1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
3	No. 1:15-cr-10153-WGY
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
7	
8	vs.
9	
10	NICHOLAS A. ROVINSKI
11	
12	*****
13	
14	For Hearing Before: Judge William G. Young
15	
16	Sentencing
17	United States District Court
18	District of Massachusetts (Boston) One Courthouse Way
19	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Wednesday, December 20, 2017
20	meanesaa, seeemsel 20, 2017
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

```
1
                      APPEARANCES
 2
 3
    B. STEPHANIE SIEGMANN, ESQ.
       United States Attorney's Office
       J. Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse
 4
       1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200
 5
       Boston, Massachusetts 02210
       (617) 748-3191
 6
       Email: Stephanie.siegmann@usdoj.gov
   and
 7
    GREGORY R. GONZALEZ, ESQ.
       U.S. Department of Justice
8
       950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
       Washington, DC 20530
       (202) 513-4050
9
       Email: Gregory.gonzalez2@usdoj.gov
       For the United States
10
11
12
    WILLIAM W. FICK, ESQ., ESQ.
       Fick & Marx, LLP
       100 Franklin Street, 7th Floor
13
       Boston, Massachusetts 02110
14
       (857) 321-8360
       Email: Wfick@fickmarx.com
15
       For the defendant
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
PROCEEDINGS
1
 2
                (Begins, 10:00 a.m.)
 3
                THE CLERK: Criminal Matter 15-10153, the
     United States of America versus Nicholas Alexander
 4
 5
     Rovinski.
 6
                THE COURT: Good morning, would counsel
 7
     identify themselves.
8
                MS. SIEGMANN: Good morning, your Honor,
     Stephanie Siegmann for the United States, and with me at
9
     counsel table is Gregory Gonzalez from the National
10
11
     Security Division at the Department of Justice.
12
                THE COURT: Thank you.
13
                MR. FICK: And good morning, your Honor,
14
     William Fick for Mr. Rovinski, who is here next to me.
15
                THE COURT: Yes. Good morning.
16
           May I talk directly to Mr. Rovinski?
17
                MR. FICK: Yes, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Mr. Rovinski, have you read the
18
19
     presentence report that's been prepared in your case?
20
                THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have, your Honor.
21
                THE COURT: Have you talked it all over with
     Mr. Fick?
22
23
                THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes.
24
                THE COURT: Do you believe you understand it?
25
                THE DEFENDANT: I believe I do.
```

THE COURT: Nothing's been withheld from the presentence report under the rules of criminal procedure?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

(Defendant is seated.)

THE COURT: This matter comes before the Court on a C-plea. I think it's appropriate to start by saying I've carefully reviewed all the materials that are before the Court and I -- so I have before me his tender of a plea of guilty pursuant to that C-plea agreement, and now I accept that tender. So that restricts the Court's, um, the range. I should go further and say, having read the government's sentencing memorandum, um, I am inclined -- and I think that's a sensitive and careful recommendation, to accept that recommendation, and that is not different than the best the defendant can do. But I'll hear argument if some is necessary.

It is still my obligation accurately to calculate the sentencing guidelines. And so, Ms. Siegmann, let me pose this question to you.

Yesterday you argued an issue in the guideline calculation which, um, raised with the Court its responsibility independently to analyze the guidelines.

As I recall the argument, the government agreed that the guidelines arithmetically were properly calculated, but

-- and you argued frankly they were wrong and a careful review of the charge and conviction should lead the Court to that conclusion. I took the matter under advisement. And as it turned out, it was moot. That's my view.

Have I got that right?

MS. SIEGMANN: Well, I think the government had -- the calculation was one level higher than what probation had.

THE COURT: True.

MS. SIEGMANN: So arithmetically it was different, because I was at level 43 and the probation department is at 42.

THE COURT: Well, yes, but I guess I'm -- is that issue present here?

MS. SIEGMANN: No, because the plea agreement has the correct guideline calculation, in the government's view, and it uses a different guideline section than Mr. Wright's, and that's because the parties and probation basically followed the plea agreement in the calculations. And so that's why there is no issue here as there was in Mr. Wright's sentence.

