| 1 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
|----|--|
| 2 | DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS |
| 3 | No. 1:15-cr-10153-WGY-2 |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
| 7 | |
| 8 | VS. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | NICHOLAS ALEXANDER ROVINSKI |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | ***** |
| 14 | For Hearing Before: |
| 15 | Judge William G. Young |
| 16 | Plea Change |
| 17 | |
| 18 | United States District Court District of Massachusetts (Boston) |
| 19 | One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts 02210 |
| 20 | Thursday, September 22, 2016 |
| 21 | **** |
| 22 | REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR |
| 23 | Official Court Reporter United States District Court |
| 24 | One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com |
| 25 | |

```
1
                      APPEARANCES
 2
 3
    B. STEPHANIE SIEGMANN, ESQ.
    GREGORY R. GONZALEZ, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
 4
       J. Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse
 5
       1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3664
 6
       Email: Stephanie.siegmann@usdoj.gov
 7
       For the United States
8
    WILLIAM W. FICK, ESQ.
9
       Federal Public Defender's Office
       District of Massachusetts
10
       51 Sleeper Street, 5th Floor
11
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 223-8061
12
       Email: William_fick@fd.org
       For Nicholas Alexander Rovinski
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
1
 2
           (Begins, 2:00 p.m.)
 3
           THE CLERK: Now hearing Criminal Matter 15-10153,
     the United States of America versus Nicholas Alexander
 4
 5
     Rovinski.
           THE COURT: Good afternoon. Would counsel
 6
 7
     identify themselves.
8
           MS. SIEGMANN: Good afternoon, your Honor,
     Stephanie Siegmann for the United States, and with me at
9
     counsel table is Gregory Gonzalez from the
10
11
     counterterrorism section of the Department of Justice.
12
           MR. FICK: Good afternoon, your Honor, William
     Fick for Mr. Rovinski, who is here as well.
13
14
           THE COURT: Well, Mr. Fick, let me congratulate
15
     you on your new venture and wish you well.
           MR. FICK: Thank you, your Honor.
16
           THE COURT: Do I understand that Mr. Rovinski
17
     desires to tender a plea of guilty?
18
19
           MR. FICK: He does, your Honor.
20
           THE COURT: He may come forward to be inquired of.
           And could I have the original plea document?
21
           MS. SIEGMANN: Mr. Fick has the original plea
22
23
     document.
24
           THE COURT: Fine.
25
           (THE DEFENDANT, sworn.)
```

THE COURT: Could you state your full name.

THE DEFENDANT: Nicholas Alexander Rovinski.

THE COURT: Mr. Rovinski, my name is Bill Young,
I'm the judge who presides in this session of the court.
Now, when I asked your lawyer, he told me that you were
prepared to plead guilty to the charges against you.
Before I can let you plead guilty, and it's up to me, I
have to find out a variety of things. I have to find
out that you know what you're doing, I have to find out
that you know what you give up because you give up
things that are terribly important to you if you plead
guilty. I have to be sure that you know what you're
letting yourself in for if you plead guilty.

Now under the circumstances of this plea, the way you and your lawyer have negotiated with the government, if I accept this plea -- and this is the type of plea I call a "take-it-or-leave-it plea," if I leave it, if at the time of sentencing I decide not to go along with it, you haven't pled guilty, you're looking at a trial, we'll see where we go. If I accept it, we know what I'm going to do within certain ranges. And I have to be sure that you know what I'm going to do. And last, but not lastly, I have to be sure that you want to plead guilty.

Now, there's a written plea agreement here. I've

read it. The fact that you've entered into this deal with the government doesn't mean you have to go through with it. If at any time as we talk, because that's what we're going to do, if you decide you just assume not plead guilty, just tell me, we'll stop. While your case is being prepared for trial, we'll let Mr. Fick go back to preparing it for trial. And that's fine by me. I'm never going to be angry with that. If we go to trial and you were convicted, I would never, not one day in prison, punish you because you went to trial.

