UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

HONORABLE ARTHUR J. TARNOW

V.

No. 16-20552 and 17-20235

SEBASTIAN GREGERSON A/K/A ABDURRAHMAN BIN MIKAAYL,

Defendant.

SENTENCING HEARING

Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Appearances:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: CATHLEEN CORKEN, ESQ. FOR THE DEFENDANT: DAVID THOLEN, ESQ.

To obtain a certified transcript, contact:
Lawrence R. Przybysz, MA, CSR, RPR, RMR, CRR
Official Federal Court Reporter
Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 124
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313)414-4460. Lawrence_Przybysz@mied.uscourts.gov

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

INDEX SENTENCING HEARING	
INDEX	
SENTENCING HEARING	

Ī	Page 3
1	Detroit, Michigan
2	Wednesday, August 30, 2017
3	3:00 p.m.
4	
5	THE COURT CLERK: Calling case number 17-20235, and
6	case number 16-20552, United States of America versus Sebastian
7	Gregerson. Will counsel please identify themselves for the
8	record?
9	MS. CORKEN: Good afternoon, your Honor Cathleen
10	Corken on behalf of the United States.
11	MR. THOLEN: Good afternoon, your Honor. May it
12	please the Court, David Tholen on behalf of Mr. Gregerson, your
13	Honor.
14	THE COURT: Good afternoon, all.
15	MR. THOLEN: Good afternoon, Judge.
16	THE COURT: Bring your client to the lecturn, please.
17	You remember you are still under oath.
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And you still have a Fifth Amendment
20	right to remain silent. Do you understand that?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
22	THE COURT: And you are in jail now. In the last 12
23	hours, have you had any let me go back a step. And you
24	choose to answer my questions?
25	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

Page 4 1 THE COURT: Okay. In the last 12 hours have you had 2 any alcohol, prescription drugs, or other drugs that would make 3 it hard for you to understand what is happening now? 4 THE DEFENDANT: No. 5 THE COURT: Do you understand? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 6 7 THE COURT: What is the procedure today? 8 THE DEFENDANT: It's a sentencing Hearing. 9 THE COURT: Okay. And let me explain how this is 10 going to work in terms of presentation. Ultimately, you have 11 the final word. You have the right of allocution, it's called, 12 and you can choose to say whatever you want related to the 13 possible sentence. But before we get to that point I'm going 14 to talk to your lawyers, to your lawyer, and to the Government 15 lawyer about the Presentence Report. Now, have you read the 16 Presentence Report? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 THE COURT: Have you gone through it with your 19 attorney? 20 Yes, several times. THE DEFENDANT: 21 Are you satisfied with your attorney? THE COURT: 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Okay. And I note there was some 24 objections and that is one of the things I will talk to your 25 attorney about. But do you have any questions about what is

Page 5

going to happen today other than what the ultimate sentence is?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Okay. So I am going to talk, as I said, to the attorneys first about the Presentence Report to make sure that we are in agreement as to what the calculations are and should be. And then I will ask the Government for their recommendation as to the appropriate sentence. And I note that the Government has already filed a Sentencing Memorandum indicating what their recommendation is, but I want to put that on the record, not quite in so much detail. And then I will ask your attorney for his recommendation. And I note the same thing, that he has already filed in both cases. You realize there are two case here?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And both have filed in both cases memoranda as to what your sentence should be. And after I am done listening to them it will be your turn and you will have your right of allocution.

Anything else, Mr. Tholen, before I get to the sentence -the Presentence Report?

MR. THOLEN: I filed objections that relate to arguments or information the Government intends to rely on in its argument so I can address it now or we could address it at that point. It doesn't relate to the Presentence Report.

THE COURT: Okay. We can discuss it before the

	Page 6
1	Government gives their recommendation but after the Government
2	talks about the Presentence Report. The Presentence Report
3	computes a Category One, Level 21. Are the people in agreement
4	with that?
5	MR. THOLEN: We are, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Government?
7	MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: I didn't hear you.
9	MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Okay. And that according to the
11	sentencing guideline manual presents a guideline range, an
12	advisory guideline range of 37 to 46 months, is that correct?
13	MR. THOLEN: That's correct, your Honor.
14	MS. CORKEN: That's correct, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Okay. And that range applies to both
16	cases, correct?
17	MR. THOLEN: Incorrect, Judge.
18	THE COURT: What does it apply to?
19	MR. THOLEN: It applies to the destructive device
20	Counts.
21	THE COURT: Yes. Okay.
22	MR. THOLEN: In the other case the guidelines are
23	lower. I believe they are six months to 12 months for the
24	straw purchase of the firearm, the case that was removed here.
25	THE COURT: I'm corrected. Thank you. That was out

Page 7 1 of Virginia. 2 MR. THOLEN: Yes. 3 Okay. Do you agree with that? THE COURT: 4 MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, yes, that is how the parties 5 calculated the quidelines with respect to the Virginia case. 6 THE COURT: Okay. And one of you refresh my 7 recollection as to what the Rule 11 range was? 8 MR. THOLEN: The Rule 11 range, your Honor, for the 9 destructive device case was a guideline range of 37 to 46 10 months. However, there was a provision that the Government 11 reserved the right to argue for an upward departure or variance 12 up to 60 months. Also under the agreement, defense could not 13 argue for a sentence below 37 months. With respect to the straw purchase, the firearm case, the 14 15 quidelines were 6 to 12 months and the Government agreed to not 16 object or contest to a concurrent sentence in that case to 17 whatever the Court would impose in the destructive device case. 18 Is that your recollection, counsel? THE COURT: 19 MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. 20 Okay. So now we are all on the same THE COURT: 2.1 page. Now would be appropriate to talk about your objections, 22 Mr. Tholen. 23 MR. THOLEN: Yes, your Honor. The objections are not 24 to any of the calculations in the Presentence Report. 25 are -- they relate to solely to what I believe are fuller

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 8

discussions of the recordings between Mr. Gregerson and the undercover FBI employee. And I guess I want to make it clear. I think the context and completeness is important and so my objection — or it may have been formed as a correction when I filed these with the Probation Department originally — was that I was not objecting to the statement that Probation had in the various paragraphs of the Presentence Report, but that I thought that the additional information I was adding should be added to that to have a complete picture. Probation responded not that I was incorrect, but that they felt that the report is written effectively, complied with the information that the Government had provided it and so it was not inclined to add my information, if you will, or the defendant's objection information to the various paragraphs.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, the Government also has objections or are these responses to the defendant's objections?

MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, with response to the defendant's corrections or objections, the defendant has submitted a Presentence Report Addendum to the Court. I believe the defense submitted that under seal. And, in effect, it just repeats what the Probation Department has already included in their addendum to the Presentence Report.

THE COURT: So you have no objection to it being added as an Addendum?

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 9

MS. CORKEN: I think it's redundant. If we want to be redundant, that's fine. It's already there. And would you like me to address our own objections, your Honor?

