1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION
۷	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	Plaintiff,
6	DOCKET NO. 1:19-mj-24 vs.
7	
8	MUSE ABDIKADIR MUSE, MOHAMED SALAT HAJI, and MOHAMUD ABDIKADIR MUSE,
9	
10	Defendants.
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11	
12	TRANSCRIPT OF ARRAIGNMENTS, INITIAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCES, AND
13	CONTINUATION OF DETENTION HEARINGS
14	BEFORE MAGISTRATE JUDGE PHILLIP J. GREEN
15	GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN
16	January 31, 2019
17	
18	Court Reporter: Glenda Trexler
19	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
20	685 Federal Building 110 Michigan Street, N.W.
21	Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
22	Proceedings reported by stenotype, transcript produced by
23	computer-aided transcription.
24	
<u> </u>	
25	

```
APPEARANCES:
 1
 2
     FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
          MR. CLAY M. WEST
 3
          UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
          330 Ionia Avenue, N.W.
 4
          P.O. Box 208
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-0208
 5
          Phone: (616) 456-2404
 6
          Email: Clay.M.West@usdoj.gov
          MR. CHRISTOPHER M. O'CONNOR
 7
          UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
          330 Ionia Avenue, N.W.
 8
          P.O. Box 208
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-0208
 9
          Phone: (616) 456-2404
10
          Email:
                  Christopher.m.o'connor@usdoj.gov
11
     FOR THE DEFENDANT MUSE ABDIKADIR MUSE:
12
          MS. SHARON A. TUREK
          FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE
          50 Louis Street, N.W., Suite 300
13
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-2633
                  (616) 742-7420
14
          Phone:
          Email:
                  sharon turek@fd.org
15
16
          MR. JAMES S. FISHER
          FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE
          50 Louis Street, N.W., Suite 300
17
          Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503-2633
          Phone: (616) 742-7420
18
          Email:
                  james fisher@fd.org
19
20
     FOR THE DEFENDANT MOHAMED SALAT HAJI:
21
          MS. MARY CHARTIER
          CHARTIER & NYAMFUKUDZA, PLC
          1905 Abbot Road, Suite 1
22
          East Lansing, Michigan 48823
                 (517) 885-3305
23
          Phone:
          Email: mary@cndefenders.com
24
```

FOR THE DEFENDANT MOHAMUD ABDIKADIR MUSE:

MR. RICHARD E. ZAMBON RICHARD E. ZAMBON, PLLC 202 Waters Building 161 Ottawa Avenue, N.W. Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503

Phone: (616) 456-7831 Email: rick@zambonlaw.co

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

* * * *

Grand Rapids, Michigan
January 31, 2019

2:15 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: We're here on the matter of United States versus Muse Abdikadir Muse, Mohamed Salat Haji, and Mohamud Abdikadir Muse, case number 19-cr-25. This is the date and time for a continuation of the detention hearing. In the interim, since the last hearing, the grand jury returned an Indictment which is filed at docket number 25. So it's my intention, unless anyone has an objection, to go ahead and do an arraignment on the Indictment and then we will proceed with the continuation of the detention hearing.

Is there any objection from the government?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Zambon?

MR. ZAMBON: None, Your Honor.

MS. CHARTIER: No, Your Honor.

MS. TUREK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I suppose I should have 1 everyone make their appearance on the record. Why don't we go 2 ahead and do that as well. 3 MR. WEST: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Clay West and 4 Chris O'Connor for the United States. 5 6 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 7 MR. ZAMBON: Oh. Good afternoon, Your Honor. Richard Zambon appearing on behalf of the Defendant 8 Mohamud Muse who is seated to my left. 9 10 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Zambon. MS. CHARTIER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 11 12 Mary Chartier on behalf of Mohamed Haji who is seated to my 13 right. 14 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Ms. Chartier. 15 MS. TUREK: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Sharon Turek 16 on behalf of Mr. Muse Muse seated at my right. Also at counsel 17 table is Mr. Fisher from my office who has also filed an 18 Appearance in this case. 19 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon to all of you. 20 All right. Mr. -- let's see here. I'll get my notes 21 together. 22 Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Mohamud Muse and 23 Mr. Mohamed Haji, I want to remind each of you that you have a 24 right to remain silent. That means you have no obligation to

say anything to anyone from the government, anyone in law

enforcement, or anyone else for that matter. 1 2 Do you understand that, Mr. Muse Muse? 3 DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yes. THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Mohamed Haji? 4 5 DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Do you understand that, Mr. Mohamud Muse? 7 DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: 8 THE COURT: All right. If you do make a statement, 9 what you say may be used against you in a later court 10 proceeding. 11 Do you understand that, Mr. Muse Muse? 12 DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Mr. Mohamed Haji? 14 DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes. 15 THE COURT: Mr. Mohamud Muse? 16 DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes. 17 THE COURT: You each have a right to the assistance of 18 an attorney throughout the proceedings in this case. If you cannot afford an attorney, one will be appointed for you at no 19 20 cost to you. 21 Do you understand that Mr. Muse Muse? 22 DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: 23 THE COURT: Mr. Mohamed Haji? 24 DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes. 25 THE COURT: Mr. Mohamud Muse?

DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes

THE COURT: Each of you has been appointed a court-appointed attorney. Mr. Muse Muse, Sharon Turek has been appointed to represent you. She is the Federal Public Defender for the Western District of Michigan. Mr. James Fisher has also been appointed and is representing you. He is an Assistant Federal Public Defender. They are both very experienced and very capable criminal defense attorneys.

Are you satisfied with their representation so far?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yes.

THE COURT: They will continue to represent you no matter how you choose to proceed in this case.

Do you understand that, sir?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Mohamed Haji, Ms. Chartier has been appointed by the court to represent you. She is a very experienced and a very capable criminal defense attorney.