You understand these things?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And lastly, I have to be sure the government has enough evidence that if we did go to trial on these charges you could be found guilty of these two charges. Now to find that out I'm going to ask the prosecutors, the United States Attorneys, and you and I will both listen to what she tells us, and then I'm going to say to you, "Well, is that true?"

You understand that's how we're going to proceed here? You do understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I do. I do understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, let's start with the "Do you know what you're doing?"

```
How old are you, sir?
1
 2
           THE DEFENDANT: I'm 25 years old.
 3
           THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
           THE DEFENDANT: Um, 11th grade. I received my GED
 4
 5
     at a community college.
 6
           THE COURT: All right.
 7
           Have you ever been treated for any mental illness
     of any sort?
8
9
           THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
10
           THE COURT: Are you aware of any mental illness
11
     that you may have?
12
           THE DEFENDANT: I'm unaware of any mental illness
13
     that I may have.
14
           THE COURT: Are you taking any medication today?
15
           THE DEFENDANT: No, I am not.
16
           THE COURT: Under the influence of any drug?
           THE DEFENDANT: No.
17
           THE COURT: Under the influence of alcohol?
18
19
           THE DEFENDANT: No.
20
           THE COURT: Do you know what you're charged with?
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
22
           THE COURT: Tell me.
23
           THE DEFENDANT: Two counts of conspiring to aid a
24
     terrorist organization and transcending national
25
     boundaries.
```

THE COURT: Actually it's not a test but you've got that pretty much exactly what the charges are.

All right. What's before me is -- that involves you anyway, are these two counts of conspiracy.

Now, before you could be found guilty of either of these counts of conspiracy, the government has to prove certain things, and they're both conspiracy counts but they're slightly different and we'll talk about the differences. But in each of these counts, the government has to prove that you, knowing what you were doing, entered into a conspiracy with this fellow Wright, that's what they've charged.

Now, a conspiracy is an actual agreement between two or more people to accomplish something that the law forbids. So the first thing they have to prove is the agreement. Now the agreement doesn't have to be in writing, it doesn't have to be a handshake, a wink, or a nod, but it's got to be a genuine deal that you've got an agreement with Wright. You're not guilty of conspiracy because as it all fell out you hung around with the wrong people or even that you knew that other people, Wright or somebody else or other people, that you knew that they were conspiring and you didn't do anything about it, that's not conspiracy, the government has to prove that you entered into the conspiracy.

Well, the second thing they have to prove is the specific intent of the conspirators.

Now, when the government charges a conspiracy, they charge a conspiracy with a specific goal, a specific violation of law that is among anyway the goals of the conspirators, specifically that's in mind. Now they don't have to prove that the conspirators knew which particular law they were violating, but they have to prove that the idea was, the goal was to do something that in fact violates the law.

So this is not a drug conspiracy to get drugs and sell them, it's not a conspiracy to receive stolen refrigerators, they've got to be specific -- and in their indictment they charged it specifically, and I'm going to go over that, and they've got to prove that you, but not only you, they've got to prove that you and Wright had this joint idea to violate the law in a certain specific way. And we're going to come back to that.

The third thing they have to prove is that one of you, or more than one, but at least one of you did something, you didn't just talk about it, you actually did something to further the conspiracy, to move the conspiracy along, to make it operational. Now they've got to prove each one of those things to the jury beyond

a reasonable doubt.

Now let's talk about the two charges and the specific intent that they've got to prove.

On the first conspiracy, it is -- the idea was to provide material support to what we have called, an organization we have called the "Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant," "ISIL." Now the President refers to "ISIL," the media refers to "ISIS," people may refer to it in different ways, but there's no doubt -- strike that. Our government has decided that that organization, which I'll call "ISIL," that is, I guess they can prove that, a designated terrorist organization.

Now, when they say that the object of the conspiracy was to provide material support to that organization, they've got to prove not that you were planning some violent act, not that you were, um -- had some generalized law violation in mind, but you were planning something that would provide material -- and "material" means significant, it makes some difference, not just mouthing off, that you were planning anyway something that would provide material support for ISIL, this designated terrorist organization. That's the first charge.

