UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * Case No. 19-MJ-531(CLP)

*

* Brooklyn, New York

June 7, 2010

*

ASHIQUL ALAM,

*

Defendant.

*

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHERYL L. POLLAK UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

V.

For the Government: JONATHAN ALGOR, ESQ.

DAVID K. KESSLER, ESQ. MICHAEL T. KEILTY, ESQ.

Asst. United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office

271 Cadman Plaza Brooklyn, NY 11201

For the Defendant: JAMES DARROW, ESQ.

Federal Defenders of New York,

Inc.

One Pierrepont Plaza, 16th fl.

Brooklyn, NY 11201

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

```
2
 1
             (Proceedings commenced at 3:11 p.m.)
                  THE CLERK: Criminal cause for an arraignment.
 2
 3
        It's 19-M-531, United States vs. Ashiqual Alam.
                  Counsel, state your appearances, please.
 4
                  MR. ALGOR: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 5
                  Jonathan Algor, David Kessler and Michael Keilty
 6
 7
        for the United States.
                  THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 8
 9
                  MR. DARROW: Good afternoon. James Darrow, Federal
        Defenders of New York, for Mr. Alam. Also present at the bar
10
        is Ashley Brooks, a legal intern in my office.
11
                  THE COURT: Mr. Alam, I take it that you understand
12
13
        English?
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14
15
                  THE COURT: If at any point something is said that
16
        you don't understand, please let me know. Okay? Yes?
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
17
                  THE COURT: You have to answer me orally because
18
19
        we're recording the session.
20
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
                  THE COURT: The purpose of this proceeding this
22
        afternoon is to make sure you understand the crime you've
23
        been charged with, to make sure that you understand that you
24
        have the right to be represented by an attorney and to decide
25
        whether you would be released on bail, or held in jail until
```

```
3
 1
        your trial on these charges.
                  You don't have to say anything here today. If you
 2
 3
        start to say something, you can stop at any time. But what
        you must understand is that anything you do say, except what
 4
        you say to Mr. Darrow, your attorney, anything else can be
 5
        used against you.
 6
 7
                  Do you understand that?
 8
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
 9
                  THE COURT: Okay. Have you seen a copy of the
        complaint ?
10
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
11
12
                  THE COURT: Yes?
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
13
                  THE COURT: You understand that you've been charged
14
15
        with knowingly and intentionally possessing and receiving
16
        firearms, specifically, two Glock 19 9-millimeter semi-
        automatic pistols which have the manufacturer's serial
17
18
        numbers removed.
19
                  Do you understand what you've been charged with?
20
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
2.1
                  THE COURT: Okay. Now the court has appointed Mr.
22
        Darrow to represent you for purposes of these proceedings
23
        today and all other proceedings in connection with these
24
        charges.
25
                  You have the right to be represented by an attorney
```

```
4
 1
        from this point forward.
 2
                  Do you understand that?
 3
                  THE DEFENDANT: Yes, ma'am.
                  THE COURT: Okay.
 4
                  Mr. Darrow, have you reviewed the complaint with
 5
        your client and advised him of his rights?
 6
 7
                  MR. DARROW: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
                  THE COURT: And what's the government's position
        with respect to bail for Mr. Alam?
 9
                  MR. DARROW: Your Honor, it's the government's
10
        position that there is no condition or combination of
11
12
        conditions that can address the defendant's danger to the
        community and risk of flight and we're seeking a permanent
13
        order of detention.
14
15
                  And we have filed a detention memorandum to that
16
        effect. It's currently under seal, per the court's order,
        but I'm ready further to address our position.
17
18
                  THE COURT: Well, Mr. Darrow, have you seen the
19
        government's letter?
20
                  MR. DARROW: I have, Your Honor.
2.1
                  THE COURT: And have you reviewed it with your
22
        client?
23
                  MR. DARROW: We've discussed it.
24
                  THE COURT: Okay. How do you want to proceed at
25
        this moment?
```

MR. DARROW: Well, Your Honor, we do have a bail package to present. Whether a formal detention hearing is necessary I think we can talk about.

Just so Your Honor knows we are requesting that my client be released on a \$200,000 secured bond to be signed by both of his parents, who are here in court today, both of whom were interviewed by Pretrial Services.

The bond would be secured by the apartment where my client lives with his parents. My understanding, Your Honor, is that there is \$200,000 in equity in the home. That's based on discussions with my clients parents, who are both the deed holders.

In addition, Your Honor, we would ask that my client be on home confinement for the duration of the case.