THE COURT: Thank you. And so if I put it to

you, you then agree with the guideline calculation as 1 2 set forth in the presentence report? 3 MS. SIEGMANN: For Mr. Rovinski. THE COURT: For Mr. Rovinski? 4 5 MS. SIEGMANN: Yes, I do. 6 THE COURT: And, Mr. Fick, you agree with the 7 quideline calculation? 8 MR. FICK: Yes. 9 THE COURT: All right, because that needs to be established. 10 11 I think -- it's pure dicta because I don't think 12 it, um -- well, it did not bear indeed -- it bore but was of no moment in the sentencing of Mr. Wright, but on 13 14 reflection I think the government has the better of the 15 argument, and I'll say that on the record. 16 All right, I've talked enough. I've accepted the 17 C-plea. I've indicated my willingness to accept what in effect is the joint recommendation. 18 19 Oh, I do have one other question and that is 20 Mr. Fick has, on Mr. Rovinski's behalf, made a strong 21 argument for a designation recommendation from this 22 court. 23 Do you object to that? 24 MS. SIEGMANN: No, your Honor. And actually, 25 um, one of the points I was going to make today is that

the government jointly requests that BOP designation.

THE COURT: Thank you. Those are my questions. And I think I should give the government, the defense, and Mr. Rovinski a chance to speak, if you wish. I'm inclined to accept the joint recommendation and the designation as well, um, so I think it can be brief, but I think you're entitled to be heard. We'll start with the government.

MS. SIEGMANN: Your Honor, as the government set forth in its sentencing memorandum, while the crimes here are very serious, we believe the Section 3553(a) factors, especially the mitigating factors, support a sentence of 15 years, 10 years for Count 4 and 5 years for Count 1 to run consecutively. The government also urges that the Court impose a term of lifetime supervised release upon his -- the defendant's release from prison.

I just want, just for the record, to address some of the factors in this decision and recommendation, let me just briefly discuss a few of them for the Court.

There was no doubt that the defendant and his conspirators posed a grave threat to the United States in June 2015. He was a strong supporter of ISIS, he had twice pledged support for Abu Bakr Al Baghdadi, he made numerous anti U.S. statements and they were in

conspiring to kill a U.S. citizen and in plotting other violent attacks, but -- and he continued to engage in some activity in prison, but the mitigating factors here differentiates this defendant from many other defendants the government has seen and is aware of.

Mr. Rovinski has renounced publicly his support for ISIS, he has recognized that he himself deserves to be punished for his conduct, he understands the wrongfulness of his behaviors, and he cooperated fully with the government and testified for three days at trial, the government thinks that testimony was critical to the jury's convictions, and it's clear that he was a mere follower compared to Wright, and that Mr. Wright, the defendant you sentenced yesterday, was the mastermind and manipulated Mr. Rovinski as he did his Uncle Rahim.

The other issues I think that weigh in favor of the 15-year sentence is the fact that, by virtue of testifying and cooperating against an ISIS plotter,

Mr. Rovinski has exposed himself to retribution by ISIS.

ISIS is still operating even though they've lost territory graphically, they have a robust, robust presence on the internet and social media and they continue to recruit people to kill people in the United States and in the west.

Additionally I think that the factors also, um, from the government's point of view, that also are important to note, is that Mr. Rovinski never ever complained despite all the many preparation sessions we had with him, he was completely forthcoming and cooperative, and even when he was told about threats against his life and those of his family members, and even the fact that Mr. Wright wanted to behead his cat, he never expressed any reluctance to testify.

Lastly, the government believes that his physical condition, um, of cerebral palsy and cognitive deficits, although not an excuse for the crimes, may have been one of the reasons why he was so swayed by the appeals of ISIS, you know, fame and glory in the afterlife, because of the troubles he's had over his lifetime. And so for those reasons the government believes -- and likely he was deceived by it, many of the representations, because of those, um, his physical and, um, mental deficits.

For those reasons the government is requesting a sentence of 15 years, and again I jointly request the BOP designation language that's contained at Page 3 of the defendant's memorandum. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Fick.