Are you satisfied with her representation so far?

DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes.

THE COURT: And you understand she will continue to represent you no matter how you choose to proceed in this case?

DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Mohamud Muse, Mr. Zambon has been appointed to represent you. He is also a very experienced and a very capable criminal defense attorney.

Are you satisfied with his representation so far? 1 2 DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes, sir. THE COURT: He will continue to represent you in this 3 case no matter how you choose to proceed. 4 Do you understand that, sir? 5 6 DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes. THE COURT: Mr. Zambon, will your client waive reading 7 of the Indictment if I explain the charges to him? 8 9 MR. ZAMBON: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Chartier, will your 11 client also waive reading? 12 MS. CHARTIER: Yes, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Turek? 14 MS. TUREK: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: All right. Very well. And before I get 16 into it, Mr. West or Mr. O'Connor, I saw in the penalty sheet a 17 reference to a forfeiture allegation, but I don't see it in the 18 Indictment. 19 MR. WEST: That's correct, Your Honor. There is a 20 statutory authority for forfeiture, but there is no forfeiture 21 allegation in the Indictment, and so the penalty sheet as filed 22 is erroneous. 23 THE COURT: All right. So I don't need to address 24 that? 25 MR. WEST: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

All right. Mr. Muse Muse, Mr. Mohamed Haji, and Mr. Mohamud Muse, you are each charged in Count 1 with conspiracy to provide material support to a designated foreign terrorist organization. The word "conspiracy" is used to refer to a criminal agreement of sorts. If two or more persons agree to cooperate with each other for the purposes of committing a crime, that's called a conspiracy.

To be convicted of a conspiracy, the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the individual voluntarily joined the conspiracy knowing the criminal purpose of it. Here the grand jury is alleging that from January of 2017 through January 21st of this year that each of you agreed to cooperate with others in committing the crime of providing material support to a designated terrorist organization.

Now, here the government would first of all have to prove that the organization to which you allegedly intended to provide material support was a designated foreign terrorist organization. And that is, if you read the Indictment, it goes into some detail as to which entities have been designated by the State Department which are collectively referred to as ISIS for purposes of this Indictment.

It is further alleged that you agreed to provide material support and resources specifically by way of personnel, which I take to mean providing your services, to

ISIS. This would be a violation of Title 18, United States 1 Code § 2339B. 2 Mr. Muse Muse, do you think you understand what you're 3 being accused of in Count 1? 4 DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: 5 6 THE COURT: Mr. Mohamed Haji, do you think you understand what you're being accused of in Count 1? 7 DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes. 8 THE COURT: And Mr. Mohamud Muse, do you think you 9 10 understand what you're being accused of in Count 1? 11 DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes. 12 THE COURT: I'm going to go on and talk about Count 2, 13 and then we'll talk about penalties as they are the same. Count 2 charges each of you with attempting to provide 14 15 material support to a designated foreign terrorist 16 organization. Here it's alleged essentially that on 17 January 21st of this year each of you attempted to provide 18 material support to the organizations collectively referred to 19 as ISIS and that you aided and abetted each other in that 20 attempt. 21 Aiding and abetting -- excuse me -- is a separate 22 statutory provision, and that's under Title 18,

statutory provision, and that's under Title 18,
United States Code § 2. Aiding and abetting means to provide
assistance, to help somebody else in committing a crime knowing
that that person is committing a crime.

23

24

So here it's alleged that either you attempted to provide material support, that is your services, to ISIS, or you aided and abetted somebody else in attempting to provide that material support. This would also be a violation of Title 18, United States Code § 2339B.

Mr. Muse Muse, do you think you understand what you're being accused of in Count 2?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Mohamed Haji, do you think you understand what you're being accused of in Count 2?

DEFENDANT HAJI: Yes.

THE COURT: And Mr. Mohamud Muse, do you think you understand what you're being accused of in Count 2?

DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: Yes.

THE COURT: Gentlemen, if you are convicted of either Count 1 or Count 2, you face a maximum penalty of 20 years in prison, a fine of up to \$250,000. You would be subject to a period of supervised release of up to three years. And you would be required to pay a special assessment of a hundred dollars.

Supervised release is a period of time following incarceration in which an individual is subject to certain terms and conditions set by the sentencing judge. If that individual violates any term or condition, he could be sent back to prison for up to the full term of supervised release.

In some instances that could result in an individual spending more time in prison than what was allowed as the maximum penalty for the offense of conviction.

Do you have any questions as to the penalties for Count 1 or Count 2, Mr. Muse Muse?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions,

Mr. Mohamed Haji?

DEFENDANT HAJI: No.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions,

Mr. Mohamud Muse?

DEFENDANT MOHAMUD MUSE: No.

charged in a third count of making a false statement in a passport application. The grand jury is alleging that on January 2nd of this year that you made an application for a passport and that in that application you knowingly and intentionally made a false statement of the type that would cause the State Department to issue a passport where it might otherwise not. It's alleged that you attested, meaning that you stated under oath, on the application that you had accidentally thrown out your prior passport on December 19th, 2018. And it's alleged that you knew at the time that that statement was not true. This would be a violation of Title 18, United States Code Section 1542.

Mr. Muse Muse, do you think you understand what you're being accused of in Count 3?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: Yeah.

THE COURT: If convicted of Count 3, you face a maximum penalty of 10 years in prison, a fine of up to \$250,000. You'd be subject to a period of supervised release of up to three years. And would be required to pay a special assessment of a hundred dollars.

Mr. Muse Muse, do you have any questions or concerns about those penalties?

DEFENDANT MUSE MUSE: No.

THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, there are four ways that you could respond to the charges against you. You could plead not guilty. You could plead guilty. You could plead what's known as no contest, which requires the permission of the district court judge, in this case Judge Gordon Quist. Or you could stay silent, say nothing, in which case the Court would automatically enter a not-guilty plea on your behalf.