THE COURT: Well, does that satisfy you, Mr. Tholen, and your client?

MR. THOLEN: Your Honor, if I had my way I think that the paragraphs would be modified to include both parts of the information. I do wholeheartedly agree that this information is part of the Addendum. And just for the Court's edification, it was filed under seal because, of course, the Addendum to the Presentence Report is not a public document which is not on the docket. And so for me to advance this position before your Honor it had to be filed under seal because this information the Government had as part of sensitive discovery. But I do agree it is word for word the same information that is in the Addendum to the Presentence Report right now.

THE COURT: Okay. Now will you answer my question?

MR. THOLEN: Which was, am I satisfied with that?

THE COURT: Yes. Not if you are satisfied -- well, yes if you are satisfied in terms of your position being known and if it was completely redundant did you want it there or not? Your choice.

MR. THOLEN: I certainly want it to stay in the Addendum. The Court certainly has the ability to require rewriting of the report or make a finding that the Addendum is

Page 10

appropriate. And I don't want to put words in the Court's mouth, but if the Court is suggesting that because it's in the Addendum it's already in the record, I certainly understand that ruling.

THE COURT: Well, you got it. That is the ruling.

Now, the Government has some corrections?

MR. THOLEN: I understand that, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

THE COURT:

objections that are outstanding.

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. THOLEN: And I have no other objections to the Presentence Report. I don't know if the Government does or not.

MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. With respect to the Government's suggested corrections, we are not pressing on those that the Probation Department decided not to adopt. We did have some objections. There were a few that we did withdraw, one, in particular, after the Probation Department submitted its latest Addendum making it clear that the defendant's false statement with respect to the straw purchase was made before he entered his guilty plea. So we have two

THE COURT: Tell me the numbers, please.

MS. CORKEN: Sure. It's Government's objection number three which is to page 23 of the report. Paragraph --

THE COURT: Hang on, please.

MS. CORKEN: Sure. Paragraph 109, your Honor.

Gregerson a/k/a Abdurrahman Bin Mikaayl

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 11

THE COURT: Let's do objection number three.

MS. CORKEN: Okay. So, your Honor, the report provides that the sentence within the guideline range would protect the public from further crimes of the defendant. And it's certainly the case at least with respect to the grenade matter that the Government's view is that a sentencing quideline -- a sentence within the quidelines would not protect the public. In all honesty, I am a little bit -- I have a question with respect to how this is phrased in the Presentence Report because the Presentence Report covers two cases. the sentence is a sentence within the sentence guideline range that would protect the public. If the Probation Department means that a sentence within the guideline range for each of the cases in the aggregate or consecutively would protect the public then that is something that the Government would agree with. But with respect to -- if they are just talking about --

THE COURT: Isn't part of your Rule 11 Agreement to agree they be concurrent?

MS. CORKEN: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. CORKEN: I do. I don't believe that what I am saying is contrary to what we have agreed to. I think the question is, does the Government object to a sentence that indicates that a sentence within the guideline range, if Probation Department is just talking about the grenade case,

Page 12

that that would protect public, that that is not, obviously, our position. It's just not clear from the report whether since the report does address two cases --

THE COURT: What is the defense response?

MR. THOLEN: The defense response is this sounds like the Government's argument for an upward variance which -- I understand the Government doesn't like the way the Presentence Report came out and they are still entitled to make their objections and ask this Court to impose a sentence within or above the guideline range. But this doesn't --

THE COURT: To what extent?

MR. THOLEN: Pardon, Judge?

THE COURT: The Rule Eleven, as I understand it, puts a limit as to what they can ask for an upward variance. And that is how many months?

MR. THOLEN: 14 months up to 60 months.

THE COURT: Go on.

MR. THOLEN: One, I disagree with the Government's reading on that paragraph on page 22, at least the paragraph after it, 110, the Probation Department identifies two separate ranges for both cases. And then the Probation Department indicates that is a sentence within the guideline range would be appropriate to effectively achieve the goals of sentence. We accept that statement by the Probation Department. I understand the Government does not accept that statement. But

Page 13

that is not a factual issue. I think that is a legal ruling for the Court to make.

2.1

THE COURT: All right. The Government's objection is noted and I'm not going to change anything. What is your next objection, please?

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, we had one final objection and that was to paragraph -- page 23, paragraph 112 which provides -- which is discussing the factor under 3553(a)(6) of a sentence that needs to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct. And then the Presentence Report notes that throughout this court, sentences for defendants with similar records that were found guilty of similar conduct have generally fallen --

THE COURT: Please slow down and use the microphone in front of you.

MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. I apologize. Your Honor, the Presentence Report indicates that defendants who have been sentenced within this court who are comparable to this defendant have been sentenced within the same sentencing guideline range. And, first of all, we would — our objection is that in considering this factor as a legal matter, the Court is to consider not only comparable cases of defendant's sentence within this court but also those who have been sentenced nationwide.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 14

THE COURT: I understand. Mr. Tholen, your response?

MR. THOLEN: My response is the same. To me we accept the statement by the Probation Department in the report at that paragraph and I think the Government is again advancing its argument for an upward departure. I don't see why the report would need to be changed.

THE COURT: Well, I have had the same question the Government has raised in many cases. It's very rarely raised but it's been the practice of the Eastern District of Michigan to talk in terms of disparity if there are co-defendants. take a broader view and I do consider others similarly situated, even nationwide. But, and that is on the record now. And note that the guidelines are advisory so that statement is not necessarily how I'm going to come out on disparity. But I should note here that in the Rule 11, the Government has taken a position, first of all, what charge to bring and so on which is limited to a ten year felony. But more relevant is that the Rule 11 stipulates that you are not going to ask for more than five years. And what I hear is that you are wanting perhaps -and maybe I am anticipating something you are not going to do -- that you are, by changing this language, would allow you to ask for more than five years.

MS. CORKEN: No, your Honor. I have no intention of asking for more than five years.

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I don't understand what

Page 15 1 you just said. You have no objection --2 MS. CORKEN: I'm sorry. I have no intention of 3 asking for more than 60 months. 4 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. And then this 5 language will stay in the report because that's what we do in 6 the Eastern District of Michigan. But I also do what you are 7 asking me to do and that is consider a broader pool. Okay. 8 Anything else to resolve in the Presentence Report before 9 we go into recommendations? 10 MR. THOLEN: Nothing for the defense, Judge. 11 MS. CORKEN: Nothing from the Government, your Honor. 12 The Government goes first in terms of THE COURT: 13 what is your bottom line? MR. THOLEN: Your Honor, I indicated and I appreciate 14 15 that I indicated I had some objections to exhibits they may 16 refer to. Would this be an appropriate time to deal with that? 17 THE COURT: Sure. MR. THOLEN: Can we do it at side bar, Judge? 18 19 THE COURT: No. Is your objection to -- contained in 20 your letter of today? Yes, Judge. 21 MR. THOLEN: 22 THE COURT: Okay. Hang on. 23 MR. THOLEN: Three issues. That's all I am objecting 24 to. 25 **THE COURT:** Pardon?

