Can you give me just one second, please?

Go ahead, sir. Sorry to have interrupted you.

MR. REEVE: Thank you, your Honor.

My goal today is going to be to speak on his behalf, and to say some of the things that I know he would want to say. I should note, your Honor, you referenced his family. His parents are not here. His brother, Hanja, is here, and

has been here during all of the three days of the sentencing proceedings. He flew into New York about ten days ago. So he's here.

You heard from his parents in a very short video.

You did not hear from his mother, who was present on the video. She can't really talk about this case without breaking down.

Before I address a few issues, I wanted to first just address two issues that are somewhat perhaps unrelated, but I think related to Mr. Ahsan in this proceeding, and I think what he would want me to say.

Today, putting aside the last two days of hearings, today is, in my judgment, an extraordinary proceeding. I have sat and I have listened. And it's interesting that this case started, in essence, with a website. And I would ask the Court to consider posting the entire transcript of today's proceedings on the Court's website.

The Court and your Honor indicated earlier that there is a plethora of information out on the internet. What happened here is an extraordinary process. I don't think --- Mr. Ahmad talked about he didn't know what to expect in an American courtroom. I don't think he understands fully, because he hasn't been in other American courtrooms, how exceptional today is. And so I know that Mr. Ahsan would want me to thank the Court and I do.

The other, if you will permit me, your Honor, to digress just a moment. This is kind of a milestone in our office. This is the last case that Attorney Balakrishnan will be working on.

THE COURT: That's unfortunate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. REEVE: It's tragic. It won't be his last case. It will simply be his last case with us. There's a reason, your Honor, that Mr. Balakrishnan is sitting next to Talha. And it's because there's no way that I could have done this case and handled this entire situation without him. silent during this proceeding, but absolutely an indispensable and critical member of the defense team. Government counsel knows it. I think your Honor might be aware of it, but I want to say it. I can't thank him enough, and I know that Talha cannot thank him enough. He's spent far more time with Talha than I have. He has met with all the witnesses in England. He has met with Mr. Ahsan's family. I wanted to go back to England. My schedule did not permit me to do that after the deposition, but he stayed and he talked to people there. And his experience mirrored the experiences of Attorney Ward in terms of all the people that he spoke to.

I also think it would be remiss on my part if I did not, on Talha's behalf, thank Elizabeth McLoughlin, who is and has been in court every day of these hearings, who is

noticeable by her red suit coat today. She has put an unbelievable amount of time into this case. She's made it possible, literally possible, for Talha to not just tolerate, but to thrive in Northern. She has seen him on almost a daily basis. Your Honor knows we could not get the 6 terabytes or whatever the quantity of discovery into the facility. We could get none of it there. But we did, and she did it. And we and Talha are forever in her debt.

2.

And the fact of the matter is, the individual seated next to her is the federal defender's computer person. I don't think any of us could have gotten here without his assistance. He has assisted both offices. I know Talha thanks him for that.

I want to address three issues with respect to

Talha. One is, why is he here? The second is who is he and

where is he going? And the third are very specific, concrete

aspects of the sentencing that I am going to ask the Court to

impose today.

I think it's important, your Honor, and I think the Court knows it, but I want to say this. There are very good and very legitimate reasons why Mr. Ahsan, law enforcement reasons, why Mr. Ahsan is present today. You referenced Abu Jihad as a traitor. And he was a traitor. And the first lead in this case was who is the first person in England who touched the document? And it was Mr. Ahsan. No one, no one

```
would fault the government for focusing on him.
1
 2
     appropriate at the time, and we all understand why he's here.
     There are no villains in this case. There's no one good side
 3
 4
     and one bad side. There are two sides who have fought hard
 5
     through a long, sometimes torturous process, but we have done
 6
         And we have all made mistakes during that process, each
 7
    and every one of us.
              What happened in this case is, I think, that as the
 8
     onion was unpeeled, as the evidence was looked at, as
 9
     everyone struggled through the massive amount of discovery
10
11
    materials, as everyone struggled, as I certainly did, with
12
     the applicable law. What are the limits of 2339A.
13
              THE COURT:
                         Not much to the limits of the statute.
14
              MR. REEVE:
                          I think that's right. But it's a black
15
    hole, and the case law is all over the map.
16
              THE COURT:
                          It's the law.
17
              MR. REEVE:
                          It's impossible to figure out what it
18
         We would sit down in the office and say what does this
19
     statute really mean? And we'd take it apart. I have to say,
20
     I'm as ignorant today as I was at the start of this case in
     terms on what it is. There's scholars all over --
21
22
              THE COURT:
                          I am, except that I understand that what
    your client admitted he did is a crime under that statute.
23
24
                         Absolutely, your Honor.
              MR. REEVE:
```

Which I don't know that I would have

25

THE COURT:

known that before this case.