I'm now going to ask each of you to enter a plea to the charges against you through your attorney.

Ms. Turek, how does Mr. Muse Muse plead?

MS. TUREK: Your Honor, not guilty as to all three
counts.

THE COURT: Very well. A not-guilty plea will be entered on behalf of Mr. Muse Muse as to each count, 1, 2, and

3 of the Indictment.

Ms. Chartier, how does Mr. Haji plead?

MS. CHARTIER: Mr. Haji pleads not guilty, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. A not-guilty plea will be entered on behalf of Mr. Haji as to each count 1 and Count 2.

Mr. Zambon?

MR. ZAMBON: Not guilty as to all counts, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Very well. A not-guilty plea will be entered on behalf of Mr. Mohamud Muse as to each, Count 1 and Count 2 in the Indictment.

Gentlemen, the next thing we're going to take up is the initial pretrial conference. This is an opportunity for you and your attorney to learn more about the government's case against you. The prosecutors have filed an Initial Pretrial Conference Summary Statement. This lists and identifies those matters the government is required to disclose to you at this time.

Mr. West, are there any corrections, additions, or comments that you wish to make?

MR. WEST: No, Your Honor. I'll note that I've discussed separately with each defense counsel that we intend to transfer discovery to the final upload system early next week.

THE COURT: This is going to the cloud?

MR. WEST: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. 1 2 MR. WEST: Securely. THE COURT: All right. I don't know anything about 3 the cloud, so that's fine. Mr. -- as long as the defense 4 attorneys do, that's all that matters. 5 6 Mr. Zambon, any questions or concerns? 7 MR. ZAMBON: I do, Your Honor. At the detention 8 hearing last week Agent Dunham testified that my client made no statement when he was arrested, and I see that under I(A) that 9 10 "Post-arrest interviews of all three defendants." I don't understand the difference. 11 12 THE COURT: Mr. West. 13 MR. WEST: May I clarify, Your Honor? 14 THE COURT: Yes, please. I believe there was no substantive 15 MR. WEST: 16 statement given by Mr. Mohamud Muse. I think to the degree 17 that a report was written to that effect, I constituted it in 18 that category. 19 THE COURT: All right. So are you saying that an 20 interview was attempted but he declined to answer questions? 21 MR. WEST: That's my understanding, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Does that help you, Mr. Zambon? 23 MR. ZAMBON: That does. Thank you, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Anything else, Mr. Zambon?

MR. ZAMBON: No, thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Chartier? 1 The only issue is I filed an Initial 2 MS. CHARTIER: Pretrial Conference Statement last week under the MJ. 3 Would the Court like me to refile one under the new docket, or does 4 it all get transferred over? 5 6 THE COURT: I think it gets transferred. I'm going to say that with conviction. 7 8 MS. CHARTIER: Great. 9 The MJ case does get transferred THE COURT: Okay. 10 in. I think if you went on the CM/ECF under 19-cr-25 right 11 now, you would see everything from the MJ case. 12 MS. CHARTIER: Perfect. 13 THE COURT: So I don't see that there's any need for 14 you to file another one. MS. CHARTIER: Thank you. Then I have no issues with 15 the statement filed by the government. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 18 Ms. Turek? 19 MS. TUREK: No issues, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: All right. Very well. 21 Mr. Zambon, how much time would you like to file your 22 initial statement? MR. ZAMBON: I filed my Initial Pretrial Statement. 23 24 THE COURT: Oh, you did. 25 And did you, Ms. Turek?

MS. TUREK: I did, Your Honor. It was also under the 1 2 MJ. Excellent. Then we're all covered. 3 THE COURT: Thank 4 you. 5 Is there anything else we need to take up before we 6 resume the detention hearing, Mr. West? 7 MR. WEST: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zambon? 9 MR. ZAMBON: No, thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Chartier? 11 MS. CHARTIER: No, Your Honor. Thank you. 12 THE COURT: And Ms. Turek? 13 MS. TUREK: No, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: All right. As I understand it, Counsel, 15 when we were last here I advised everyone that I did not 16 believe the Court could entertain a statutory rebuttable 17 presumption in favor of detention unless it ran a preliminary 18 hearing and made such a finding of probable cause at the 19 conclusion of that hearing. The government didn't agree with 20 me on that, but that was the approach I took. 21 Intervening circumstances have occurred in that the 22 grand jury has returned an Indictment. There is no question at 23 this point that the statutory rebuttable presumption now 24 The Sixth Circuit in United States versus Stone, 25 608 F.3d. 939 at 945, a 2010 case, ruled that the presentment

of an Indictment satisfies the prerequisite for the statutory rebuttable presumption. So it does now apply.

All right. Mr. Zambon, I believe you were about to cross-examine Special Agent Dunham. Please proceed.

MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. ZAMBON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Q. Good afternoon, Agent Dunham.

some of the testimony from last week.

- A. Good afternoon, sir.
- 10 Q. As you know, sir, I represent Mohamud Muse. And I'm going to ask you questions concerning him but also possibly touch on

When I ask you a question, I'll refer to "you," and I mean that in the larger sense. You, the FBI, all these other government agencies that you spoke about last week, state and federal agencies and everybody else.

Do you understand that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Okay. So at some point Mr. Muse, my client -- we'll refer to -- I'll refer to him as Mr. Muse -- came to the attention of the government, correct?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 | Q. And it was through a Facebook posting?
- 24 A. Through a Facebook profile, that's correct.
- 25 Q. A Facebook profile. What is that?