Do you think you understand that charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, the second -- really they're overlapping conspiracies but to have two separate charges the government has to have -- has to shoulder the burden of proving something different for each one. So we've talked about the first conspiracy.

Now, the second conspiracy, which it's alleged to be or it's like the same organization, but the goal here is supposed to be -- is alleged to be -- the goal was to commit acts of terrorism transcending national boundaries, just what you told me you understood. So let's go over that.

For this one the goal was to do something, some violation of the law that we consider an "act of terrorism." So what's an "act of terrorism"? Without getting too refined, it's some act of violence directed with a mind toward destabilizing our society, creating divisions, fear, upsetment, within our society, but that's not enough, one can conceive of domestic acts of terrorism. Here the way Congress has made the violation of law, the act of terrorism has to be one that in some way transcends national boundaries. Well, what that means is beyond the boundaries of the United States, we're talking about the United States. That's what they have to prove for the two acts of terrorism.

You understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, in this session of the court, whenever someone is found guilty or pleads guilty, it is possible in the specific circumstances that the government wants to say to the sentencing judge, and in this case it's me, "Well, these crimes or this crime they're particularly bad because of this or because of that or something else." In this session of the court, by which I mean here in this courtroom where I preside, the way I read the Constitution, if the government's going to say that and it's going to have some effect on me if I come to sentence a person, they've got to prove those enhancements, those things that make it worse, they've got to prove those things to the jury on evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

Now, in your situation where what I'm given is a take-it-or-leave-it plea, um, I'm going to require that they spell out what it is they think you did, and I'll ask you whether you agree to it, but it's not going to change the range that you and Mr. Fick, on your behalf, had bargained out with the government, that range is what it is. It may have an effect on where I come down within that range or whether I accept it at all, but I need to know because I take each one of those things

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

seriously and I require that the government prove them.

So let me just -- I want to tick them off now so you know what they are.

They claim to be able to prove that the material support or resources provided to ISIL were done with the intent, knowledge, or reason to believe that they would be used to commit or assist in the commission of a violent act. Then they say that for the purpose of transcending national boundaries, that they claim to be able to prove that you specifically agreed with others to kill and maim persons within the United States. they claim that there were two or more acts or transactions connected by a common criminal objective or constituting part of a common scheme or plan. They claim to be able to prove that the offenses -- well, this is a matter of law, that the offenses -- they'll be telling me that the offenses we're talking about here are felonies that involved or were intended to promote the federal crime of terrorism.

Now, I mention those because if I'm going to count those at all, if we go to trial, I'll make them prove them to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt, but if I accept this plea or if you go through with the plea, I want them to recite that here this afternoon and I want to know that you agree that those things in fact

happened. So that's what we're talking about with respect to the charges.

Do you think you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Let's talk about your rights, very serious rights, rights that you have under the Constitution.

I keep talking about "proving." You have the right to have this case tried to a jury of the people and that jury would have to agree unanimously, beyond a reasonable doubt, before you could be found guilty of either of these two crimes, and if you were found guilty of either or both of them, before I could count any of these enhancements that I just mentioned. The jury decides, not me. My duty is to give you a fair trial.

At the trial you have the right to be here right here in the courtroom, you can look at the witnesses as they testify, but more important than just looking at them in the courtroom and seeing what the evidence is, Mr. Fick has the right to examine them, cross-examine them, ask them questions, make arguments to the jury, call witnesses on your behalf. You have the right to testify on your own behalf, give your testimony. But then there's another right, you don't have to, you don't have to do anything, you have the right absolutely to be

silent. And to the extent you're silent, I'm going to tell this jury, if we go to trial, that you're an innocent man, and that's the word I'll use,
"Mr. Rovinski is innocent, he cannot be found guilty unless you jurors come to believe unanimously beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Rovinski is guilty." See the burden of proving here, that's on the government, and it stays on the government. It never shifts to you. You don't have to explain yourself. Just because you're arrested, you don't have to justify anything. They've got to prove it. You don't have to prove anything.