MR. REEVE: I think that's right. I think it took us awhile to reach that point, and to really grasp and understand that. And we all understand it, and that's why he's entered a guilty plea here. That's why he's come forward and he said, I did what I did, and I understand why I am here.

When the case is unraveled to its essence, I'm not going to go into the facts. Your Honor has summarized them. I agree with the Court. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Ahsan had a relatively minor role in a serious offense at a time when he was very young.

The only issue about the evidence I'm going to address is the letter to his father because I think it's taken us a while to get to having an understanding. And even yesterday, I think I was thrashing at times and with -- trying to explain it to the Court. And I don't pretend to fully explain what's inside anybody's head, let alone my own.

THE COURT: On its face, it appears to be very carefully written. As I commented about the nature of his printing on it, it's a deliberate writing. It's postdated, suggesting that at the time he planned to go fight, I presume, in Afghanistan in the fall. That's what it appears on its face to be.

MR. REEVE: I think that's right, Judge. And I

think I agree. And I think the reality in this situation is that it was a very dark time, as all the evidence shows, in Mr. Ahsan's life. That he had just recently gone through a divorce, and that he was guite depressed at the time.

The letters from his very closest friends that follow our first submission to Mr. Lopez after Talha's own letter, I think speaks volumes. I should say speak volumes about Mr. Ahsan's mental condition at that time.

THE COURT: I would also, and this time I won't forget, to reference the classified record that relates to this time.

MR. REEVE: I was just going to refer to that, your Honor, you took the words out of my mouth.

THE COURT: That's an answer, Attorney Reeve, but then that poses another question for me. I know you are not done, but I have to cut you off.

You know, it's a dark time. He struggled with some mental health issues. When he has his next dark time, you know, is he also going to think about going -- I don't know where you go today, Syria, Iraq, I don't know, and fight against anybody who wants to be killing Muslims?

MR. REEVE: I was going to go there, and I appreciate the Court's inquiry.

I think what might not be clear from all the paperwork is that finally during this time, Mr. Ahsan did

reach out for help. He did receive counseling. He did move in a positive direction through the support of his family. He did address some of those issues. He did get better and his actions around the time shows that process.

We have spent a great deal of time with him talking about -- this is independent from whatever the Court can force him to do when he's in England -- but what does he need to do to make sure that if he has a dark moment, he gets the help he needs? He has the support of his family on it. He is willing and understands that he needs support on that for exactly these circumstances and this situation. And I'm convinced he will do that.

I also think we have to be mindful of the fact that sometimes writing something down in a journal shows us how foolish our ideas are. And I suggest to the Court that that's part of the process of the creative writing process. That's why so many people write in autobiographical ways. I am not saying this is a piece of fiction. I am not minimizing the importance. But I think in his life, it had something of a cathartic effect.

Now can I say, your Honor, was it kind of me thinking this way, in almost a suicidal way, like this is the way, you know, in the country we have suicide by bank robbery. Somebody goes in to a bank and they are hoping that their life will be ended. It happens. Whether that was in

any way part of Mr. Ahsan's thinking, I can't prone the depths that deeply. What I can say is he's evaluated it. He understands exactly what he needs to do to stay out of trouble. I believe, although I agree with Attorney Miller that none of us have a crystal ball. I believe that he will. And I believe that the Court can rely upon his actions subsequent to that letter, but also his actions before, and reach that conclusion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The question of who he is and where he's going. think the letters and especially the four letters that follow Mr. Ahsan's say it better than I can. I think he has an incredible amount of talent in a creative way. Like you, but probably even worse than you, I'm not an expert in poetry. But it's clear to anybody who reads his poetry, and it's been clear to experts, that he has talent. He's continued to develop that talent. I think he would make an extraordinary librarian. I think he has an opportunity to take over his father's business and to relieve his elderly parents of some of the burdens that his own actions have placed on them. had and will step to the plate on that. I think there's so many ways he can go with his life. I think when you look at his beliefs and the evolution of those beliefs, there's a fairly consistent thread through all of the materials and everything we know about him, which is he's open-minded. His beliefs have evolved. He has grown a great deal from the

time he was in his teenage years and in his very early 20s when he was involved in this.