- 1 A. A Facebook profile is going to be a page that's on the
- 2 | Internet that may contain pictures, statements, commentary,
- 3 | likes, things of that sort.
- 4 | Q. And I truly don't have a Facebook account and I'm not very
- 5 | knowledgeable, but I have a rudimentary knowledge of it. I
- 6 understand that there's a private and a public page, correct?
- 7 A. There are user settings. So a user decides what they want
- 8 people to be able to see or not see.
- 9 Q. And Mr. Mohamud Muse had a public page, is that correct, or
- 10 posting or whatever it's called?
- 11 A. He had material that was available to other Facebook users,
- 12 yes.
- 13 Q. Now, how did that get brought to the attention of the
- 14 government?
- 15 A. So as I shared last week, there were analyses that were
- 16 being conducted by the FBI for other Facebook accounts that had
- 17 | material that suggested extremist views, and so Mohamud Muse's
- 18 | was one of the accounts that came up during that analysis.
- 19 Q. How do they do this analysis? Does the FBI just look at
- 20 everybody's Facebook account?
- 21 A. No. So in conjunction with other accounts that
- 22 demonstrated extremist material, the Facebook account
- 23 Mohamud A. Muse with an "A" displayed other pro-ISIS,
- 24 | pro-Jihad, pro-violence, and pro-martyrdom type material.
- 25 \parallel Q. And who are these other accounts that are associated with

1 Mr. Mohamud Muse?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

A. I think I would have to be careful in answering some of those questions.

THE COURT: Do the best you can.

THE WITNESS: I couldn't tell you the specific names of those accounts, but some came on for reasons that were unclassified. Some came on for reasons that were classified.

- Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) So what were the -- I assume you don't want to talk about the classified reasons or you can't.
- 10 A. I'm not able to, sir, that's correct.
- 11 | Q. What about the unclassified reasons?
- 12 A. So these are accounts that demonstrated pro-ISIS,
- 13 pro-violence, pro-Jihad, pro-martyrdom exchanges of material.
- 14 So there's linkage amongst the accounts.
- 15 Q. So it would not initially -- Mr. Muse, he was connected with some other account?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. Okay. Now -- and when did that occur?
- 19 A. This was in the spring of 2016.
- 20 Q. 2016?
- 21 A. That's correct.
- 22 | Q. And you mentioned something last week about a grand jury in
- 23 Miami. Is that correct?
- 24 A. So the matter started with not knowing if that Facebook
- 25 account was used by a person inside the United States or

1 | outside the United States.

THE COURT: Let me interject here. I have concerns about Rule 6(e) here. We're not invading that rule, are we?

THE WITNESS: I guess I'm doing my very best here to answer the questions.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: So we can say that process was served in order to determine where the IP logins were, the Internet protocol logins were for that account. So in the beginning it wasn't clear if the account user was in the United States or not in the United States. So the IP logins revealed logins from internet service providers in Omaha, Nebraska.

- Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) All right. And how does that connect with Miami?
- A. So, again, Miami had subjects and individuals they were investigating. The Facebook account Mohamud A. Muse came about during their investigation. As the investigation of that began, it revealed that the user was likely in Omaha, Nebraska, based on the internet protocol logins.
- Q. There wasn't any large like NSA looking at all of these accounts that I might read about in some mystery or something like that?
- A. There was not.
- Q. Okay. Thank you. I assume, then, that when Mr. Muse came to the attention of the FBI you did a background search on him;

1 | is that correct?

6

14

15

18

21

22

23

24

- 2 A. Eventually, once we identified who we believed the user of 3 the account was, that's correct.
- 4 Q. Once you identified him. And you identified him about when then?
 - A. It would have been in the fall of 2016.
- 7 | Q. All right. And to start off in the spring of 2016 I think 8 | you said?
- 9 A. That's when some of the initial work was conducted. You 10 know, it basically brought the account to the FBI's attention 11 and then subsequent investigation occurred.
- 12 Q. And was the purpose of the investigation into the
 13 background of Mr. Muse to conduct a risk assessment of him?
 - A. No. No. Just trying to determine who the user of that account was.
- 16 Q. All right. At some point did you do a risk assessment of Mr. Muse?
 - A. Can you define "risk assessment" for me?
- 19 Q. I think it's probably self-evident. You decided whether or 20 not he was a credible threat, an imminent threat?
 - A. I mean, I guess, just by way of background, so I'm a certified public accountant, and risk assessment means something very different to me in the context of financial reporting, compliance, operations. So I guess I'm just trying to understand when you say risk assessment, that's not a word

- 1 | we use in the FBI. How about that?
- 2 | Q. But you're also a special agent. You've gone beyond just
- 3 | financial accounting, correct?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. Okay. And so you understand by that I mean about an
- 6 | imminent threat to the safety and welfare of the United States.
- 7 A. So we're trying to assess intentions and capabilities, if
- 8 | that's what you're asking.
- 9 Q. And that started in the fall of 2016, two and a half years
- 10 ago?
- 11 A. That's fair, yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. Did you determine where Mr. Muse was born?
- 13 A. Yes, eventually.
- 14 | Q. And where was that?
- 15 A. My understanding from his alien file from the United States
- 16 Citizenship and Immigration Service, it was in a refugee camp
- 17 in Dadaab, Kenya.
- 18 | Q. When did he come to the United States?
- 19 A. Um, I want to say around 2003. That's my best
- 20 | recollection.
- 21 | Q. All right. And he is about 23 years old I think you
- 22 testified?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 | Q. Did you check out his educational background?
- 25 A. Limited, yes.