Page 16 1 MR. THOLEN: It's those three items. That is what I 2 am objecting to, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I picked up the packet of letters 4 in support of your client. 5 MR. THOLEN: I'm not objecting to those, Judge. 6 THE COURT: I understand that. But now I have to 7 find -- I have it here, too. I'm sorry. All right. First of 8 all, is the Government planning on using any of these three? 9 MS. CORKEN: No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Without mentioning what they are? MS. CORKEN: We submitted them under seal, your 11 Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Does that answer your objection? 14 MR. THOLEN: It does. Just so I'm clear, the 15 Government is not going to argue any of those three things 16 today? 17 MS. CORKEN: No. 18 THE COURT: You want to give her a chance to change 19 her mind? 20 I asked twice, Judge, just to be safe. MR. THOLEN: 21 Then it's resolved, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Now, the Government's 23 bottom line and why? 24 MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, the Government is requesting 25 a sentence of 60 months.

Page 17

THE COURT: Why don't you adjust at least the microphone so you're using it.

MS. CORKEN: Sure.

THE COURT: And the whole podium goes up if you need it higher.

MS. CORKEN: I think I'm okay.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, a 60 month sentence in the Government's view is a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to protect public, to reflect the seriousness of the offense and deter others from similar conduct.

Your Honor, this is a defendant who is an ISIS supporter, who purchased high explosive grenades, who had an arsenal of other weapons, who, like ISIS, believes that there is a war between ISIS and those are not ISIS, who believes he's a soldier in that war and who, as ISIS directs, equipped himself with weapons in preparation for violent actions and who made statements about harming others with weapons. Those are aggravating factors that are not taken into account in the calculation of the sentencing guideline range that is applicable here.

The sentence guidelines only look to the defendant's 's conduct in possessing the grenades. They don't look to these factors that magnify his dangerousness and the need to protect

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 18

the public. That range doesn't take into account the seriousness of the offense when possession of grenades are coupled with his ISIS support. So it's not just a case about someone who has purchased high explosive grenade. That's dangerous enough. Grenades are military weapons. There is no other purpose for them but to injury and cause death. That is their function.

But high explosive grenades are even more dangerous in the hands of an ISIS supporter who approves the terrorist attacks and makes statements about harming others.

Your Honor, the defendant denies that he's an ISIS supporter in the face of overwhelming evidence. He denied it to the Probation Department that he even read or disseminated Dabiq. In his Sentencing Memo he admits that he read Dabiq but he claims it was purely for an academic interest. And that is completely contradicted by the evidence.

The defendant certainly downloaded every issue of Dabiq that was published up to the time his arrest. But he also disseminated that publication to other ISIS supporters via e-mail. He also e-mailed links about ISIS terrorist attacks and with a clear indication of his approval of those attacks. He had in the subject line, Allahu Akbar, God is Great. He had a smiley face in the subject line of an e-mail where he was providing a link to an article about the ISIS terrorist attack on the Sinai Peninsula where police officers were killed. On

2.1

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 19

Facebook, in emails, to the UC, he praised terrorists' attacks committed by ISIS and those inspired by ISIS, the Paris attacks, the Nice attack, the Orlando attack. He referred to terrorists who commit attacks in the name of ISIS as brothers. He defended ISIS violence. He sent an e-mail to others defending the ISIS's murder of the Jordanian Air Force Pilot. They had been criticized for it. And he sent an e-mail providing a theological justification for that murder.

He also, as he stated to the UCE, is an avowed follower of Anwar Al Awlaki. He has 96 CDs of Anwar Al Awalki's lectures. And Anwar Al Awlaki, as the Court may know, was a big recruiter providing inspiration to many individuals who have committed terrorist attacks that have resulted in mass casualties. The defendant used the collective, we, when referring to ISIS and his Facebook profile, which is something people use to project their identity, had a photograph of ISIS soldiers.

So this is not just some academic interest on the part of the defendant. His alignment with this terrorist group is clear. It's also clear he believes there is an ongoing war between ISIS and those who are not ISIS adherents. I'm not going to repeat everything that was in the Government's Sentencing Memo but it's clear he approves of terrorist attacks committed by ISIS and he thinks those are legitimate because the world is at war. And he views himself as a soldier in that war as is clear from his reference to himself as the prisoner

Page 20

of war.

2.1

Your Honor, ISIS call on their followers to stockpile weapons, to equip themselves with weapons. The defendant sent an e-mail with a translation of the second in command's speech calling on ISIS soldiers to do just that, to prepare themselves and to mobilize for Jihad. And that is what the defendant did.

Particularly, your Honor, in 2009 he amassed an arsenal of weapons and ammunition, tactical gear, tactical training materials. He owned guns before that, yes, and he appeared to have a prepper or survivalist type of interest. But that certainly was not his exclusive interest, and as of 2015 it's also clear he was equipping himself with weapons in preparation for violent action.

Something clearly changed in 2015. That is clear from his actions. That's clear from his statements. That is clear his purchasing history. There was an escalation in the number and the changing nature of the weapons that he purchased.

Your Honor, the Sentencing Memo already discussed the defendant's -- the change in the defendant's purchase of knives, that he purchased fifteen in 2015. He also purchased two training knives. The defendant claims that these were not knives that were marked for tactical use, that basically he was just purchasing collectors knives. But it's clear from the names of the knives themselves that they are tactical knives, that they are combat knives. He purchased, for instance, the

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 21

the Ontario Knife Marine Combat Knife. Most of the names of the knives do have the word combat or tactical on them. And almost every one that the defendant purchased was specifically marketed as a tactical knife and how they were advertised and that is what we have included as Exhibit K.

So these are not collectors knives. And you certainly don't get training knives that are the rubber counterparts of fixed blade knives if your interest is simply in collecting.

Your Honor, the amount of money that the defendant spent on knives during this time period as a percentage of his income undermines any claim that this is just a hobby or that he's some collector of knives. There is a true seriousness of purchase that is reflected in his purchasing actions during this time period. I had handed to Mike Government's Exhibit Number One. I was wondering the Court had that.

THE COURT: The purchasing from June 2015, yes.

MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, I have, of course, provided it to the defense.

MR. THOLEN: We have it, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, that Government's Exhibit shows the knives that were purchased from June 14, 2015 to July 12, 2015 by the defendant. That is a 28 day period. He purchased five tactical knives during that period. And his payroll during that period was, as indicated on the exhibits,

Page 22

\$1,170.

2.1

THE COURT: You used the word payroll. I think you mean income.