I have already addressed the mental health issue, and I'm not going to go back to that.

Your Honor, I have asked the Court in this case to impose a sentence of credit for time served. I am making that request now, but I want to address some specifics that are of concern to me, with specific reference to Mr. Ahsan all of his personal circumstances and characteristics.

I agree with the Court, I'm not sure I could survive and grow in the manner that Talha Ahsan has. And I have only known him at Northern. Attorney Ward talked about Northern.

13 I agree. I don't know if your Honor has been there --

THE COURT: I have not.

MR. REEVE: It's worth going. I'm going to describe to you --

THE COURT: I have seen videos of prisoners being moved at Northern. I have seen the cells, but I have not visited.

MR. REEVE: When you enter, you go up in an elevator after you get through all of the security. When you get off the elevator, you are in a metal, aluminum hall. It has a regular concrete floor, but all sides are silver, and it descends. It descends down. When you get to the end of that corridor, at a very bowels of Northern, you take a right.

When you take a right, you get in to the death row unit now. The death row unit used to be on the left. it's on the right. But it's exactly the same. That's what I think Attorney Ward was talking about. When you walk in, when you are in the visitor room, you are in a glass box. You look out and the only way I can describe Northern is it's like -- you know, the amusement park thing you enter, the fun place, but it has all of these mirrors and reflections and you don't know what's real and what's not. That's Northern. You can look out and you are seeing mirror images of things but you don't know if what you are seeing is real, or if what you are seeing is a mirror reflecting what's behind you. Ιt was all constructed in that way to be as disorienting as possible. It is -- I don't know, I don't think this is intentional, but because it's underground and because of the nature of the heating system, it's freezing in there in the wintertime, and it's hot in the summer.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't think anyone will -- who works as Northern, will ever forgot the fact that in June, July and August, Betty McLoughlin came in with winter gloves. That's how she came in to the prison because there's no way not to have gloves on and survive three or four hours there using the keyboard. You can't do it. We all bring sweaters in there in the wintertime. We have to wrap ourselves. There's a great deal of both, I think, intentional and unintentional

sensory deprivation, but he survived.

If your Honor imposes now credit for time served, which I hope the Court is going to consider, and I hope your Honor will do it, because I think it's a proper delineation between the roles in the case. If your Honor does that and just says credit for time served, it's going to result in Mr. Ahsan going to at least three more federal prisons after Northern, and this is why.

He was brought here by law enforcement airplane and in a secret way. And he was dropped into the United States. That's the one and only time he's ever been in the United States. When he now reaches the end of his sentence, he will have to go through what I understand is a removal process by ICE. He can agree to that process, but he has to go into a federal facility. And ICE has one or two facilities in the country where he'll go. And then they will order him removed, and he will be flown back to England.

If the Court just says credit for time served, between that prison and Northern, he will go to two more prisons. He will first be moved to the MBC in Brooklyn. Then he would be transported to whatever facility the Bureau of Prisons says. I know that sounds crazy because you are looking at me and you are thinking, if I give him credit for time served, it's done. It's not done. And with apologies to the Court and apologies to the government, as we were

preparing for this, Attorney Balakrishnan contacted someone we have been in touch with who is in the Federal Defender's Office in New York. I provided an affidavit. I wish I had provided it to the government many days ago. I apologize for that. I wish I had provided it to the Court. We just got it yesterday.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm just going to summarize it, then with the Court's permission, I will give it to you. She's worked on cases, she indicates, involving approximately 54 nationals. What happens because the Bureau of Prisons -- and under the Supreme Court case, it's their exclusive determination as your Honor knows about credit for time served -- when there's time spent in a foreign prison, the Bureau of Prisons conducts it own due diligence investigation separate from anything the U.S. Attorney's Office will say, separate from anything the Court says, separate from anything that I will They will reach out to the English authorities. say. will find out, in whatever way they can, which sometimes takes months and months, was Mr. Ahsan getting credit on some other pending case. So even though this Court could impose credit for time served, it's going to result in his incarceration for a period of time. But in addition, he's going to have to adjust to three separate new prisons. so what I'm asking the Court to do, and I would submit the affidavit. Again, your Honor, with apologies that it hasn't

gotten to the Court earlier with the thousands of pages that you have received.

2.