- 1 Q. His educational background is limited or you did a limited
- 2 search?
- 3 A. We did a limited search.
- 4 **|** Q. What did you discover?
- 5 A. It's my understanding that he graduated from high school
- 6 and might have started some college.
- 7 | Q. In Nebraska?
- 8 A. The only piece I'm aware of for college is -- no, I take
- 9 that back. Yes, in Nebraska, yes.
- 10 Q. At some point he came to Michigan?
- 11 | A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. Did he obtain a driver's license?
- 13 | A. In the state of Michigan?
- 14 Q. In the state of Michigan.
- 15 A. Yes, he did.
- 16 | Q. All right. And did you seize that driver's license? Is it
- 17 | in your possession?
- 18 A. I'm not aware if his driver's license was seized or not.
- 19 Q. He was arrested at the airport, correct?
- 20 A. He was, that's correct.
- 21 | Q. And he's been locked up since then?
- 22 A. Yes, he's been in the custody of the Marshal Service,
- 23 | that's correct.
- 24 | Q. And the usual course of procedure is that defendants are --
- 25 | all their property is taken from them, including driver's

- 1 | licenses, et cetera, correct?
- 2 A. Yes. Again, because they were arrested on a holiday,
- 3 | though, they started in the custody of the Kent County
- 4 | Sheriff's Office, so I personally wasn't involved in that
- 5 process, so I'm not sure what property went to what agency.
- 6 Q. Did you ever verify that he lived in Lansing?
- 7 A. When you say verify, what do you mean?
- 8 Q. Well, that you know that he was -- moved to Lansing,
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. So like there are driver's license records that reflect --
- 11 | Q. Right.
- 12 A. -- an address of record in the state of Michigan in the
- 13 | Lansing area, yes.
- 14 ||Q| And he put a driver's -- excuse me -- put an address on his
- 15 driver's license, correct?
- 16 | A. He did.
- 17 ||Q|. Did you ever verify that the address on his driver's
- 18 | license was in fact where he lived?
- 19 A. Um, so he moved multiple times. Is there a particular
- 20 point in time you're referencing?
- 21 Q. The last year.
- 22 A. Um, I'm going to estimate I think he moved three to four
- 23 | times within the last year.
- 24 | Q. Did he change his driver's license --
- 25 | A. He did not.

- 1 Q -- to reflect that?
- 2 | A. He did not.
- 3 | Q. Okay. Did you check to see if he had a passport?
- 4 A. Yes, I did.
- 5 | Q. And did that reveal any travels --
- 6 A. Um, so I could --
- 7 | Q. -- outside of the United States?
- 8 A. So I think your question was two parts. Yes, I did check
- 9 to see if he had a passport, and then based on the limited
- 10 records I saw, no, I'm not aware of any international travel.
- 11 | Q. What about his employment? Do you know if he was employed?
- 12 A. I do.
- 13 | Q. And where was he employed?
- 14 | A. Most recently at WalMart.
- 15 | Q. And before that?
- 16 A. Um, he's been at WalMart for a while. I'd have to go back
- 17 | into records.
- 18 | Q. Perhaps Home Depot or someplace like that?
- 19 A. He was at Home Depot, that's correct.
- 20 ||Q|. Did it appear to you that he's been employed since he's
- 21 moved to the Lansing area?
- 22 A. Continuously?
- 23 | Q. Sure.
- 24 | A. I think there's periods of time that he was not.
- 25 $\parallel Q$. For how long of periods of time?

- I don't recall right now. Again, I would have to go back. 1
- 2 They are detailed records.
- Q. But he's had several jobs in the Lansing area since he 3
- moved here to Lansing; is that correct? 4
- That's correct. 5
 - When did you say he moved to Lansing?
- I think it was around the fall of 2016. Either late summer 7
- or early fall. 8

- Now, did you ever know him to use an alias to obtain 9
- 10 fraudulent identification?
- 11 A . Not that I'm aware of, no.
- 12 Okay. Did you check to see whether or not he had any bank Q.
- 13 accounts?
- 14 A . I did.
- 15 Q. And does he have any bank accounts?
- 16 A . Yes.
- 17 Q. And where are his bank accounts located?
- 18 A . You're asking the name of the financial institution?
- 19 Q. The name of the bank, correct.
- 20 Is it problematic to reveal? A .
- 21 THE COURT: No, not that I know of.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. Fifth Third Bank.
- 23 Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) All right. In Lansing? A particular
- 24 branch in Lansing? Do you know? Or just generally
- 25 Fifth Third Bank?

- A. Yeah. I mean, I don't know that financial institutions
 necessarily work that way. I think you can show up at whatever
- 4 Q. Okay. What were the accounts? Checking? Savings? That kind of accounts?

branch you want.

3

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I'd have to go back to the detail, but, yeah, those types of accounts, yes.
 - Q. What about a credit card? Did he obtain any credit card?
 - A. I don't recall off the top of my head. There was a debit card, but I don't recall if there was a credit card or not. A debit card that was linked to a checking account.
- 12 Q. Now, having been an accountant, still being an accountant, did you do an analysis of his checking/savings accounts?
 - A. His financial records were reviewed, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Did that reveal any transactions where he sent money to a foreign country?

MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor, I would just object. To the extent that Mr. Zambon is calling for information derived through the grand jury, we need to be careful about Rule 6(e) disclosures of information that this agent -- to the extent this agent only knows certain information through the grand jury, I'm not sure that that's something --

THE COURT: Well, it would certainly be problematic if the agent was disclosing the source of the information. I suppose any piece of information that was obtained solely

- 1 | through a grand jury subpoena would be considered a matter
- 2 ccurring before the grand jury and would be considered 6(e).
- 3 So I recognize that the agent cannot under law disclose matters
- 4 if they were only obtained through a grand jury subpoena.
- 5 Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) Was that information only obtained with a
- 6 grand jury subpoena?
- 7 A. Yes. I would have no other basis to speak to that.
- 8 Q. Okay. Now, Mr. Muse had this Facebook account and then
- 9 your ECU I believe it is Number 1 made contact with him; is
- 10 | that correct?
- 11 A. I'm sorry, ECU? Are you saying undercover employee, UCE?
- 12 | Q. Correct.
- 13 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 14 | Q. What did I say? And what's the right term?
- 15 A. I think the letters were transposed when you said it, but
- 16 | the substance of what you were explaining made sense.
- 17 | Q. UCE?
- 18 A. UCE. Undercover employee, UCE.
- 19 | Q. Undercover employee. Okay. I'll get it right. Okay.
- 20 | It's UCE-1, okay. And I assume that was the first undercover
- 21 | agent to make contact with Mr. Muse, that's why he's designated
- 22 Number 1?
- 23 A. So as I summarized last Friday in my testimony, there was
- 24 | an undercover employee prior to Undercover Employee 1 in the
- 25 Criminal Complaint.