MS. CORKEN: I do, your Honor. Income. Excuse me. His income during that time period was as I just indicated and you also see what his bank balance was. So when you look at this exhibit, you see that first he spent more than half of his income on these five knives at a time when his bank balance was modest and those spending — these spending decisions, excuse me, undermine any claim that this — these purchase of tactical knives was some kind of hobby or of collector's interest.

There are also additional purchases showing the nature of his purchases during this time period were tactical in nature. He purchased tactical belts, body armor with military grade plates, balaclava ski mask, commerical grade road spikes. He also amassed an enormous amount of weapons and weapon related material. And just focusing on, for instance, AK47 related materials, and just during this time period, in March of 2015 the defendant purchased 700 rounds of K47 ammunition. A month later he bought an underground ammunition storage container. That same month, in May of 2015 he bought a Kushnakov (ph) training video. Same month he bought Dummy AK47 training rounds. And in the search of the residence, law enforcement recovered almost 3,000 rounds of AK47 ammunition. A total of almost 8,000 rounds of ammunition were recovered from his

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 23

residence. This -- the information about his purchases relating to AK47 materials all during the time period where the defendant was evidencing support for ISIS and their terrorist attacks.

Your Honor, the Sentencing Memo has also laid out the defendant's increase or acceleration of firearms purchases within a two week period in 2016 where he bought three firearms, two of which were long barreled. And the memo also sets out what is a clear indication of the defendant's priorities. He received a check for 1,200-dollars as charity and spent the bulk of that on guns, not on necessities for his family.

The defendant in his Sentencing Memo makes some reference to -- makes a claim that the firearms were all purchased legally. That is not the case at all. The defendant used a third party to circumvent gun laws.

MR. THOLEN: Judge, that's not the claim, just to correct it. I specifically said the straw purchase firearm was the exception. The Government is misstating my filed document with the Court.

THE COURT: You may continue.

MS. CORKEN: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor --

THE COURT: Your objection is noted.

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, Judge.

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, my point was simply that the

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 24

defendant violated the law on three occasions, federal law on three occasions in making straw purchases of a Kel-Tec sub 2000 assault rifle, a Beretta. The Beretta he used to purchase the grenades and a Glock. And, in addition to violating federal law, he did not register the Beretta or the Glock when he had them. When he moved to Michigan he didn't register either of those guns with Michigan.

He also had components in a grenade launcher, your Honor, to make homemade illegal grenades. In two conversations he relayed in detail about how to make illegal fragmentation grenades from those components. And he was — he explained the benefits of having all the parts necessary to modify 37 rounds but not assembling them to prevent being caught.

Your Honor, in addition to the components and everything else he had, he obviously engaged in the purchase of high explosive grenades which, of course, can inflict mass casualties and are inherently dangerous. That was just a start. He planned on purchasing a claymore mine which has a killing rate of 1,000 yards. And he also told the UCE he wanted flash bang or stun grenades and he wanted the connection for military weapons to be kept open in the future. It's clear he wasn't buying grenades or that he had any interest in the other weapons for a hobby.

Your Honor, most importantly, there is a connection between the weapons he acquired and using the weapons in a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 25

violent act. He told UC how he would commit an act on a building using 37-millimeter grenades. Quote, if I locked into a building, I'm talking about interior use, by the time you get through then you walk over there. When you get inside everybody is all disoriented. I really think that would be devastating. He's talk about committing an attack on people within a building and using 37 millimeter grenades which he had or smoke grenades which he bought to make sure people inside the building were disoriented by the time he got inside. had two conversations with the UC where he's detailing how to make these homemade fragmentation grenades. What does he say about that? He specifies that illegal -- these illegal homemade rounds could be used indoors to clear places to hit a gathering. He's talking about using illegal homemade grenades of the type he described making to the UC indoors hitting a gathering of people. He expressed an interest in obtaining particular type of 40 millimeter grenade launcher that would be mounted on a rifle that was made for combat. He talked about purchasing smoke grenades to cause chaos within your enemies ranks, that is, using enemies against people. And he talked about using homemade -- or excuse me -- high explosive grenades against law enforcement.

Your Honor, there is also a connection between the weapons and using those weapons against the enemies of ISIS. The defendant states about high explosive grenades. He was

2.1

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 26

expressing his belief that he was equipping himself with grenades to be better prepared against those he believes to be at war with and in preparation for confrontation with infidels. He also expressed his desire to supplement his self-described armory with more battle rifles and arm like-minded ISIS brothers in Maryland.

Your Honor, with respect to the claymore mine, he called it a magical piece of equipment and that it achieves total destruction. That was what was appealing to the defendant about the claymore mine — its destructive capabilities. That is what he focused on. He indicated that he had the patience to wait for it in terms of purchasing it and that all that a believer has to have in the Jihad in the cause of Allah is patience. Patient is what distinguishes the believer from the infidel. We will outlast them because we can keep fighting and fighting but eventually they will get tired. We will not. I think it's clear from his statements he wanted to purchase the claymore mine as a weapon in Jihad to take violent action in this perceived war against the infidels.

The defendant also made statements of intent to harm

Muslim clerics who do not subscribe to ISIS indicating when

they were deserving of death. he talked about using the knives

he was carrying to execute them or a firearm to shoot them

using this Mozambique drill technique. He talked about using

high explosive grenades against laws enforcement. ISIS has

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 27

called on that repeatedly in terms of attacks against law enforcement. He talked about how he and the UC could attack and kill a park ranger. And he certainly made it clear that he thought all homosexuals were deserving of death. He praised the ISIS attacker in Florida. He called him a brother. He was deserving of paradise.

Your Honor, his accumulation of weapons, his purchase of the high explosive grenades were all connected with the ISIS extremism and its believe in this war between ISIS and others and his own preparations to commit a violent act.

What is most chilling and what underscores of the defendant's dangerousness I think is his critique of ISIS terrorist attacks, how attackers could have increased civilian and law enforcement fatalities. That is beyond creepy. It is chilling. He talked about the Orlando attack and how the attacker could have increased deaths in that case. He emphasized the importance of planning. He praised the attacker in the Nice attack for using a truck with bulletproof glass. He was critical of the Garland, Texas attack because the attackers were killed there before they could kill. This is not someone who has an academic interest. This is not someone who is a prepper. This is not someone who has an academic interest in ISIS.

A 60 month sentence is necessary to protect the public. The law enforcement has an enormous challenge in preventing

Page 28

individuals have been radicalized and subscribe to the ISIS ideology. They can become operational. The defendant argues that he didn't harm anyone. It is true, obviously, that the Government arrested the defendant before any specific plot or before a terrorist attack was committed. But it's also clear he's an ISIS supporter who illegally obtained lethal fragmentation grenades and he wanted more.

If you sentence the defendant to the low end the range, 37 months, he is out in eighteen months. And it's the government's view that he cannot be released --

THE COURT: How is he out in 18 months?

MS. CORKEN: Calculating good time, your Honor, the time that he already served and the time in a halfway house.