Now, this business about starting innocent, that's for real. Now I see we've got you in custody, but that's so you'll show up for the trial. Mentally I have to -- the jury, I want them to start you off innocent, if we have a trial, and as much as my words can impress that on them, I will do that. I take you as innocent. Now seriously, I don't know anything about this case except -- I've read a lot of papers to get ready for the case, but this is the first time you and I have met, I've heard no evidence, other than reading papers I don't know anything about the case, and I must tell myself you're innocent, you start innocent, and that's how I look at you. And I'm not giving you anything by explaining these things, these things are your rights

under the law, under the Constitution.

Now, do you understand you have these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, you tender, if you plead guilty this afternoon, you say, "Judge, I'll plead guilty and we'll see whether you as the judge will accept it," you've given all these rights away, we'll never have a trial, we'll never get to see any evidence at all, the closest we're going to come is when I ask the U.S. Attorney to tell me what she hopes she could prove if we went to trial, that's as close as we're going to come, and then I'll say, "Well, is that true?"

Your right to be silent, oh, you still have that, you have that up until I sentence you, but once I sentence you, that right is gone as to these crimes, not as to other crimes, but as to these crimes that right is gone because you're guilty. So your Fifth Amendment right to be silent, that's gone.

Now, understand you're charged with this fellow Wright and one imagines the government is interested in how all this, if anything, did happen or was conspired to and the like, they're interested in how all of this came to be. Once I sentence you, you've got no right to keep silent about that, you're going to have to tell.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And lastly, if you plead guilty here this afternoon, you go from being truly innocent in my eyes to being a guilty person and what's left for me to decide is whether this plea agreement that I have is fair and just both to you and to the interests, not of the government, but of all the people who the government represents, that's what I have to figure out, that's the only thing left, but I think you're guilty. You understand that? Do you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Counsel, why don't you come up here. I just want to show you the plea documents, that's why I'm coming down. (Sidebar sealed.)

(In open court.)

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: Now, what we need to know is what the deal is here because all that's left is whether I'm going to go for this deal or not. We won't know that today, I'm going to need a presentence report. But as I started out, this is a take-it-or-leave-it plea, that -to the judge, and that means -- and it's perfectly appropriate under the rules for your counsel and the government and you to enter into a deal, and that deal in essence sets the parameters of what I can do. the first thing I can do is just refuse to accept it. If I refuse to accept it, what we do here this afternoon doesn't count, even if you tender your plea, you go back to being an innocent man, but you're an innocent man charged with these crimes and we'll get you to trial and see how that works out. If I accept the plea, here's what will happen, I mean, because this is the deal. I will sentence you for at least 15 years but not more than 22 years to prison.

You understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I will impose a fine on you unless I think you're unable to pay a fine. I will keep you on supervised release for the rest of your life.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 1 THE COURT: Now that's like probation, that means 2 3 that we'll have a handle on you so that if you commit some other crime or violate the terms of your supervised 4 5 release, I can put you back in prison or some other 6 judge can. 7 You understand that? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: That's for the rest of your life. 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 10 11 THE COURT: And I will impose upon you a mandatory special assessment of \$200. 12 13 Do you understand that? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Now, other than this plea document, these papers that we've just gone over, is there any 16 other agreement, any other deal, any other promise that 17 18 the government has made to you that's not here? 19 THE DEFENDANT: No, there has not been. 20 THE COURT: Have they threatened you with anything 21 to get you to plead guilty? THE DEFENDANT: No. 22 23 THE COURT: Now, in this type of case, and in 24 every case really I should ask, are you covering up for 25 anyone else by pleading guilty yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: I'm not. 1 THE COURT: You should know that if you're not a 2 3 citizen of the United States, conviction of these crimes may have the consequence of your being denied admission 4 5 to the United States, denied naturalization under the laws of the United States, and if you're not a citizen 6 7 it may result in your deportation, do you understand 8 that? 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Have you had enough time to talk all 10 11 this over with Mr. Fick, your attorney? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. THE COURT: Do you think he's been a good attorney 13 14 gotten for you those things that are your rights under 15 the law, we've been talking about your rights, do you 16 think he's secured those rights for you that are your rights under the Constitution? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Affirmative. 18 19 THE COURT: Go ahead. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Do you think he's been a good 22 attorney? 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Are you satisfied with him as your 25 attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 1 2 THE COURT: Do you still want to plead guilty? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Why? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: I feel, um, in the interests of 6 myself and people of the United States that I should, 7 um, pay for the crimes that I have committed. 8 THE COURT: All right. Now I follow that, and in that there is an acknowledgement that you think you have 9 committed crimes, correct, is that true? 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Now I'm going to ask the government to 12 tell me briefly, just touching on the essential elements 13 14 and the enhancements because I need to know, um, tell me 15 what you hope you can prove. 16 And you listen to this. You don't have to agree to it, but listen carefully. If you disagree with any 17 18 of it, you tell me because she's going to tell me now 19 what she hopes she can prove and then I'm going to say, 20 "Do you understand that and is that true?" 21 Ms. Siegmann. 22 MS. SIEGMANN: Had this case gone to trial the 23 government would have proven beyond a reasonable doubt

In November of 2014, the defendant met David

24

25

the following facts.

Wright on Facebook. In December of 2014, defendant and Wright began discussing that their mutual support for ISIL, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant -- and as your Honor said, "ISIL" is known by several names, they didn't always use "ISIL," they often used "ISIS" and "ISS," but for purposes of my facts today I'm going to refer to it as "ISIL." The United States government has designated ISIL as a foreign terrorist organization and at all times relevant to this indictment it was so designated.

Indeed Wright and Rovinski both understood that it was a terrorist organization, Mr. Rovinski understood and discussed with Wright the fact that ISIL committed violent acts and had called for violence and individuals to kill and behead nonbelievers including people in the United States.

In January 2015 the defendant downloaded six issues of ISIL's online magazine, "Dabiq," D-A-B-I-Q, which Wright had sent him via e-mail. ISIL uses "Dabiq" as a promotion and means of recruiting people and propaganda. The magazines that Mr. Rovinski downloaded and viewed boasted about military victories of ISIL, criticized western governments, and called its supporters to kill nonbelievers and to commit violent Jihad. Wright also sent Rovinski links to other ISIL

materials including beheading videos and e-books. For instance on January 26th, 2016, Wright sent Rovinski a link to the Islamic state 2015 full e-book which contained instructions on how to travel to ISIS's controlled territory in Syria through Turkey and it also contained a list of twitter accounts for people that live in the Islamic state.

Now, although initially Rahim, Usaamah -- Rahim was another co-conspirator in this conspiracy as laid out in the indictment, and initially Rahim -- Usaamah Rahim, David Wright, and Rovinski, planned to travel oversees to join the Khalify, to join the Islamic state, but over time their plans changed and they began planning plots, a plot to kill and commit violent Jihad in the United States to kill and behead individuals here.

After Wright introduced Rahim to ISIL, Rahim had numerous conversations with people overseas, ISIL members overseas, um, between the time --

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

MS. SIEGMANN: I'm sorry?

THE COURT: After Wright introduced Rahim? Don't you mean Rovinski?

MS. SIEGMANN: Sorry, I actually -- for purposes of this indictment of the conspiracy, your Honor,

there's acts that Rahim actually committed that would —
that we would be proving at trial against Rovinski. So
Wright actually introduced — had conversations with
Rovinski, he also introduced his uncle, Usaamah Rahim,
to ISIL and actually, um, he indicated this is a
legitimate organization and that they should support
them. And but for Wright, Rahim may not have ever done
the acts that he committed on June 2nd, 2015. So back
about a year before this occurred, Wright introduced
Rahim to ISIL, and then after that, between the date and
time of February 2015 until his death in June to 2015,
Rahim had numerous conversations with ISIL members
overseas.