THE COURT: I haven't read it carefully. I had this conversation with Ray this week. But I have to tell you, I struggle. I don't understand, if the United States District Court says the sentence is time served, in the past tense, how the Bureau of Prisons can keep him in custody other than to turn him over pursuant to a detainer that I presume they have because he's not in this country legally. I will use that word loosely since he was brought here by legal authorities, but he has no right to remain here.

I guess you will have to explain that to me other than, I guess, if this affidavit explains, that it's a practical matter that that's what happens.

MR. REEVE: It does explain what the Bureau of Prisons does. I guess I would agree with the Court, some things the Bureau of Prisons does are inexplicable, but they do them. We could all turn blue --

THE COURT: We could issue a writ and have the marshal here go out and serve it the Bureau of Prisons' head to come and answer why he's possessing Mr. Ahsan when the sentence is completed.

MR. REEVE: We could do that. Except then the civil division of the U.S. Attorney's office might get involved and their obligation is to defend the Department of Justice,

```
including the Bureau of Prisons, that's the work that they
1
    do. And they would come in and say that Mr. Ahsan, as
 2
    Attorney Ward said earlier, has not exhausted his
 3
    administrative remedies, and until such time as he exhausts
 4
 5
    his administrative remedies, you have no jurisdiction.
 6
              THE COURT:
                          I understand the problem with credit --
     let me finish.
 7
              MR. REEVE:
                         I have a solution.
 8
                         All right. You go ahead.
 9
              THE COURT:
                          I'm sorry. I cut you off.
10
              MR. REEVE:
                         No, you are compelled to go ahead, so go
11
              THE COURT:
    ahead.
12
13
                          If your Honor -- we all know he's been
              MR. REEVE:
14
     in prison for now eight years and one month, about, since
15
    early July. A little over eight years. Obviously, the Court
     is taking that time into account, but if the Court imposes a
16
17
     sentence of, for example, 21 months. He's been in the United
18
     States more than 21 months. We all know that he's being
19
     sentenced on the basis of all of his time, but then all it
20
    would take is verification from the marshals, in whose
21
     custody Mr. Ahsan has been to the Bureau of Prisons,
22
     indicating that there have been no other charges on which
    he's been held. It's the same as credit for time served.
23
24
    Now I understand it might say in the newspaper, you know,
25
    Judge Hall slapped somebody's wrist. I understand.
                                                          And I
```

would only refer your Honor back to the comments you made at the beginning of this process. I think it's the right thing to do in this case. And what it would accomplish is that Mr. Ahsan would immediately, or very shortly thereafter, go into the custody of ICE. He would still have more time in the United States, but we could try to expedite that. He'd go to one facility, and he'd be on a plane as soon as we can arrange it to England.

I think that's the only way to get around it. Is it crazy? It's crazy, Judge, I agree. But I think it's right, it's proper and everybody in this courtroom understands what would happen. And I guess that's one of the other reasons I think I would ask the Court to place this entire transcript in the public record. So that if there is questions, people can read about this and understand. Because believe me, it would be an invaluable lesson.

It would be great if the Hartford Courant would publish this entire thing, but they won't. But that's what I think. The only solution I can come up with that gets us to where I hope the Court wants to be.

So I appreciate the Court's time and attention throughout this proceeding, as does Mr. Ahsan. And we all thank you.

THE COURT: Everything you've just said about the time served problem and your affidavit, it seems to me, is a

problem that apparently Attorney Ward and Attorney Barrett are going to wrestle with in getting Mr. Ahmad full credit for all of the time he has been in custody.

But I don't understand, if the judgment says that the defendant is sentenced to term of "time served," that the Bureau of Prisons has any other option but to release the defendant. He has certainly served a day at Northern in the custody of the United States on a United States matter. If they want to view it as that's the same served. Whatever it is that they calculate, however they could spend years deciding what time he served, at the end of the day, the judgment says he served it.