MR. FICK: Thank you, your Honor. I'll be brief and not belabor what's in the papers.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You know I'd make the observation that the government and law enforcement face a very vexing problem today about what to do about online radicalization, young people looking for a cause, and what happens when they lash onto an odious and dangerous and violent cause, and, you know, one can certainly understand, stepping back, that it's very difficult for the government and law enforcement to know both who might go operational, who might stay within the realm of ideas. You know we'd like to think in this situation, given Mr. Rovinski's unique background and circumstances, that, you know, if he hadn't had the misfortune of encountering Mr. Wright online, this idea, this phase, might well have passed unnoticed much like the -- the notion of joining the teepee community in Suskatchewan, like Dr. Reid talked about in the psychiatric evaluation. But unfortunately that's not what happened, the federal crime of conspiracy is serious, the elements here are met, Mr. Rovinski is guilty and pled guilty to that crime, which still however leaves us with the question of "Well, what do you do in a situation like this?" And I think it's important to recognize that 15 years is a very very substantial punishment. We get inured to huge numbers in this building sometimes, but 15 years, on any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

measure, is a very substantial punishment, particularly for someone coming from where Mr. Rovinski is. You know the, um -- but certainly I think it's amply sufficient in the circumstances.

And I think one of the best measures of that, and the most interesting ones, and the one that I'm sort of the most appreciative of is the measure of -- that the government and law enforcement itself eventually came You know we entered the plea agreement originally in the situation where even notwithstanding the cooperation the government took the position that it was going to ask for 22 years, although the defense would be allowed to ask for 15. What I think happened as time unfolded and as Mr. Rovinski had the opportunity to spend hour after hour after hour both with the prosecutors and with law enforcement agents is, um, the agents, I think in particular, came to have a very -- a much more nuanced view of what Mr. Rovinski is, what challenges he faced, where he is now, and what hope he offers in the future, and I really -- it's a peculiar position for someone like me to be in, for a defense lawyer to be in, but I really appreciate the sort of openmindedness, honesty, and integrity that law enforcement showed for Mr. Rovinski in this case, and I think the government's decision to jointly recommend 15

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

years under the C-plea is a reflection of that, and I think it clearly indicates that that is a sufficient punishment. You know they are the people here who really came to best know what Mr. Rovinski went through and where he's wound up today.

The other group of people of course that I look to in trying to assess, um, you know, what arguments I can make and how to look at this situation are his family, his mother, his father, his brother, the people that have known him since he was born, and, you know, I will say to them and to the Court, um, that I think I will probably go to my grave thinking that perhaps I have failed them in some way because from their point of view of course 15 is an unthinkable tragedy, they could never imagine that their son, their brother, would wind up in this situation. On the other hand I recognize the challenge that law enforcement faces, these are very serious crimes, these are very dangerous ideas, and so some measure of punishment is necessary here and, um, this is the number we landed on in the circumstances. appreciate the Court's inclination to adopt it and I support that. And once again I simply thank the government and law enforcement for its, um, recognition that that is sufficient in the circumstances.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Rovinski, you have the right to talk to me directly. You are not required to. If you want to, if you want to say anything, you may do so now.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I would like to. I've prepared a speech for you.

(Takes out paper.)

THE DEFENDANT: While being incarcerated I've had ample time to meditate on my circumstances, seeing what I was planning as being met with malice, animus, and evil. Since coming to such realization, I'm starting to be a new man, I've come to accept responsibility for my actions that brought me here today.

Standing here before you, while it's unfortunate but necessary to me and my development as a human being, but utterly condemning the violent acts with which I am charged, I shall move forward. As for my future, I hope to contribute to my country in a meaningful way through career and charity. I was planning to pursue a career in diesel mechanics, hydraulics, possibly Merchant Marine, and in doing so I will work diligently to participate as a productive citizen and member of society.

Pertaining to charity, I wish to volunteer for programs towards helping the destitute. I wish to

volunteer my time for veterans who have fought for the security and freedom of this country. I want to thank God for giving me a second chance and to thank the prosecuting agents for taking their time to talk with me and to work with me towards my sentencing. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: Mr. Nicholas Rovinski, pursuant to 18 United States Code, Section 3553A, the information from the United States Attorney, your attorney, the probation department, and, um, yourself, this Court sentences you to 15 years in the custody of the United States Attorney General. The Court breaks down that sentence as follows: On Count 1, I sentence you to 7 years. On Count 4, I sentence you to 8 years from and after the sentence on Count 1. I, um -- the proposal by the government makes perfect sense but since I stumbled in sentencing Mr. Wright, it seems to me to make sense to certainly not sentence Mr. Rovinski, as a matter of form, to more than I sentenced Mr. Wright on Count 4. I'm fully cognizant now that the sentence has to run from and after. So it's a total of 15 years.