- 1 ||Q|. And I know you answered a lot of questions about these
- 2 undercover agents, and we went through this, whether or not
- 3 | they are employees of the FBI. Are they special agents or
- 4 agents?
- 5 A. Um, most of the people are in what we call a category of
- 6 professional support employees, so they are not special agents.
- 7 | But they are other direct employees of the FBI.
- 8 Q. Is there some kind of background that you have to have in
- 9 order to be an undercover?
- 10 A. Um, so there's specialized training that occurs. There's a
- 11 process associated with that.
- 12 Q. Is there some protocol for that, some document which I
- 13 | could look at to see if I would be qualified?
- 14 A. I don't know the answer to that question.
- 15 | Q. Do you know if there's any written protocol or anything
- 16 | like that?
- 17 | A. I'm saying I don't know. There could be, but I don't know.
- 18 Q. Okay. There was also testimony, I think, that the
- 19 government has in its possession contacts between my client and
- 20 UCEs that are text messages, correct?
- 21 A. You're saying written exchanges?
- 22 Q. Correct.
- 23 A. Typed exchanges. Yes, that's written material.
- 24 | Q. Any other kind of material, like a recorded phone call or
- 25 something like that?

- So through Facebook there's voice communication capability, 1
- and so there are recorded audio communications as well. 2
- Is that only through Facebook or were there any phone 3 calls?
- No, there were no phone calls. 5

- 6 I did not know that you could make an audio contact through 7 Facebook.
- You can do it through WhatsApp as well, which is the same 8 9 here.
- 10 WhatsApp, is that the application for Facebook?
- 11 A. No. So WhatsApp is a completely separate communication.
- 12 So it's its own application that allows for voice
- communications and/or written communications between parties. 13
- 14 THE COURT: How do you spell that?
- 15 THE WITNESS: W-A -- W-H-A-T-S-A-P-P. WhatsApp.
- 16 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 17 THE WITNESS: So there are WhatsApp communications 18 between undercover employees and Mohamud Muse.
- 19 Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) And I understand, then, that those are 20 all preserved?
- 21 They are. A .
- 22 Okay. You also said last week that Mr. Muse had been in Q. 23 contact with people in other countries?
- 24 A . He had.
- 25 And what kind of contact was that?

- A. Facebook.
- 2 Q. The written or the WhatsApp?
- 3 A. Um, so I can speak to the written. Based on your question
- 4 we would tread into other material if we answered the rest
- 5 of --

1

- 7 written parts?
- 8 A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. And what other countries are those?
- 10 A. Specifically Ghana and Nigeria.
- 11 Q. And is the person or -- how many people in each country?
- 12 A. One person in each.
- 13 Q. Have you determined whether or not that person is an ISIS
- 14 or an ISIL member, or are we treading --
- 15 A. I don't think I can speak to that.
- 16 | Q. Now, I understand Mr. Muse's brother engaged in a financial
- 17 | transaction with the FBI to get money to buy an airplane
- 18 | ticket, correct?
- 19 A. Again, I guess I struggle with that characterization only
- 20 | because Muse Muse was communicating with the person he
- 21 understood to be an ISIS fighter in Somalia.
- 22 | Q. Right, but we know the truth.
- 23 A. I don't know how I'd rewind that and reconcile that with
- 24 | the events of the time versus what people are aware of now.
- 25 ||Q| Okay. Do you know if my client received any money in order

- 1 | to purchase an airplane ticket?
- 2 A. I know that \$300 was transmitted in your client's name to
- 3 pick up money in furtherance of Muse Muse's request for money
- 4 to purchase an airplane ticket, yes.
- 5 Q. And how was that transferred? Was that in a money order?
 - A. So it was through the service MoneyGram.
- 7 Q. All right. And that's some kind of online money-transfer
- 8 organization?

- 9 A. So MoneyGram is a money service business. They have a lot
- 10 | of locations in WalMarts. WalMart stores. So you can send
- 11 money from one location to another.
- 12 | Q. You can also buy money orders and that kind of thing there?
- 13 | Is that kind of the same idea?
- 14 | A. I don't know if that technically belongs to MoneyGram's
- 15 service. That could be WalMart or another provider. I don't
- 16 know if MoneyGram issues money orders or not. But it's
- 17 | basically an ability to transfer cash from one place to
- 18 another.
- 19 Q. Did Mr. Muse purchase any money orders at any of these
- 20 | locations, WalMart or anyplace else?
- 21 A. Did he purchase money orders?
- 22 Q. Correct.
- 23 A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- 24 \parallel Q. The ticket that was purchased for his brother, was that a
- 25 one-way ticket?

- 1 A. No, that was not.
 - **Q.** It was a roundtrip ticket?
- 3 **|| A.** It was.

2

- 4 | Q. Was there a return date on that?
- 5 \parallel A. There was.
 - Q. What date was he supposed to return?
- 7 A. I don't remember the exact date, but it was in early
- 8 February. Like around a handful of days from now.
- 9 Q. So he would have been gone around two months, then; is that
- 10 | correct?
- 11 A. No, about two weeks or even less than. Maybe 10 days-ish.
- 12 | Q. So he's supposed to fly to Somalia, be there 10 days, and
- 13 | then come back?
- 14 A. The ticket date was a departure of January 21st and a
- 15 return date in early February. I don't remember exactly.
- 16 | Q. All right. And it's to your knowledge that Facebook closed
- 17 down Mr. Muse's account; is that right?
- 18 A. So Mohamud Muse had a total of four Facebook accounts.
- 19 Q. Correct. And I was going to talk about the first one.
- 20 | A. Okay. And I'm sorry, your question is what regarding the
- 21 | first account?
- 22 | Q. Facebook closed down the account; is that right?
- 23 A. Facebook disabled it, that's correct.
- 24 | Q. Now, they did that independent of the government, right?
- 25 A. That's correct.