I'm reading this affidavit, and I don't have the time to read it carefully, but I'm not sure it relates to a situation of a sentence of time served versus, for example, the sentence I gave to Mr. Ahmad. If I give Mr. Ahsan a sentence like I gave Mr. Ahmad, which is for a certain period of time and I leave it to Bureau of Prisons to calculate it -- I actually had this discussion with Ray, is whether it would be better and fairer if I just did the arithmetic and entered a sentence which was X months with no credit for time served, but I was persuaded that wasn't better. But I don't see how if the sentence is a time served sentence the Bureau of Prisons ever has to think about, let alone calculate, credit. I'm missing something.

```
1
             MR. REEVE: I agree with the Court. May I have a
 2.
    moment?
              THE COURT: Sure. I don't know who is in the
 3
     courtroom. I don't think I see the U.S. Marshal. The chief
 4
 5
    deputy.
 6
              MR. REEVE: Attorney Sheehan was trying to get my
    attention. We got some clarification. I think the marshal
 7
     could address the Court if -- better than I can.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: He may not want to. He might want to
    have Brian here.
10
11
              MR. REEVE: I can paraphrase --
              THE MARSHAL: Your Honor, I have been a marshal for
12
13
     23 years. It's the way -- the way it's always worked in our
    office is if a judge sentences time served, that's done.
14
15
     call whoever has the detainer on him.
16
              THE COURT: So you go to immigration.
17
              THE MARSHAL: We would call immigration, we turn him
18
    over to immigration. If you were to make a date
19
    determination, as in months, at that point the judgment needs
    to be entered --
20
              THE COURT: They do the calculation.
21
22
              THE MARSHAL: We have gone through this with Judge
23
    Chatigny.
24
              THE PROBATION OFFICER: Just to add to the record,
    my experience has been exactly the same for the past 24 years
25
```

1 in sentencing.

MR. REEVE: And I must say, Judge, mine, too. But I haven't had a situation where there's -- most of the time is the foreign time. That's my concern.

I made things more complicated, as is my usual way, so I accept the representation. I stand corrected. And I think I would ask your Honor simply to impose that.

THE COURT: I should say, though, in the event I was not clear enough, I mean, I said it. And I said it again at Attorney Ward's request. But my view of Mr. Ahmad's sentence is that he has already served just shy of 120 months. And he has, I'm pretty sure, earned good time credits of approximately 17 months. So in my view, the sentence I imposed on him today calls for him to serve an additional 13 months with some credit for time served. And if served in England, whatever it is they do as far as parole over there, although I gather they are carrying out my sentence.

So if he were here in the United States, my view is that he'll serve approximately one more year. Now, it's not my judgment to make that. But if anybody thinks that that's the sentence I should impose so that there's no question with the Bureau of Prisons, I will do that. Making clear that I'm not sentencing him to 13 months in time. I'm sentencing him to 150, but he effectively has 13 more months to serve.

MR. WARD: That -- that sounds fine to me, your

```
Honor, to do what you just said.
1
 2
              THE COURT: Does the government have a view?
    mean, obviously you are not concerned that the Bureau of
 3
 4
    Prisons is going to get this right, but I have to say I am.
    And I think that the fact that the defendant fought
 5
     extradition, nonetheless, he served time in prison for no
 6
    other crime than the one he's pled guilty to here. And while
 7
    he was at a home in England, it doesn't sound like he was in
 8
    a camp facility, either.
 9
              MR. MILLER: I think we all need to take a step
10
11
    back.
            I completely disagree with Mr. Reeve's 20 month
12
     suggestion.
              What the Court should do is sentence each defendant
13
     to a term of incarceration appropriate for the crime.
14
15
              THE COURT: Right, that's what I'm trying to do.
              MR. MILLER: If you sentence -- I think you did
16
17
    appropriately in terms of the way you placed the sentence
     with Mr. Ahmad. You said 150 months with credit for time
18
19
     served in England.
20
                          I listed the dates.
              THE COURT:
              MR. MILLER: If you -- and I would like a chance to
21
22
    be heard on the sentencing advocacy issue with Mr. Ahmad.
    But with Mr. Ahsan, he served, I think, 96ish months,
23
24
     something like that. Is that right, Mr. Reeve?
```

THE COURT: He served eight years minus a few days

25

plus credit for time served.

MR. MILLER: So if you were going to impose a time served sentence, one way of doing it is today, I sentence you to time served, which is 96 months, or whatever the right time is. I think the defense is concerned they are not going to get time for credit in England, which the government -- we said in the plea agreement and would stand by it, the government believes they should.

The other caveat here is what we're forgetting, is that some time, some place, in another courtroom another judge is going to be looking at cases just like you did, your Honor, and trying to reconcile why somebody who did what Mr. Ahsan did got 20 months, and won't be able to figure it out. That's not appropriate under 3553(a).

MR. REEVE: Judge, I complicated this more than it needs to be. I'm confident that what the marshals have represented to the Court is correct. And I suspect --

THE COURT: That works if I impose a time served sentence.