The \$200 special assessment required by law. The -- a lifetime of supervised release, as agreed by the parties, the Court imposes it, with all the general

conditions of supervised release and the following special conditions.

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

When you are released from prison, you're to reside for a period of up to 6 months in a residential reentry center or until such time as a suitable residence can be located. You must observe the rules of that facility. You must not knowingly have any contact, direct or indirect, with Pamela Geller. You're prohibited from drinking alcohol to the point of intoxication, as defined by Massachusetts state law as a .10 blood alcohol level. You must participate in a program for substance abuse counseling, which program may include drug testing not to exceed 104 drug tests per year. You must participate in a mental health treatment program as directed by the probation office. You must participate in a vocational services training program as directed by the probation office. You're required to contribute to the costs of these special conditions to the extent of your ability so to contribute. They'll be no fine due to your inability to pay a fine.

The Court adopts the recommendation and now makes the recommendation which both parties jointly propose. The Court strongly recommends that Mr. Rovinski initially be designated to FCI Danbury and that he

participate in the Bureau of Prisons' Skills Program.

The Court recommends that his security level not be increased outside the parameters of the Bureau of Prisons' security classification system. If the Bureau of Prisons does not comply with this recommendation, the Court requests a letter detailing the specific reasons for not so complying.

Let me explain this sentence to you, Mr. Rovinski, though both sides in effect agree and you evidence a real understanding of why this sentence is necessary. These are most serious crimes. I listened very carefully to what you said. I'm glad you can acknowledge how fair the government has been here. And in his skill as your attorney, I accept and I think Mr. Fick accurately compliments the government in its sensitivity toward your position and your specific circumstances, and I truly respect that.

I tried to say yesterday -- I'm not going to extend this. I tried to say yesterday, and I did so inartfully, what you, Mr. Fick, have managed to say more succinctly and more accurately, that this is a problem beyond individual defendants who seek to put these ideas into action. Our society is not afraid of ideas, we're committed to the belief that we have better ideas, ideas that allow all people the chance both to participate and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

realize their full potential and, um, have an equal and just and respectful place in society, and the one thing -- and I'm sure I did not do this well yesterday, but I did try to address what you raised, that outside the law enforcement, which has been superb here in this case, superb at the level of enforcement of the law and superb in the prosecution of crimes that justly can be indicted and proved, we need something, something that's internet-attractive to young people to convey those ideas and to convey the self-sacrifice, the heroism, the daily requirement of what it means to be a citizen in a republic. In your several roles, the prosecutor and defense counsel, that's not your direct responsibility, but it is all of our responsibility as Americans to see that the truly magnificent system that we have, a system that is borne out in this proceeding in so many ways, um, resonates in the hearts and minds of -- I called them "restless young people" yesterday, and I'll stand on that.

He should have credit toward the service of this sentence from the 11th of June of 2015 toward the present, and I do declare such credit.

Mr. Rovinski, despite your plea agreement, you have the right to appeal from any findings or rulings the Court makes against you. Should you appeal and

should your appeal be successful, in whole or in part 1 and the case remanded, you'll be resentenced before 2 3 another judge. Mr. Fick, if an appeal is decided upon, you want transcript, seek it from this session of the 4 5 court because I'll turn it around right away. Do you understand? 6 7 MR. FICK: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: That's the sentence of the Court. He's remanded to the custody of the marshals. We'll 9 10 recess. 11 (Ends, 10:30 a.m.) 12 13 CERTIFICATE 14 15 I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, 16 do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true 17 and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes, before Judge William G. Young, on Wednesday, December 18 19 20, 2017, to the best of my skill and ability. 20 21 /s/ Richard H. Romanow 1-9-18 22 RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date 23 24

25