The defendant also had several conversations with people located overseas using various internet-based applications, messaging applications. For instance, on May 20th, 2015 he told a person named Khalid, located in the United Kingdom, that he would be, quote, "carrying things out here in the United States rather than traveling over to Syria to join ISIL. Similarly on that same day, May 20th, 2015, Rovinski told a woman over --located in the United Kingdom, that -- during a chat, that he, quote, "had chosen the path of Jihad."

"Jihad," your Honor, is a reference to committing acts of violence in the United States.

In March of 2015 --

THE COURT: Right, at least you say in the circumstances of this case it is?

MS. SIEGMANN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MS. SIEGMANN: In March 2015, Wright had obtained and studied a Jihadist manual entitled "How to survive in the West," which detailed how to become a sleeper cell in the U.S. until ordered to attack, ordered to carry out acts of violence. Wright forwarded a link to this document to Rahim, the other co-conspirator, and advised Rahim, "That it is perfect for the initiative," that was a quote, "perfect for the initiative."

Now, all these acts were going on and they were having discussions about "How can we support ISIL?" but by April 2015, Rovinski, Wright, and Rahim had agreed to commit attacks and kill persons inside the United States which they would -- which they believed would further the objectives of ISIL, would support their objectives. They each took steps in furtherance of this plan. Their attack plans included the beheading of at least one person, on one New York woman who's identified in the indictment as "Intended Victim 1." As a matter of public record, "Intended Victim 1" is Pamela Geller, and she has acknowledged it as such and publicly

acknowledged this recently.

In 2015 ISIL had issued a fatwah, F-A-T-W-A-H, or religious decree -- and that's the Arabic word, your Honor, um, to its supporters calling for her murder.

Ms. Geller had organized a Muhammad art exhibit and contest in Garland, Texas on May 3rd, 2015, and severally from the plans of Rovinski and his conspirators, two armed men had attempted to attack that contest and kill Ms. Geller, but before they were able to do so, they were killed by law enforcement.

Minutes after this attack occurred, an individual by the name of Junaid Hussain, an ISIL member located in Syria, had tweeted, using his twitter account, "Two of our brothers just open fire at the Prophet Muhammad art exhibit in Texas, kill those who insult the prophet," hash-tag, "Garland shooting." Hussain used twitter to encourage terrorist attacks in United States and Europe against persons whom ISIL had decided were worthy of killing, that they believed should be targeted, should be killed, and wanted them executed. Pamela Geller was one of those people. Hussain was killed by a drone strike on August 24th, 2015.

In May, a few months before his murder -- I'm sorry, in May, a few months before he was killed, Hussain, who was located in Syria, had directly

communicated with Usaamah Rahim concerning the murder of Geller. On May 26th, 2015 Rahim told David Wright, during a recorded telephone conversation, that he had received an encrypted document from Mr. Hussain with details about the woman in New York who likes to insult the Prophet Muhammad. And between May 25th and May 27th, 2015, Rahim had purchased three knives, three knives ranging in size between -- ranging in size of 13 to 15 inches from Amazon.com, the last of which was delivered to his residence on May 30th.

Between -- and he wasn't the only one that researched or looked at weapons in this case, your Honor, between April and June 2015, Rovinski researched knives and weapons using the internet. Rovinski also viewed videos on how to make weapons on Youtube and downloaded those videos to his account. In April and May of 2015, Wright also conducted internet searches on firearms, weapons, and law enforcement capabilities. For instance, on April 19th, 2015, Wright had conducted internet search queries on Google including "which tranquilizer puts humans to sleep instantly" and he did multiple searches on how to purchase tranquilizer guns, taser guns, and firearms.

On May 25th, 2015, Wright conducted another internet search querying "How to start a secret militia

in the United States," and that same day Rahim conducted searches on Facebook on the name "Pamela Geller" and the name of one of her relatives.