THE COURT: Well, he's certainly served that time in custody awaiting trial or awaiting the plea and the sentence. That doesn't mean he's only serving 18 months. He's serving eighteen months plus what he has already served.

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: And I understand the good time does reduce the 37 months somewhat.

MS. CORKEN: Yes, your Honor. My point I guess would be that the defendant is dangerous and that he can't be released in the near future without posing a risk to the public.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand your point.

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 29

MS. CORKEN: Okay. Your Honor, I think it is significant that the defendant does not even admit that he's an ISIS supporter. When he walks out of prison, will he be anything other than a committed ISIS adherent? He considers himself a POW. Like any professional soldier he is unlikely to relinquish that view of himself as a soldier while he's in prison. He hasn't changed since his arrest. He hasn't concluded that he's on the wrong path. If he hasn't concluded he's on the wrong path, he's not likely to change his behavior. He's not on the road to doing something different once he's released from prison.

Your Honor, we already discussed in our Sentencing

Memorandum the history and characteristics of the defendant and
how in the government's view they do not argue for anything
less than a 60 month sentence, particularly given the
defendant's — the nature of the defendant's associates and his
friends.

Your Honor, the defense does argue that the defendant has no criminal record. But I would suggest that there is greater proclivity to break the law than his lack of record reflects. And I would point to the number of times that he engaged in straw purchases, his failure to register handguns and but for his arrest, he would have continued to buy illegal military weapons.

Your Honor, with respect to the factor of providing or

2.1

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 30

fashioning a sentence to afford adequate deterrence, the Government submits the 60 months is necessary to achieve that purpose as well. Deterrence is critical because of the serious nature of the threat posed by ISIS supporters who abide by ISIS' directive to prepare or begin to prepare for Jihad. It's important to sent the public a message that even the first steps to prepare to exhibit a violent act carries serious consequences.

And then, lastly, your Honor, we have cited in our Sentencing Memorandum a number of cases where other courts have recognized that the combination of a defendant being an ISIS supporter and indicating an intent to do harm is — justifies a significant upward variance. The Government in this case is asking for fourteen months.

Now, the defendant argues, well, these other cases aren't comparable because the defendants there made specific threats of violence against a specific target. That is not the case with respect to the Shaw case that we cited. There was no specific plan. There was no specific targets. The other defendants also were not on the eve of committing any attack. This defendant is no less dangerous than they are. Just because he did not commit a specific act of terrorism doesn't mean he's not dangerous. All of the other defendants like this defendant were charged with firearms or other offenses. They were not charged with committing a terrorist act. They weren't

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 31

charged with committing an attempted terrorist act or conspiracy. What the courts recognized was that ISIS support plus evidence of intent to do harm causes — is a danger to the public and it requires a very substantial sentence.

Here we have evidence of the defendant's intent to do harm. He has stated it in different -- with respect to different attacks, different -- on different occasions, in different -- with Facebook, e-mails and with the UCE.

Your Honor, in conclusion, we would ask for a 60 month sentence because of all these factors, primarily because he's an ISIS supporter who bought high explosive grenades, amassed an enormous amount of guns and ammunition as ISIS directs and made statements reflecting a desire to commit violence acts. We would also ask that you impose a supervised release condition pursuant to Rule 11 (c)(1)(c) that are set out in paragraph 3(b) of the Rule Eleven. And with respect to forfeiture, your Honor, there is an agreement that certain items will be administratively forfeited and therefore no forfeiture orders are needed and no forfeiture language needs to be included in the judgment. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, Judge. Your Honor, my request on behalf of Mr. Gregerson with respect to the straw purchase firearm case would be a sentence at the bottom of the guidelines of six months imprisonment and have that sentence

Page 32

run concurrent to the other case. With respect to the destructive device case, I'm asking the Court to impose a sentence of 37 months imprisonment and I will explain the reasons why.

The Government had a lot to say today and has had a lot to say in the pleadings that it filed before today. From my assessment, the Government has overstated its case from the first court proceedings I represented Mr. Gregerson in which were during his detention hearings. I made the claim then and it's surprising that when I line up the pleadings that the Government filed at that time and the allegations they had, and, of course, they had the benefit because they had investigated Mr. Gregerson for 16 months. This was all before they filed a complaint against him. So they had that information. There is very much of an overlap and very little new information that they are presenting now at the time of sentencing.

I said it before and I will say it again, the Government is overstating its case. And the Government from my perspective had a preconceived theory of this case and it involved all this talk about ISIS and whether or not Mr. Gregerson is aligned with ISIS and then the Government, and I mean the Prosecutor in this case, has cherry picked facts, whether they are taken out of context, whether they are misleading to the Court, and plucked them in to support its

Page 33

theory. And it's not -- it's going about this all backwards.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

In this case the first thing I will argue against will be the Government's request for an upward departure of 14 months. I would object to any upward departure in this case. And I know the Court has the authority -- first, the Government has the authority to argue for it under the Rule Eleven. with that, and the Court certainly has a discretion if it believes there is aggravating factors to go above the guideline range. I wholly agree with that. In this case, quite simply, the Government has neither the facts nor the law on its side. The Government cited four or five specific cases that it attempted to bolster its position to support or make an argument to your Honor that a 60 month sentence was warranted. However, they didn't want to talk about any of the facts of that case, Judge. I did, Judge. Each of those cases had something very specific and something very scary, a specific threat against an individual or a specific location that is wholly absent in this case. And I disagree with the government's assessment that in the Shaw case there wasn't a plan because actually in the Shaw case, if you read the full transcript, the Court points to the buildings, local buildings from Houston were found on Mr. Shaw's computer and they had concerns that he was targeting those buildings. They were aerial type photographs. So I suggest in addition to all of the other things that Mr. Shaw was doing, there was evidence of

Page 34

a plot there. It is lacking in this case.

2.1

I represented Mr. Gregerson for thirteen months now and in that time someone close to Mr. Gregerson shared with me that Sebastian talks a lot of crap. And you know what, Judge? I agree with that statement. I also think the undercover FBI employee in this case talked a lot of crap in the discussions he had with Mr. Gregerson when they were building their case or trying to do their investigation and bring this case to court.

The Government seems to be taking -- I mean this is the United States. We have a First Amendment right. Individuals are allowed to read controversial texts or magazine articles if they want to. The Government knows that Sebastian Gregerson was taking a Homeland Security class at Henry Ford Community College. And they know this, one, because they had an undercover employee following him around at those classes, but, two, they went and interviewed his instructor at least three times and they asked for his class work and asked how was he doing in the course and what does he act like in class?