- 1 | Q. They just have their own people who review postings and
- 2 | look to see if somebody appears to be dangerous or a threat; is
- 3 | that right?
- 4 A. That's my understanding as well, yes.
- 5 | Q. I assume you never worked with Facebook or --
- 6 A. I have not.
- 7 | Q. But you -- okay. What does it take to obtain a Facebook
- 8 account? I assume not a whole lot, right? I can go on there
- 9 | if I wanted to and enter some information?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. Even after my account was closed by Facebook?
- 12 | A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. What information is required to open a Facebook account?
- 14 A. I think it's very minimal. Basically a name.
- 15 Q. Do you have a Facebook account?
- 16 A. I do not.
- 17 | Q. Okay.

yes.

- 18 THE COURT: I don't either, Mr. Zambon, if that helps
 19 you.
- 20 MR. ZAMBON: There's three of us. Three of us in 21 West Michigan all in one room.
- 22 | Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) All right. So it's minimal information.
- 23 | And then there were four Facebook accounts opened by Mr. Muse?
- 24 A. That's my understanding of how many are attributed to him,

- 1 Q. Do you know if the same information was used to open each
- 2 account?
- 3 A. You're saying like the listed name --
- 4 Q. Correct.
- 5 A. -- of the user? No, it was not the same on any of them.
- 6 Q. What names were used?
- 7 A. So the first one was Mohamud A. Muse ending with an A.
- 8 Q. The second one, do you know?
- 9 A. Yes, Abu Usama. So A-B-U U-S-A-M-A.
- 10 ||Q|. And the third?
- 11 A. The third was Abu Osama with an O. So O-S-A-M-A.
- And then the fourth I don't remember the name off the top
- 13 of my head.
- 14 | Q. All right. Now, were these the names of the -- you used
- some term last week like an ISIS fighter name or something like
- 16 that.
- 17 | A. The latter two were made, and then ISIS we talked about
- 18 | kunya, K-U-N-Y-A.
- 19 Q. Kunya. That's the term. What is that term again? What
- 20 does that mean? Is that a fighter name for --
- 21 A. It's your ISIS fighter name.
- 22 | Q. Who gives you that? Or do you just pick out one?
- 23 A. You select it yourself. You decide what your fighter name
- 24 | is going to be.
- 25 ||Q|. The first Facebook account was closed when?

- A. It was closed around July of 2017.
- 2 | Q. And when was it -- the second one opened?
 - A. Right around July of 2017.
- 4 Q. Do you know when that second one was closed?
- 5 A. To the best of my recollection maybe like Octoberish of
- 6 2017. It wasn't open for very long. A couple of months.
- 7 | Q. Did Facebook close that one down also?
- 8 A. It did.

- 9 Q. All right. And the third one was opened?
- 10 A. The third one was opened in November of 2018.
- 11 | Q. Closed down by Facebook when, do you know?
- 12 A. It has not been closed down.
- 13 Q. What about the fourth one?
- 14 A. What --
- 15 | Q. You said the fourth account.
- 16 A. Yes. I'm sorry.
- 17 \parallel Q. When was that opened?
- 18 A. You're correct. The third account was closed. The fourth
- 19 account was opened in December of 2018. So Facebook closed all
- 20 three accounts that preceded the fourth one.
- 21 Q. Were there any contacts with your UCEs on every account,
- 22 every of the four accounts?
- 23 A. There was. There was contact between UCEs on all four of
- 24 those Facebook accounts, yes.
- 25 ||Q| Was it just UCE-1 or had UCE-2, 3, 4, and 5, et cetera,

1 jumped in?

- 2 A. Again, to the best of my recollection, because there was a
- 3 | lot of communication, UCE-1 would have probably been exclusive
- 4 to just the first two accounts, and then UCE-2 for the second
- 5 two accounts.
- 6 Q. When an account was closed, let's say account number 1 was
- 7 closed, did UCE-1 then try -- or did UCE-1 initiate contact
- 8 to -- with Mr. Muse in account number 2?
- 9 A. Yes. Yes.
- 10 | Q. What about when account 2 was closed and account 3 was
- 11 pened, did a UCE initiate contact then?
- 12 A. So that would have been the reverse. That would have been
- 13 contact being initiated by the Abu Osama account to UCE-2.
- 14 Q. All right. And then what about when that third one was
- 15 closed and the fourth one was opened, who initiated the
- 16 contact?
- 17 | A. That would have been the fourth account initiating contact
- 18 with Undercover Employee 2.
- 19 | Q. You obtained a number of search warrants out of this case;
- 20 | is that correct?
- 21 A. When you say a number, like just give me a sense of what
- 22 you mean.
- 23 Q. Well, a dozen or so. Twelve or so.
- 24 A. All the way through the events of January 21st of this
- 25 year, that's correct.