MR. REEVE: I suspect that Attorney Schwartz' affidavit, and I haven't spoken with her directly, relates to cases where the Court imposes a specific amount of time and then says to be credited, as in, for example, Mr. Ahmad's case. But where the Court simply says, credit for time served, I do agree that there's no exercise of discretion or

authority on the part of the Bureau of Prisons, that's what 1 2. the marshal is saying. So, again, I apologize for complicating it unduly. 3 THE PROBATION OFFICER: I would just add real quick, 4 5 your Honor, with respect to Mr. Ahsan. I think the Bureau of Prisons would prefer you just say time served. 6 That leaves no question whatsoever as to what the finality. If you said 7 time served which amounts to 96 months, they might look at 8 that as a 96-month term that needs to be computed. 9 10 Then with respect to the PSR, on the face sheet, has in parenthesis official detention. We talked about that. 11 12 And talked about the statute that commands the Bureau of 13 Prisons to apply what's termed "official detention," any pretrial detention as a result of the offense that hasn't 14 15 been applied to any other sentence. So we discussed having confidence in the statutory 16 17 provision, that the Bureau of Prisons couldn't do anything at 18 all with the time and detention in the U.K but to apply it to 19 his sentence. Okay. Are you finished with your 20 THE COURT: advocacy on behalf of Mr. Ahsan? 21 22 I'm more than finished, your Honor. MR. REEVE:

MR. MILLER: Just very briefly, your Honor.

With respect to Mr. Ahsan, in some ways it's an

For the government.

THE COURT:

23

easier case, in some ways it's a more difficult case. Your Honor concluded, appropriately, I think what you said about Mr. Ahsan is when he went to the camp twice in Afghanistan, once he made it, the second time he got sick, you were not very good at that. That's exactly what the cooperating witness said. The government believes what the cooperating witness said. And you are affirming that, what the cooperating witness said. That's a fact that I think there's ample evidence to find.

The troubling fact here is the letter. And Mr. Reeve is in a tough place. You asked him twice, I don't think he's been able to answer it either time. Your Honor picked up immediately on certain aspects of the letter, which is why we introduced it as an exhibit yesterday. You said this was a deliberate writing that was postdated. It is. And it's striking when you look at it in that book. The book has been described as a creative writing journal. The letter, even juxtaposed to the very next page, is very, very different. That book is a functional document. There's diary entries in addition to creative writing in there.

The letter is -- I don't know what to make of it,

Judge, but you're appropriately troubled by it. It's

factually accurate. It's neatly written. There's no

crossouts. It's not a draft. I guess you could conclude he
either did it perfectly the first time, or it was a document

that was a final document. It's clearly postdated. It's expressing his sincere beliefs. It talks accurately about what he's done. He's been to the land of Jihad. He found --someone died in his arms, I think is what he says. And then when he says at the end, after condemning the events in July which are the terrorist attacks in the U.K., I add practically at the mistakes of the Mujahideen and this Ummah do not equal all the policy and cruelty and callousness of America and those of her alliance of crusaders and their actions upon the Muslim world.

This letter was written somewhere between July of 2005 and February of 2006, probably late in 2005. And this defendant is clearly less culpable, significantly than Mr. Ahmad. His sentence should clearly be less than the Court imposed on Mr. Ahmad.

But this is a factor I think the Court needs to consider in terms of imposing what is an appropriate sentence in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you. What I haven't done in discussing the factors, which I have principally addressed them, I have not addressed the issue of the likelihood of recidivism or the need of individual deterrence of Mr. Ahsan.

Given the nature and circumstances of what he did, he was a young man, he helped in the mail room, in effect.

He's certainly not likely to recidivate in the sense that the

guidelines place him in a Category VI. It reflects a very high likelihood of recidivism. He's not that person.

The letter to his father is troubling, mostly because I think it does reflect struggles that he has had with mental illness. I don't mean that he's mentally ill. I'm not using the right words because I'm trying to avoid being more specific and revealing more of things that I'm sure he wishes would remain private.

But his experiences during his life and struggling, it's quite clear that he has, in his young life, passed through many periods of what I will call darkness, depression, whatever other word you want to put on it. I reference the material in the classified record, as well as in the letters that I received on behalf of Mr. Ahsan, that this likely was what was going on with him in the 2005, 2006 period. At least early 2006.

It appears that he pulled himself out of that as evidenced by the paperwork that supports his statements and his recountings of how he was thinking of applying for graduate school again, or perhaps he would become a librarian and had applied for and was seeking positions to be trained as a librarian. People were encouraging him that this would be a good activity for him. That he was active in attending literary events, seeking out people who had interests similar to his own creative interest that way, looking for

encouragement of those activities. All of that is very positive.