So for the Government to suggest why would Mr. Gregerson read any articles about the Middle East or about anything going on with terrorist attacks belies their own investigation. He was in a class on Homeland Security. I mean, he was in that class because he did have an interest in that. But the government has verified through its own investigation. But once again, that doesn't fit with their fact pattern, that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 35

doesn't fit with their conclusion so they say Mr. Gregerson allies himself with ISIS. That is not true. Mr. Gregerson and every one in the United States is entitled to unpopular speech, is entitled to politically incorrect speech, and ultimately that is what the Government has. It you did a count on the number of times they put ISIS in their 47 page Sentencing Memorandum it would probably be at least hundreds of times. What they didn't have was facts. You might have noticed they weren't citing cases. They weren't citing reports. weren't citing interviews most of the time. And that's very dangerous in this case, Judge. In fact, one of the things the Government wanted to introduce was certain articles that Mr. Gregerson sent to other individuals. And I explained in my Sentencing Memorandum that as part of his interest Mr. Gregerson did access through the Long War Journal which is the United States political blog, if you will, articles about the Middle East and terrorist activities there. That is where he was getting them from. He wasn't on some ISIS website or something as the government tries to portray. It's just not true.

So, your Honor, with respect to whether or not the Government has established the facts or the law for an upward variance I don't think they have, Judge. I know that the Judge -- your Honor is going to be concerned with -- I'm asking the Court to stay within the sentencing range, so what would be the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 36

appropriate sentence within the range? The Government, again, the things they focused on as far as danger, there are misstatements. The Government stood here and said today just this afternoon that Mr. Gregerson had 37-millimeter grenades. Patently untrue. What he did have was 37-millimeter Untrue. flares. What the Government knows through its own investigation through the FBI explosives agent that analyzed the flares, they were completely untampered with. So they never became grenades. The Government stands here and tells your Honor Gregerson had 37-millimeter grenades at his house. No, he did not. False statement. The Government also has continued to talk about in this case a Claymore mine. You know what? We never saw a Claymore mine. Every report has had the Government's Exhibit of, quote, a Claymore mine that they got out of some book or off Google or something like that. But you know what? There was never a Claymore mine that was negotiated for, that was bought and sold, that was found in Mr. Gregerson's house. It didn't happen. But you wouldn't know that and the Government never backs down from that.

The Government has said that Mr. Gregerson has expressed, if you will, my words, dangerous thoughts. The most -- the closest thing I can find to that in the four months of recordings between Mr. Gregerson and the undercover FBI employee -- and mind you, these recordings lasted from anywhere from a half hour to seven or eight hours. I mean, they were

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 37

all over the map. They spent a lot of time together. And Mr. Gregerson did make some comments that are close to what the Government paraphrased and they were along the lines of his prepper beliefs, which were that if all hell broke loose and he was under attack or his family was under attack, he would bring all the power he could against that force. Now that is something very different to me, your Honor. To me that is a defensive type statement or a defensive type posture. And the Government has continued to use those statements and insert law enforcement or insert citizens or say, just like ISIS preaches, but those things were not part of the statement and the Government knows it.

I have asked the Court to consider a sentence at the bottom of the range but I do so also because in the guideline calculations, the calculations that reach the 37 to 46 months, there is an enhancement, a specific offense enhancement due to the number of firearms. And in this case explosives equal firearms for purposes of the guidelines. So what has gone into that calculation of 8 to 24 firearms are these 37-millimeter flares that were found at Mr. Gregerson's residence. There is They upped -- without those being included, it ten of them. would be a plus two level. The guideline range for the destructive device would be 30 to 37 months. They have been included pursuant to the Rule 11 Agreement. I am not shying away from that. But I point out to the Court that effectively

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 38

through the terms of the agreement it's been elevated to capture those 37-millimeter flares. And what I think is critical about the 37-millimeter flares, and the Court doesn't have to take my word for this, the FBI analyzed these and the flares — and the Government keeps saying buckshot. The buckshot was in shotgun shells. So the 37 millimeter flares were in tact and they were, in fact — the shipping box they came was from Specialty Arms. That is all in the FBI's explosives reports. The shotgun shells were in tact as well. These things were not tampered with and the Government's own experts looked at that.

What I think is critical, Judge, is the Government's theory has been, well, Mr. Gregerson could have manipulated the buckshot, could have manipulated the flares and created what would be an unregistered explosive device. I get it. It wasn't done in this case. And the plus four levels he gets in his guidelines which make his guideline range 37 to 46 months, it's the same now with pristine condition flares and shotgun shells or the devious situation that the Government keeps saying was going to happen if Mr. Gregerson had taken those things apart, resembled them and created 37-millimeter grenades which didn't happen. The guidelines would treat those the same. What I suggest to the Court is even if the Court gives a sentence which appears to be at the bottom of the range of 37 months, it's taking into consideration this enhancement that the

Page 39

guidelines factored into with respect to the 37 millimeter flares. I thinks it's relevant, judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, throughout this case the Government has -really has had tunnel vision about this from my perspective and not looked at any other possible explanation for things. And I have tried to pinpoint a few of them for your Honor. One is that Mr. Gregerson is and has been a prepper for at least the last ten years. And a prepper, a doomsday prepper, whatever you want to call it. It's not my cup of tea, Judge, but there are folks like Mr. Gregerson that are preparing for calamity, catastrophe, power grids going down and he is going to have food, water, and weapons to protect himself and his family from the ravaging people that come after his stuff. Okay? He is The Government hasn't looked at that. allowed to do that. Government knows when they did the search warrant at his residence after he was arrested that they pulled out of their in addition to all the exhibits it shows, your Honor, with the guns and the ammunition and the knives, all of which were legal with the exception of the firearm that was from Virginia in the straw purchase case. They also found a bunch of camping equipment. One of the pictures is a hatchet. There was tents. There was backpacks. There was water. There was food stores. They didn't seize that because, of course, there is nothing illegal about that, but it was all there. But the Government didn't want to talk about that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 40

Mr. Gregerson also is proudly a Muslim and he has been so, again, over the last ten years, perhaps more, actually more, and he converted shortly after high school and he lives his life in that way. And your Honor can see he has a long beard but his long beard is one of the things he does as part of the his religion, to identify himself to others as Muslim. He is that.

The fact that he has made unpopular statements about certain segments of society, that happens to be in line with his belief and his faith. It's politically incorrect. not the way I think. But he's entitled to think that. entitled to say it. He has not acted out on any of those Again, something else the Government ignores. that note, the Government submitted -- it's not referencing it but it submitted a portion of the recording between the undercover FBI employee and Mr. Gregerson talking about the Orlando attack which as the Court knows involved what was known to be a gay nightclub and there was a horrible tragedy there and a number of innocent victims were shot up. And the Government presents this for the Court's consideration, has highlighted, of course, only the portions that Mr. Gregerson talks about. But I am going to draw the Court's attention to statements that were made unprovoked by the FBI undercover agent which I find chilling and shocking. One was the undercover agent saying he would have smoked every last

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 41

hostage. And by smoked I assume he means killed them. That is coming from the undercover. Another is, they're going to be tripping on bodies. That is a nice image coming, again, from the undercover. And perhaps what to me seems to be some of the most gruesome is the statement in here that they would smell blood in the air. Now, these are all statements that were unsolicited, made by the undercover employee. And this is part of why I objected and I wanted the whole story put into the Presentence Report about these conversations. I think context is highly relevant. I find those statements shocking. those statements concerning. I am sure the Government is going to say, well, when you are undercover you do what you can. are trying catch the bad guys. But those statements are as vile or more vile than anything they have attributed to Mr. Gregerson.

