Case 1:16-cr-00376-RMB Document 85 Filed 01/09/18 Page 1 of 7

HCC3BAHC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 16 CR 376 (RMB) V. 5 ABDULRAHMAN EL BAHNASAWY, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. December 12, 2017 9 1:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD M. BERMAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES JOON H. KIM 15 Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 NEGAR TEKEEI 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 ANDREW FRISCH JASON WRIGHT 19 Attorneys for Defendant -and-20 FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant 21 SABRINA SHROFF 22 23 24 25

THE COURT: From my point of view, the purpose of today's conference is to set a date for sentencing. And that is I think reflected in the memo endorsement of mine dated November 28, 2017, which endorses a letter from Mr. Frisch of that same date. So that's what I have in mind here today.

MR. FRISCH: So, Judge, we've conferred with the government, and they have kindly agreed not to object to our request for a period of 60 days within which to make our submission in aid of sentencing for Mr. Bahnasawy.

It is necessary for a couple of reasons, one of which is the unusual history, substance abuse and mental illness history, the complexity of some of the issues to be presented. We also want to assure that we address treatment going forward for him, for him personally and also for the Court's evaluation in setting an appropriate sentencing. There is also some scheduling issues. Ms. Shroff has two trials coming up --

THE COURT: I got it. That's agreeable to you as well?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, I must confess that when we received Mr. Frisch's voice mail this morning, it was our understanding that his request was a request to adjourn the sentencing date for 60 days, not the date by which the sentencing submission would be due. So when we voiced our consent to that adjournment, it was to set a sentencing date 60 days from today.

1 THE COURT: Okay. I got you. Let me just look at the calendar and see. 2 3 Here's the schedule, which I think is fair and it 4 works also for me. I would like to do the sentencing on 5 February 13 and I'll give you a morning. 6 MS. SHROFF: Judge, I will be on trial. I'm quite 7 certain I will be on trial on another terrorism case. THE COURT: You know, I have a calendar also. So, I'm 8 9 trying to accommodate everybody. It is certainly long enough 10 out for everybody to be ready for sentencing. 11 MS. SHROFF: Is there any way you can give me two more 12 weeks, please? 13 Two after that? No, because I'm sitting THE COURT: 14 on the Second Circuit in two weeks after that. 15 MS. SHROFF: Could you give us three weeks after that? THE COURT: Can't do it. Can't do it. 16 17 MR. FRISCH: Your Honor --18 THE COURT: I can do it over lunch, at a lunch break, 19 give you two hours then. 20 MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may I just -- I just finished 21 telling the line assistant Ms. Tekeei --22 THE COURT: So, putting schedules aside, it's really 23 time to conclude this case. It has been for some time.

defense counsel, but even adding in the new defense counsel,

Defense counsel have made some changes, I get that.

24

25

it's still time. So I personally think that the date I was going to suggest for sentencing is January 30. I think that's enough time. So, I certainly think that February 13 is enough time.

And it is time, is really the point I'm trying to make. It is not fair to Mr. Bahnasawy, or anybody, for us to keep dragging this out.

MS. SHROFF: May I just have one second with them just one second.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

MS. SHROFF: Ms. Tekeei, can you just join us for a minute.

MS. TEKEEI: Sure.

(Pause)

THE COURT: What have you got?

MR. FRISCH: Your Honor, so we completely understand where your Honor is coming from and the history of the case and the government's interest and your interest in getting this done. Completely understand.

Here's the problem we have. One of the issues is the work we need to do, but there is the issue of scheduling as well. Ms. Shroff has a trial in December and one in January. I have a trial in January which is out of the city. I won't even be in New York City, it is Upstate New York. Mr. Wright

has commitments.

I fully -- our overriding objective here is to get this right from our point of view, not just to be effective lawyers, but also not to shortchange the Court in explaining the issues, certainly our client. And all we can ask the Court to do is to see if your Honor can see clear to give us as much time so we can just do the best we can, not just for our client, which we certainly want to do, but also for the Court.

THE COURT: So what does that mean?

MR. FRISCH: Well, in talking about this with Ms. Shroff and Mr. Wright before we came to court, and ultimately the government, and we had obviously a miscommunication as to what 60 days meant. We felt that after speaking to the professionals who have worked with Mr. Bahnasawy and plotting a course forward in advance of sentencing that we could make it work if we had 60 days to get our submission in. You know, I'd like the 60 days.

If your Honor just thinks you can't do that, we'll take whatever your Honor feels you can do. But February 13 just seems undoable, given our desire to do our best for our client, and also in light of our, frankly, commitments to other clients as well and other judges.

THE COURT: It's undoable in what respect?

February 16. You can't get the materials in by then? It makes no sense to me, to be honest with you.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I could explain why we wouldn't be able to meet that deadline. We're just, honestly, in talking with them and I think we're finally --

THE COURT: I think you're talking about trial calendars, which is what you're talking about. I don't think you're talking about the merits. It is certainly enough time between what's already transpired and these kinds of dates we're talking about, is certainly enough time to do a pretrial submission.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I'm really not talking about the trial schedule at all. I'm trying to explain to the Court that it has taken a while for the three of us to congeal as a team. I know this Court knows this case backward and forward, but it takes a while to know. It takes a while to get to know the client, and the client has a lot of baggage, as this Court has very uniquely recognized.

So it is not just our trial schedule. We really are trying to work as a team. It is an adjustment of sorts.

Trying to bring the family back in. And your Honor, you have been incredibly patient.

THE COURT: What does that mean?

MS. SHROFF: It means we'll put in our submissions 60 days from today, please. And the government concedes that because of the misunderstanding between us, they are now okay with the request. You could hear from them. And we of course

will not seek any further adjournments. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, for what it's worth, having 3 4 spoken with defense counsel, and hearing their arguments, we 5 have no objection to a hard deadline of February 13 for their 6 sentencing submission and a hard date for sentencing. We're 7 not interested in any further adjournments, as I'm sure your Honor shares the concerns related to that. 8 9 THE COURT: Okay. So here's the schedule. We're 10 going to sentence on March 1 at 10. The defense submission is 11 due by noon on February 15, and government's response is due by 12 noon on February 22. I take it that works for everybody. 13 that right? 14 MR. FRISCH: Yes, your Honor. Thank you very, very much. 15 16 MS. TEKEEI: Yes, thank you. 17 MS. SHROFF: Thank you, your Honor. I really 18 appreciate it. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Thanks a lot. Nice to see you. 20 (Adjourned) 21 22 23 24 25