What's concerning is, you know, what happens when the next dark moment comes. Will you be someone susceptible to be used by a person for things which you disavow now, but which might make more sense to you as perhaps they did when you wrote the letter to your father. I'm going to take -- and I believe that your family and friends are, as they are for Mr. Ahmad, they are for you and to support you when you return to England. I will add as a condition of supervision and hope that it will be respected by the U.K. authorities in their supervision of you, that you receive mental health treatment and counseling as is appropriate and needed for you.

I don't think it's in your nature to, as we use a legal criminal term, recidivate here, to go and do again what you did when you were 19 and 20 years old, but I do worry that to the extent you struggle with depressive periods, that at those times things might look different to you. But I don't see that as a reason to conclude that you will recidivate, particularly if you receive appropriate treatment and support.

I think in sum, the sentence I'm about to impose upon you, Mr. Ahsan, reflects the fact that you involved yourself with what I view as very serious conduct. You had a

minor role in it. You were really at the edges of it, but you did assist and support it. You did it. It was -- everything you did was done before 9-11, which also tends to testify to the fact that your involvement was of a less serious nature.

You were very young at the time. And in my view, your culpability is low. While I understand why the Battle Group Document was viewed so seriously, and particularly in my view, from the side of the person who provided it given his position. In my opinion now, today, in -- I have lost track of the date -- July something 2014, in this courtroom, what it proves to me is that you never intended to, never planned to, never wanted to be involved in what I call invalid or terroristic Jihad because you did nothing with it. Nothing was done with it. You didn't allow anything to be done with it in the sense that if someone had acted on it outside of yourself, you would have been responsible for having created it, but no one did.

You also, in effect, withdrew from what you were doing, which is something I need to consider in the nature and circumstances of what you have done.

Balanced against that, in my opinion, is the most significant other factor present is your history and characteristics. You've otherwise lived a law-abiding life. You have pursued your education seriously. You have done

quite well. You're intelligent. You had a positive and well-meaning life other than the struggles that you had, which are mentioned in the Presentence Report. Those aren't, shall we say, your fault. You have just struggled with them.

You strike the Court as a gentle person. A person who can write poetry. It's certainly a different person than I am.

I do hesitate because I'm concerned, and I would hope that you would be sensitive to the fact that you might be easily influenced by others. And you should, I hope now at the age of 30, understand that there are consequences and you have to make your own choices. And that you have to think about consequences when you make those choices. But it's clear to me you have other interests now. You are older now. And I don't see you in any way involved in anything that could smack of terrorism or material support of conduct which we describe as terrorism.

I would ask if you would please rise, sir. Based upon those considerations, the Court imposes the following departed sentence, not a guideline sentence, or even departed guideline sentence, but a variance.

The Court imposes upon you in connection with Count
One and Count Two, a sentence of time served to run
concurrently. Just -- not to go in the judgment, but to
reflect my judgment, it should be understood on this public

record that I equate that to be together with the time you have been incarcerated as well as credit for what would be good time. You have served approximately 110 months. It's my judgment that while you associated yourself with something that was serious conduct, that sentence reflects it.

Therefore the judgment will read that you are sentenced to a

sentence of time served.

The Court imposes a period of supervised release of three years on each of Counts One and Count Two to be served concurrently.

The Court imposes no fine because it finds you cannot pay one. The Court imposes no restitution because it's either not applicable or it's not been sought.

The Court imposes a special assessment of \$100 on each of Count One and Count Two for a total of \$200.

With respect to the period of supervised release, it's my understanding that you have agreed to be supervised by the United Kingdom and under their protocols, but in that respect, the Court would impose its own conditions of supervised release as follows: One, that you would comply with the standard conditions of supervised release as well as the following mandatory conditions: You not commit another crime. You not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. You pay the special assessment I have imposed, and you cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample.

Further, the Court imposes the following special conditions: One that you be provided mental health treatment, either in or outpatient as would, in this instance, be determined by the probation office. That you would pay all or a portion of the cost associated with that treatment based upon your ability to pay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Second, you will provide the probation office with access to requested financial information. Third, that you will submit your person, residence, office or vehicle to search conducted by a United States Probation Office at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based upon a reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure to submit to the search may be grounds for revocation and the defendant shall warn any other resident or occupant that the premises or vehicle may be subject to search pursuant to this condition. the defendant shall not possess ammunition, a firearm or other dangerous weapon. Lastly, the defendant shall, as directed by the probation office, notify any third parties of the risk that may be occasioned by your criminal record or personal history and characteristics and permit the probation office to make such notification and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

Is there anything about the sentence that's unlawful or that I have overlooked?