Your Honor, the Court knows Mr. Gregerson is a first offender. The Government seems to brush that aside. I think it's highly relevant. The Court should know because he didn't have prior felonies, the majority of firearms and ammunition, the knives, the equipment that he had which is so troubling to Government, he all purchased legally, he purchased in his name with the exception of the straw purchase pistol. And, in fact they were able to follow these transactions through on-line vendors or Amazon, things like that. They also followed him to local gun stores like Dunham's or something and saw him filling

2.1

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 42

out paperwork in his name. So he bought these things the way you are supposed to.

Mr. Gregerson is a family -- he has a close family. They are here. His mother and father is here. His wife is here. His father-in-law is here. They have stood by him. This case, the time that he has been incarcerated, and we have full recognition that he's going to serve time still, some amount of time when he leaves court today. It has a destructive impact on him and his family as well. And, your Honor, I think that for all those reasons, a sentence of 37 months and concurrent sentence of 6 months will achieve the goals of sentencing. It's warranted. And I would ask the Court to not impose any upward variance or departure in this case.

THE COURT: Does your client wish to speak?

THE DEFENDANT: I just stand by the Plea Agreement I submitted and the remarks from my lawyer.

THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else have anything to say before I decide on the sentence?

MR. THOLEN: I don't, your Honor.

MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, I would just note that the defendant's guilty plea did include relevant conduct related to the components to assemble the grenades, that is 37-millimeter shells and buckshot. And that as part of the Rule 11 as well as the Plea Hearing, the defendant acknowledged his intent to assemble those components into destructive devices.

Page 43

THE COURT: Thank you. Would you bring your client to the lecturn, please?

MR. THOLEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I respect your decision not to say anything in addition to what has been said. It's my turn to talk and I have to go through the rules in terms of sentencing.

And the first rule is to consider at least as I interpret the higher courts and Congress, is to consider the guidelines. While they are advisory they are also important and everyone myself included agrees that Category One is reflecting your not having any prior felony convictions and Level 21 as calculated by the Presentence Report writer is accurate and it results in a guideline range the same as anticipated by the Rule 11. That guideline range is 36 to 46 months.

MR. THOLEN: 37, Judge.

THE COURT: 37 months. I'm sorry. I don't recall but I think I accepted the Rule 11 Agreement. If I did not, I accept it now. And that affectively allowed the Prosecutor to do exactly what they have done or she has done and that is ask for an upward departure to 60 months. And I am obviously considering that as well as the range that is recommended.

I also have to consider the congressional intent. And they have set forth a number of factors that I will discuss starting with the seriousness of the offense. Obviously, it's a serious offense because it's called a felony. And in our

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 44

system a felony is the top kind of crime except for treason or I guess treason or capital offenses. And it's a ten year felony which puts it in the middle to high end of the felony range so both those points lead me to the conclusion of what you have pled guilty to is a serious offense.

In terms of general deterrence, that refers to deterring other people who might be inclined to do what you have done in each of these cases. And, quite frankly, the most effective deterrence in this case has already been done and that is by the arrest and all the publicity that was engendered by every stage of your going through the system so that people thinking of procuring an explosive device or people thinking of getting a weapon, using a straw person, will know that another person, that is you, have been charged with two felonies, both of them ten year felonies, and are facing a significant amount of prison time. And I should indicate that -- well, I will get to that in a minute.

I should indicate that in terms of special deterrence, that is, will you be deterred from doing this in the future, I don't think anything I can do will change what is described as a collector's hobby by the defense and is described as collecting weapons for future use. If it is, in fact, a hobby, you are entitled to do that. If, in fact, it is for actual use, obviously you are not entitled to do that. I don't know. I'm not a mind reader. I think the Government when they

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 45

decided what to charge you with recognizes that this is not a life offense which tells me that they use their discretion and their experience of their agents to determine what would be the appropriate charge, and, in addition, what the appropriate plea agreement would be. And that gives me some guidance as does your attorney's presentation on your behalf. And if, in fact, your language, and the court record has been quoted as, one, accurate, and, two, meaningful, the only way to deter you would be to put you in prison for the rest your life. And that is not what anyone has decided is appropriate in this case, neither side, nor have I.

In terms dangerousness, I think what I just said applies to dangerousness. I don't know how dangerous you are but I know that your conduct to this date has not created an action event that could be called dangerous. The coming together of your religious slash political beliefs, you are entitled to in the coming together of your procurement of most of the weapons that you have collected are legal. And it is very easy to conflate the two but under our system of law that is not the way it's done. And I respect your rights and I respect the Government's right to exercise their discretion. And part of my respect for your rights is after listening to your attorney reminding me of what is in the Constitution.

In terms of disparity which was raised, I already indicated that I do look at a much broader pool than our local

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 46

interpretation of co-defendants. However, the range is so scattered to matter what sentence I impose would be disparate, that is, unequal to some other sentences in some other jurisdictions for a similar charge. In other words, the range of people involved, what they have done, what they have said and so on is vast. And while I acknowledge it's important not to have diametrically opposed sentencing, I don't think that is a factor that helps me a whole lot.

Care and treatment is something that your attorney has raised. It's been raised somewhat in the Presentence Report when your attorney talks about you're talking, I think the quote was, crap, that may reflect a lot of different things I'm not qualified to determine. But included would be a compulsive obsessive behavior that is perfectly legal and part of it could be interpreted as a much more dangerous thing. And as a result I am recommending in terms of care and treatment that you be evaluated at the Bureau of Prisons for mental status so that if you do need some help that would be provided. If you don't, that is the end of it.

Your prior record is obviously very important. While it's unusual for me to have two felony cases at the same time, I think we all know that the straw man case is much less serious than the other case, possession of destructive devices.

In terms your work record, I am not sure how that comes into play and I don't think after all that I have said it's an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 47

important factor. And in terms your attitude, you have accepted responsibility which is good. And the rest that I already said about my ability to, based on what you said and done, predict where you are in terms of attitude, I don't think I have to say any more.