On May 31st, 2015, the defendant met with Wright and Rovinski for more than two hours on a secluded beach in Rhode Island where they discussed their plan to behead Ms. Geller and Wright and Rovinski had actually previously met on that same beach just a few weeks earlier on or about May 9th, 2015.

Now, according to statements made by Mr. Rovinski to law enforcement on June 2nd, 2015, all three men agreed to murder Pamela Geller and each of them were going to play a critical role in the planned beheading, and killing and/or maiming a person violates both Massachusetts General Laws as well as New York -- New York state penal law.

And moving forward. During a telephone conversation on the morning of June 2nd, 2015, Rahim informed Wright that he could not wait until July 4th to go after their target and wanted to go after the "boys in boy," a slang term referring to police officers in Massachusetts. So he wanted to attack and to go after police officers in Massachusetts.

Wright encouraged Rahim's plan to attack the police and die as a martyr and less than two hours after

Wright spoke to Rahim the police -- I'm sorry Rahim was killed when he lunged with a knife towards police officers and special agents of the FBI in a Roslindale parking lot after being repeatedly asked to drop his knife.

After Rahim was killed, Hussain, Junaid Hussain, the individual in Syria, the ISIL member, the recruiter, acknowledged -- publicly acknowledged that he had directly communicated with Rahim and at trial the government would have proven that these communications demonstrate the significance of this conspiracy, a conspiracy in which Rovinski was involved.

On June 12th, 2015, using twitter, Hussain described Usaamah Rahim as a martyr in Boston who was involved in a plan, quote, "to behead Pamela Geller." Hussain further acknowledged that he had spoken to Rahim and during their last conversation Hussain had instructed Rahim to "carry a knife in case the Feds tried to arrest him." Because of that knife Hussain explained Rahim became a martyr rather than be arrested.

Even after the defendant was arrested on June 11th, 2015, he continued to engage in activity designed to further the conspiracy, the plan to commit violent attacks in the United States. In August 2015, Rovinski wrote two letters addressed to his co-defendant and

conspirator, "Daoud Wright," and that's how they're addressed, "Daoud Wright," and Rovinski attempted to recruit people while in jail to assist in their plan to kill people in the United States on behalf of ISIL because his intention, as was it the intention of Wright and Rahim, was to bring down the United States government.

THE COURT: Well, just a moment. You say he wrote two letters to Wright, but you didn't characterize the letters at all?

MS. SIEGMANN: I'm going to do that. You're right, your Honor. I'm going to summarize them right now.

THE COURT: Oh, go right ahead.

MS. SIEGMANN: The government recovered both of those letters before they could be sent or delivered to Mr. Wright, and in the first letter Rovinski informed Wright that he, Rovinski, had found an inmate that would assist them in their plan to take down the Eastern Coast -- that's a quote, "the Eastern Coast and ultimately the U.S. government by killing and beheading people."

Included in this plan Rovinski wrote that he intended to, quote, "place their juicy heads for display, the victory will be ours, use any resource possible, surely we will persevere and win," end quote.

Now the government would have proven at trial that the term "juicy heads" and "juicy necks" was a term that Rovinski, Wright, and Rahim use often and it was used to refer to beheadings, and since June of 2014 ISIL has been distributing beheading videos and promoting decapitation as an acceptable means of killing nonbelievers.

Rovinski concluded this letter by pledging allegiance to ISIL's leader, he wrote, "I give full bayah," B-A-Y-A-H, which is an Arabic word meaning "allegiance," "to Amir Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi and the Khalify." And, your Honor, Abu Bakr Al-Baghdadi is the leader of ISIL, the "Khalify" is a term that refers to the Islamic state.

Now turning to the second letter, similarly in Rovinski's second letter he advised Wright that he had, quote, "acquired a recruit," end quote, from the jail that had pledged allegiance and support to ISIL and the defendant wrote to Wright, in pertinent part, quote, "We will try to get ammo and more personnel to coordinate our attack. Leave no stone unturned. We need to leave them blind. This is going to be worse than Genghis Khan. Can't wait for them juicy necks." Again, the term "juicy necks" referring to beheadings.