1 THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor. 2. MR. MILLER: No, your Honor. MR. REEVE: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Is there a motion to dismiss the 4 5 remaining counts against Mr. Ahsan? 6 MR. MILLER: Yes, your Honor. The government moves to dismiss Count Three as it pertains to this defendant. 7 8 THE COURT: The government's oral motion to dismiss the remaining counts as to this defendant is granted. 9 Mr. Ahsan, you had a right to appeal your sentence, 10 11 but I believe you waived it when you pled guilty in light of the sentence I have just imposed. So I don't think you have 12 13 a right, but if somehow you think you were forced to give up 14 that right or you didn't understand what you were doing, then 15 you can try to appeal. I would urge you to speak to any one of your lawyers and to consult with them about what you 16 17 should do about trying to appeal. 18 I would urge you to do it promptly because the time to appeal is very short, only 14 days from today. If you ask 19 20 them to file a Notice of Appeal, they will do so for you, but it's a very short time. 21 22 Do you understand that you only have 14 days to file such a notice? 23 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 25 THE COURT: I guess apropos of the deputy's

```
comments, where do you think Mr. Ahsan would go now that he's
1
 2.
     subject solely to the ICE detainer?
              THE MARSHAL: It is my understanding that our
 3
 4
     standard procedures are to call immigration and have them
 5
     come and pick him up. Where they take him from there --
 6
              THE COURT: It's out of your control and my control,
     right?
 7
 8
              THE MARSHAL:
                            Yes.
              THE COURT: Is there anything further?
 9
              MR. REEVE: Nothing, your Honor.
10
11
              MR. MILLER: No, your Honor.
12
              THE COURT: I think -- Terri, would you go and at
13
     the end of the Ahsan proceeding transcript, I would like you
     to enter the following?
14
15
              THE COURT REPORTER: You mean Ahmad?
16
              THE COURT: Ahmad, I'm sorry, at the end of the
17
     Ahmad sentencing.
18
               (The following two paragraphs were inserted on page
     113.)
19
20
              The Court imposed a sentence of 150 months on each
     of Count One and on Count Two to be serve concurrent.
21
22
     previously indicated that that is with credit for time
     served, including all time spent, not only in the United
23
24
     States, but also in the custody of the United Kingdom in
25
     relation to these charges, the dates of which I understand to
```

```
be December 2 of '03 to December 9 of '03, and August of '05,
1
 2.
     2004 to the present.
              It's this Court's view and its understanding in
 3
 4
     imposing sentence reflects its view that Mr. Ahmad will
     receive credit for that time which the Court estimates,
 5
     including good time credit, to be approximately 137 months.
 6
     I'm not -- the Court does not expect to be held to the
 7
     precise calculus, but it wishes anyone who should decide to
 8
     read this transcript to understand that the sentence of 150
 9
10
     months is reflective of the approximate ten years Mr. Ahmad
11
     has been in custody and recognizing that good time credit is
     earned in connection with time served.
12
13
              MR. WARD: Your Honor, I think when you asked the
14
     court reporter to go to the end transcript --
15
              THE COURT:
                          I know. She corrected me.
                                                       She knows.
     If you didn't hear it, I'm sorry, but she fixed it.
16
17
              MR. WARD: Again, your Honor, just that language
18
     that all time spent in custody has been in relation to these
19
     charges.
20
                          I think I said that already, if I
              THE COURT:
21
     didn't, I repeat it.
22
              MR. WARD:
                         Thank you.
23
              THE COURT:
                          Is there anything further?
24
              MR. WARD: No, thank you, your Honor.
25
              THE COURT: I thank all of the counsel.
                                                        I thank the
```

```
court staff especially, and we'll stand adjourned.
1
              (Whereupon, the above hearing adjourned at 03:31
 2
 3
     p.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
8
 9
     COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT CERTIFICATE
10
     I hereby certify that the within and foregoing is a true and
11
     correct transcript taken from the proceedings in the
12
     above-entitled matter.
13
14
     /s/ Terri Fidanza
15
     Terri Fidanza, RPR
16
     Official Court Reporter
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```