We would ask that he have an ankle monitor affixed because as Your Honor knows as -- from the Pretrial report, he's a rising senior at John Jay College and he works two jobs. We would like for him to continue doing that.

I'll note, Your Honor, that when you sort of strip away the things that the press reports have been focused on in this case, what we have and what the government has undertaken to charge in this case is a zero to five gun charge.

And, therefore, it's not a presumption case. It's not a crime of violence. My client is an LPR who's lived

here with his mother and father for 12 years, Your Honor.

The only international travel I'm aware of was travel that he undertook with his family to Bangladesh twice during school breaks. He is a student who works two jobs. He has no criminal history of any kind.

So it's our view, Your Honor, that that package is sufficient to deal with any risk of flight. If the passport's an issue, we can arrange, I'm sure, to get it back to Pretrial Services.

My understanding is it's an expired Bangladeshi passport, but I'm happy to go myself and get it and bring it back, if necessary.

And as to any dangerousness, I mean, the fact of the matter is the man will be locked in his home with an ankle bracelet on and I'm happy to -- I'm open to other conditions as necessary, as the court feels is necessary.

But as alleged, this is a transaction that occurred between my client to law enforcement agents. So there's no allegation that he is talking to strangers about these sorts of things, or talking to anybody else who's not fully aware on the government's side of what exactly is going on.

So it's for that reason, Your Honor, that we're proposing this bail package.

MR. KESSLER: Your Honor, if I --

THE COURT: Let me just -- so you requested an

defendant has taken specific steps to plan an attack in New

25

York City.

So as detailed in the complaint and as in our detention memo, the defendant developed a specific plan to attack Times Square. He researched firearms and explosive devices.

He talked about how to construct explosive devices. He conducted multiple reconnaissance trips, including videotaping potential target area.

He had Lasik eye surgery, and as he explained it be able to shoot more accurately. That's my paraphrase.

And then he went and actually took the step of trying to acquire two different firearms.

So the nature and circumstances of this offense are extremely serious.

Second of all, the weight of the case is absolutely overwhelming. The purchase of the firearms is on video and the defendant's other interactions, as detailed in the complaint, are recorded in some form or another. So the weight is overwhelming.

The defendant's circumstances, he does have family in another country. That gives him a place to flee.

As the Pretrial Services report lays out, he has unexplained assets. I'll note that the recommendation in that report is that the defendant should be detained.

And finally with respect to the conditions sought

by the defendant, you know, an ankle monitor and a locked door do not adequately address the kind of danger we're talking about in a case like this.

So I'm happy to detail more of the facts that are laid out in the detention memorandum. I think at this point the memorandum should be unsealed generally because we're relying on all the facts in there and the facts I laid out. But that's our position.

Certainly, this bail package does not address these concerns, but it's the government's position that there is no set of conditions that would address them.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Darrow, anything to respond to --

MR. DARROW: Yes, yes. I mean, look. The fact of the matter is this case is charged the way it is. It's charged as a zero to five firearm charge. I understand that the government's allegation is that there is this specific plan of an attack, but he's not charged with terrorism. He's not charged with the terrorism type allegations that are set forth in the memorandum. He is charged with what he is charged with. And so that's what I'm directing my arguments to.

What I would request, Your Honor, is that if Your Honor's inclined to make a finding of dangerousness based on these non-firearm related allegations, I think what we need

is a formal detention hearing where evidence can be presented as to his dangerousness in that regard. Because insofar as this going of the actual complaint and relying on other things, I think there needs to be a formal finding based on evidence in that regard.

I will notice -- just noted, Your Honor, in terms of these unexplained assets, I'm not entirely sure what that was referring to. I will note though, Your Honor, that my client does work two jobs and he is extremely hard working and he saved a bunch of money.

So I'm not sure that that is a factor here. My client couldn't flee if he wanted to. The fact that he was born in another country is not something that he can help. He has a green card and, therefore, a right to bail.

So it's not the case if you're born in a foreign country and have some family there you're automatically denied bail. I didn't understand the government to be saying that.

So I guess what I'm saying, Your Honor, is we think our package is sufficient as to these charges. But to the extent that these other larger terrors and related allegations are what the government's going to be relying on are germane to Your Honor, what I would request is that we put this over for an actual formal detention hearing where evidence can be presented in that regard.

THE COURT: I guess I was a little confused because I thought I heard you say that these were not things that are alleged in the complaint. That they actually are --

MR. DARROW: I meant -- when I said complaint -- I mean, look. I think there are -- some of these allegations are set forth in the complaint. Others of them are set forth and were detailed in the detention memo that was filed before Your Honor.