Your family responsibilities. It's wonderful that you have a five year old and as a matter of common sense, the collection that you claim you are doing has to be impacting your ability to support your wife and child and this is something you should consider over the next period of time so that when you get out you will put it in perspective and accept the choices you have to make. And there are programs in prison which we will talk about you about, life skills and how to survive, and one of them is how to spend and budget your money so that your family should come first. And I am recognizing you are not in great financial shape. And I am recognizing you are 30 years old which plays into and emphasizes the fact you don't have any prior contacts with the law. That helps you. Also at the age of 30, the studies show that a certain wisdom and maturity is beginning to blossom. And I would note that from all I read about you, you are obviously a smart, capable person who should be able to set priorities and survive without getting into trouble again, without succumbing to whatever your beliefs are in terms of taking action and whatever your survival instincts are have to include a recognition of the

Page 48

importance of your five year old and your wife. The fact that you have your parents supporting you and your family supporting you obviously indicates that you have not been completely absent in doing family responsibilities. But what I have just said indicates that you could do better. You have to go to prison for what you have done. And I'm ready to impose sentence unless anybody has anything they want to say to correct anything I have said. Government?

MS. CORKEN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Defense?

MR. THOLEN: Just so the Court knows, he has twin sons so has two sons. They are both five, Judge.

THE COURT: It makes it even more important how you allocate your resources for the benefit of your family. And thank you for correcting that. Anything you want to say on your own behalf at this time?

THE DEFENDANT: No, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. This is going to take a few minutes because there are two Counts involved. And while I'm reading from a script the decision as to what your sentence will be and is going to be is made after I listened to all sides in the case.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the Court, considering the sentencing guidelines which I already discussed and the factors contained in the Congressional Statute 18 USC

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 49

Section 3553 paren small A which I also already discussed, hereby commits the defendant to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons for a term of 45 months on Count One of docket 16-20552, and be placed on supervised release for a term of 36 months on that docket and impose an assessment of \$100 which is due now.

As to docket number 202 -- excuse me -- 17-20235 which has been referred to as the straw man Count, it is the sentence of the Court of nine months which shall be run concurrently as per the Rule 11 Agreement, and supervised release. There will also be 36 months which will run concurrently and a special assessment of a hundred dollars will be due immediately for a total of \$200. I am not imposing a fine or the costs of incarceration or the costs of supervision due to your financial condition. The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on my determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse. I should indicate, first of all, I should ask counsel does he have a choice as to where he wants to serve his time?

MR. THOLEN: We would ask the Court to recommend Milan. It's physically the closest facility to where his family resides.

THE COURT: All right. I do recommend Milan. I should explain that is simply a recommendation. The Bureau of Prisons will decide and I will ask the Bureau of Prisons to

Page 50

inform me of what their decision is.

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Also recommend that you be evaluated for mental health needs and if it's determined that's necessary, that you be provided with mental health treatment. But, again, that is a recommendation and I'm not in charge of the Bureau of Prisons.

While on supervision you shall abide by the standard conditions as adopted by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan and shall comply with the following special conditions.

One, you are prohibited from using a computer during the term of supervised release with the exception of and solely for legal research, outside employment, or for specific class assignments if you are in school at an accredited educational institution or you may use it to send or receive typed e-mail messages without attached electronic files and images embedded in the body of the message, and for other use as approved by the probation officer. You shall access the internet only through one internet capable device. All other internet capable devices such as cellular phones and gaming consoles shall not have the internet connected. You are prohibited from accessing any on-line computer service at any location including but not limited to public libraries, internet cafes, and places of employment or education without the permission of

Sentencing Hearing Wednesday, August 30, 2017

Page 51

the probation officer. And you shall the provide probation officer, we call them probation officers. In the state they are called parole officers. You shall provide them with accurate information about all computer systems, hardware, software, and all passwords and internet service providers that you have potential access to and abide by all rules of the Probation Department Computer Monitoring Program. And this is — I guess this is the day of redundancies. This is redundant. You shall only access a computer approved by the probation officer. You shall consent to the probation officer conducting periodic announced examinations of all computer systems which may include computer monitoring software, period. It says at defendant's expense, but you don't have to pay for that.

For the purpose of accounting -- and this is four -- for the purposes of accounting for all computers, hardware, software, and accessories you shall submit your personal residence computer and/or vehicle to a search conducted by the Probation Department at a reasonable time and manner. You shall inform other residents that the premises and your computer maybe subject to a search pursuant to this condition. You shall provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information including billing records, telephone cable, internet, satellite and so on and any necessary codes to access that information. Do you have any

	wednesday, August 50, 2017
	Page 52
1	questions? Counsel?
2	MR. THOLEN: No, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Your client? Defendant?
4	THE DEFENDANT: No.
5	THE COURT: Government?
6	MS. CORKEN: Your Honor, you may have done this. I
7	did not hear though myself whether you accepted both Rules
8	Elevens.
9	THE COURT: I will accept both Rule Elevens.
10	MS. MARION: Thank you, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. And any objection to the sentence
12	from either side?
13	MS. CORKEN: No, your Honor.
14	MR. THOLEN: No objection from defense, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: All right.
16	PROBATION OFFICER: Your Honor, excuse me. As a
17	matter of housekeeping, is the destructive device that was
18	Count Two?
19	THE COURT: Yes.
20	PROBATION OFFICER: I believe the court said Count
21	One.
22	THE COURT: Okay. That is true. And did I say for
23	what I consider Count Two which is a Virginia case I don't
24	recall if I mentioned a number of months.
25	PROBATION OFFICER: You did.

Page 53

MR. THOLEN: You did, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. It's a long day. I do have to tell you about your right to appeal which is required by court rule and statute. And if you cannot afford an appeal the Court will provide you with counsel and the transcript and waive the filing fee. There is a ten day time period to file your papers. Your attorney and my case manager will provide you with the necessary form requesting it but I should also note part of the Plea Agreement is that if the plea -- if the sentence is below 60 months you waived your right to appeal so that while technically you have the right, more likely than not if you were to exercise it and something were filed at the Court of Appeals they would dismiss your appeal as having been And it's a lot of time. It's a lot of things that you have to think about. I commend both sides for their treating this as an individual case and not using the facts of the case to generate media attention or public dispute. The fact that both sides came together on worked out with your approval a Rule 11 Agreement tells me that the system is working. You are entitled to believe the sentence is way too high. And if you do believe that you would not be the first person entering prison who believes that. And you might be right. But the goal of the system and what should be your goal while you are serving your time is to be able to control your anger at the system, at the sentence that I imposed, and anyone else you

Page 54

want to be angry at and that anger should be at least more under control each day you were there.

You will be offered some choices in terms of programs, in terms of jobs. None of them will be your first choice and the jobs that may be offered are at the bottom based on seniority. But do them and with the understanding that it may help you pass the time a little bit faster and it may teach you some skills and some realism. And I am not suggesting that you have to modify any of your religious beliefs, only how you act upon them. And will I wish you luck. We are done.

MR. THOLEN: Thank you, Judge.

MS. CORKEN: Thank you, your Honor.

- - -

-

Page 55

CERTIFICATION

I, Lawrence R. Przybysz, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

s/Lawrence R. Przybysz

Official Court Reporter