Your Honor, based upon these facts, among others,

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 government is confident it could prove the defendant guilty at trial that he intended to engage and conspired to engage in an act of terrorism to promote violence and with the intent of supporting ISIL and bringing down the U.S. government. THE COURT: Did you hear what Ms. Siegmann had to say? MR. FICK: May I interject one moment, your Honor, before you inquire? THE COURT: You may. MR. FICK: I just wanted to carve out for the Court that there's a lot of information in the government's recitation there as to which Mr. Rovinski doesn't necessarily or doesn't have personal knowledge such as Rahim's communications abroad, but we acknowledge and understand that as co-conspirator statements and activity that would come in at trial. THE COURT: I thank you and I had intended to ask a couple of questions and I will. MR. FICK: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Did you hear what she had to say? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor. THE COURT: Do you understand what she had to say? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, insofar as she referred

specifically to you and referred to your agreeing, your 1 2 researching, your writing, your communicating, are all 3 those things true? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, they are. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. And did you understand and 6 agree to the various goals that she laid out there in 7 her recitation? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: So as I understand it, and this --9 they're all important questions but now I'm getting to 10 11 the end, I mean you're prepared to plead guilty because 12 you acknowledge you are guilty of these crimes, you're 13 hoping I will accept this deal that you worked out with 14 the government, but you acknowledge you are in fact 15 guilty, is that true? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. I find that Nicholas Rovinski, knowingly, 18 19 intelligently, and voluntarily exercises his right to 20 tender a plea of guilty to the two counts of the 21 indictment and the Clerk may receive the tender. 22 Now, I understand that this is a 23 take-it-or-leave-it plea, so she's going to -- the Clerk now is going to ask you, she'll say, "You earlier 24

pleaded not guilty, do you want to change your plea from

25

not guilty to guilty?" and if you want to stop, say
"No," and we'll stop, but if you want to plead, say
"Yes." And then she'll say, "How do you plead, guilty
or not guilty?" If you say "Guilty," then in my eyes
you're guilty, there's no taking it back -- you can't
get it back unless, for whatever reason, I come to
believe that I'm not going to go along with this plea
agreement, then it doesn't count and in essence we start
over, you're innocent and you're awaiting trial. But if
I were to accept this, when we come on for sentencing,
we don't know exactly what the sentence will be and I
have a lot of thinking to do, but I will follow the
agreement.

Do you understand that's how it works?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. The Clerk may accept Mr. Rovinski's tender of a plea of guilty.

THE CLERK: Mr. Rovinski, you have previously pled not guilty to a two-count superseding indictment charging you in Count 1(f), conspiracy to provide material support to designated foreign terrorist organization, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2339(b)(a)(1), and Count 4(f), conspiracy to commit acts of terrorism transcending national boundaries in violation of Title 18, United States Code,

```
Section 2332(b)(a)(2) and (c).
1
           Do you now wish to change your plea, "Yes" or
 2
 3
     "No"?
           THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 4
 5
           THE CLERK: How do you now plead to Counts 1(f)
     and 4(f), guilty or not guilty?
 6
 7
           THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.
8
           THE COURT: Thank you. You may step down.
           (Defendant steps down.)
9
           THE COURT: I propose sentencing for the 23rd of
10
11
     March 2017 at 2:00 p.m., is that satisfactory,
12
     Ms. Siegmann?
13
           MS. SIEGMANN: Yes, your Honor.
14
           THE COURT: And, Mr. Fick, is that satisfactory?
15
           MR. FICK: Yes, your Honor.
           THE COURT: Very well. That's the date for
16
     sentencing. He's remanded to the custody of the
17
     marshals. We'll recess.
18
19
           (Ends, 2:50 p.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes before Judge William G. Young, on Thursday, September 22, 2016, to the best of my skill and ability. /s/ Richard H. Romanow 10-11-16 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date