But I think what the government is doing is alluding to them to present a picture of dangerousness that is outside what is strictly relevant for consideration of the charge, which is receipt of, as alleged, two firearms with obliterated serial numbers.

That has nothing to do with a planned attack on Times Square or anything else that's been the subject of press reports, et cetera.

So my point, Your Honor, is that to the extent that that is the basis of the detention that is being sought, it should take the form of an actual hearing with evidence presented for showing of dangerousness, if the government can do that.

MR. KESSLER: So the Bail Reform Act does not, you know, say read the statute and then whatever the words in the statute are, that's how you do the bail analysis.

The question is what are the nature and

circumstance of this offense. The nature and circumstances of this offense are the ones laid out in the complaint and they're far broader than just the receipt of a gun, whether you call them terrorism charges or something — terrorism or something else.

The point is the events alleged in the complaint are as they're alleged, you know, to have happened. And all of those are in front of the court to consider in terms of determining whether the defendant poses a danger to the community.

You know, it could be in another situation, someone charged with the same charge might not be a danger to the community, or there might be a set of conditions that could address that danger. But that's not the case here.

So with respect to a hearing, you know, the government is entitled to proceed by proffer of evidence.

We've preferred the evidence, the evidence as laid out in the complaint. And as I said, the evidence is almost entirely from recordings.

So we don't even think a hearing is necessary to address a finding of dangerousness. Certainly, not for purposes of today.

Well, let me say this. I've read the complaint very carefully and relying just on the allegations in the complaint and not any extraneous statements in the

2.1

government's letter that might not have been included specifically in the complaint, I find that regardless of what the charge before the court is here, which is, as you say, limited at this moment to the receipt of two semi-automatic pistols which, by the way, with their serial numbers obliterated is a pretty serious offense in and of itself.

I find that based on all of the other circumstances under which he purchased the guns and his stated intent, which as the government indicates seems to be on recorded conversations. So, therefore, something that is pretty well established or will be in terms of the recordings. I assume they're all — when they're quoted in the complaint, that means they're recorded somewhere, correct?

So based on all of that and my consideration of you bail package, which had this been any other set of circumstances, simply the purchase of these firearms without all of the background information, I might find it sufficient.

But at this point I'm finding that he is a danger to the community and I'm going to order him permanently detained.

I also find that even with the bail package he's a risk of flight. These are serious charges. The government's allegations are serious as well and he has ties to Bangladesh. He's gone back there. He is a citizen, I take it,

```
14
        of Bangladesh. So there is a risk of flight as well.
 1
 2
                  But basically I'm relying on the dangerousness
 3
        element, which I find the government has proved by clear and
 4
        convincing evidence.
 5
                  So I'm going to order him detained. I guess the
        question that remains is whether or not you want me to set a
 6
 7
        date for the indictment.
 8
                  MR. DARROW: I do, Your Honor. We request a
        preliminary hearing.
 9
                  THE CLERK: So June 21st at 11 a.m.
10
                  MR. DARROW: Thank you.
11
12
                  THE CLERK: You're welcome.
13
                  THE COURT: Anything else --
                  MR. DARROW: No, Your Honor.
14
15
                  THE COURT: Okay.
16
                  MR. KESSLER: Your Honor, two additional things
        very briefly.
17
18
                  First, just for the record, counselor notification
19
        has been made.
20
                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
```

MR. KESSLER: Second of all, with respect to the detention letter that was filed, I understand it's still under seal and we're not asking the court, unless the court is already inclined to unseal it at this moment.

21

22

23

24

25

However, we'll note that detention memoranda like

that one are judicial documents for which there's a presumptive right of public access.

And it will be the government's position that the document should be unsealed subject to any, you know, narrowly tailored redactions necessary to protect personal information or for that sort of consideration.

THE COURT: Well, in that regard what I'm going to ask Mr. Darrow to do is confer with you about anything specific in the detention letter that should be redacted and present them to me. Once I see that I will order the letter unsealed.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

MR. DARROW: I'd be happy to do that, Your Honor.

I just wanted to note in that regard, you know, Local Rule

23.1 doesn't require that the government can publish any
information subject only to private information being
redacted. It's really a much broader rule. So that's going
to be the subject of our discussions. And if we have any
dispute in that regard, we'll raise them with Your Honor.

THE COURT: (Indiscernible).

MR. DARROW: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KESSLER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. DARROW: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. MR. KESSLER: Thank you. (Proceedings concluded at 3:28 p.m.) I, CHRISTINE FIORE, Certified Electronic Court Reporter and Transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Christine Fiore June 8, 2019 Christine Fiore, CERT