- 1 Q. Correct. Were all of these search warrants obtained
- 2 | through the Western District of Michigan?
- 3 A. Yes, they were.
- 4 | Q. Nothing in Omaha, Nebraska, or Miami?
- $5 \parallel A$. No. None.
- 6 Q. Let's go to some of the exhibits here. Do you have your
- 7 | exhibit book up there?
- 8 A. I do, sir.
- 9 Q. There's mention of the word "kuffar" through several of the
- 10 exhibits, K-U-F-F-A-R.
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 | Q. And I know you explained that before. What is that
- 13 exactly?
- 14 A. Again, in my understanding, that's the Arabic word for
- 15 nonbeliever or disbeliever. Someone who does not believe in
- 16 Islam.
- 17 Q. Does that refer to the universal nonbeliever like in any
- 18 country in the world or just in particular areas?
- 19 A. It's my understanding it's universal. Anyone that's not --
- 20 | that basically is not a follower of Islam.
- 21 ||Q|. A typical exchange here -- or maybe that's a bad way of
- 22 | saying it. Go to Exhibit 15, if you would, please. The way I
- 23 understand it, the first page I've got, which is page 110, you
- 24 | start at the bottom and you work your way up to the top and
- 25 then you flip the page over and 109, is that how it works? Or

1 do I have it backwards?

- 2 A. No, you have it correct. So Facebook produces the records
- 3 | from the most recent to the oldest. But the page order, in
- 4 order to follow along, would require what you just described.
- 5 Q. Okay. And that's what it appears to me. Just looking at
- 6 the times that are listed, the oldest time, 17:03:02, and you
- 7 get to the top it's about five minutes later. You go to the
- 8 bottom of 109 at 17:07:36 and you work your way up. That's
- 9 | right?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 | Q. I do have that right. Good.
- 12 Is this a complete record of all of the transactions or
- 13 texts or whatever they are, or did you just cherry pick these
- 14 out between Mr. Muse and your undercover people?
- 15 A. When you say cherry pick, what do you mean?
- 16 ||Q| Well, at one point in here it says "Well, what do you mean?
- 17 | I got a little busy, akhi." And there's, you know, a little
- 18 bit of a time break there. So were there other texts in
- 19 between those two?
- 20 A. For this particular exchange?
- 21 | Q. Yeah. Well, is this particular exchange -- were other
- 22 people texting, or whatever you want to call it, with Mr. Muse
- 23 there in this time frame that are not listed here on this
- 24 | exhibit?
- 25 A. Again, there are literally hundreds of thousands of pages,

```
CROSS-EXAMINATION OF PAUL DUNHAM
```

- so I don't know off the top of my head if there are other 1
- things -- you're saying are there other things happening 2
- simultaneously? 3
- Right. 4 Q.
- I would have to reference that material. I don't know. 5
- 6 Okay. It's a little confusing because, you know, there's a
- time gap there of, you know, seven minutes. He said, "What you 7
- mean? Sorry, got a little busy, akhi." 8
- Do you see that on page 109 about the third one down? 9
- A . 10 I do, from the top.
- 11 Q. Right.
- 12 A . I do.
- 13 Q. Okay. Now --
- 14 MS. CHARTIER: Your Honor, I apologize for
- 15 interrupting. Would it be possible -- is there a sweatshirt or
- 16 something for Mr. Haji? He's been shivering because he's cold.
- 17 I don't know if there's anything that we could put over him.
- 18 No? Okay.
- 19 THE COURT: I think I have something. All right?
- 20 Hang on.
- 21 MS. CHARTIER: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 22 Sorry, Mr. Zambon.
- 23 THE COURT: I don't think he wants to wear a black
- 24 robe.
- 25 MR. ZAMBON: I'm almost done. I don't anticipate

being much longer either, so . . .

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

THE COURT: Mr. Zambon, you're not in any hurry.

Nobody is going to rush you here. There are important issues at stake here. Please take your time.

MR. ZAMBON: No, that's -- it's more for the defendant's sake.

THE COURT: It is a little chilly in here.

You may proceed, Mr. Zambon.

MR. ZAMBON: Thank you.

- Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) Now, the reason I'm bringing that up is
- 11 because there was, I think it was paragraph 31 of the
- 12 | Complaint, a passage about my client having just been married.
- 13 Are you familiar with that passage?
- 14 A. Yes. I'm flipping to it right now, but I am aware that he
- 15 was recently married.
- 16 Q. And that's a correct statement, right? He was just
- 17 recently married?
- 18 A. Yes. I don't see that reflected in paragraph 31, but if
- 19 you're asking, yes, it's my understanding he was married in the
- 20 summer of 2018.
- 21 | Q. And do you know if his now wife is pregnant?
- 22 A. That's my understanding, yes.
- 23 Q. And he wrote that he would travel to Somalia to join ISIS
- 24 soon after the birth of his child.
- 25 Was there, to your knowledge, an exchange about, well, why

- 1 did he have to wait until after the birth of your child? Why
- 2 don't you come on now?
- 3 A. Was there an exchange between whom?
- 4 | Q. Well, between whoever is -- UCE-2 I suppose it is and
- 5 Mr. Muse.
- 6 A. And I'm sorry, so your question is what then?
- 7 \mathbb{Q} . Okay. Well, do you know if -- it appears to be some kind
- 8 of reluctance to travel to Somalia by Mr. Muse at the present
- 9 time on December 17th. Correct? Because he's not -- he's
- 10 going to wait until after his child is born.
- 11 A. Right. That's what Mr. -- that's what Mohamud Muse is
- 12 citing to UCE-2, yes.
- 13 Q. Did UCE respond to that?
- 14 A. There was a lot of discussion between UCE-2 and
- 15 | Mohamud Muse about that topic.
- 16 Q. Well, about -- right about December 17th, you know, I know
- 17 | there's a lot of conversations, but about that particular
- 18 exchange, like waiting until the child is born.
- 19 A. That was part of what was discussed, yes.
- 20 | Q. Okay. And what was discussed? What did UCE-2 say?
- 21 A. Um . . .
- 22 \mathbb{Q} . Are we again --
- 23 A. No. I don't want the material to get too embarrassing.
- 24 | But if you're fine, I can share it. But there are definitely
- 25 people in the courtroom that it could be embarrassing for.

1 | Q. Okay. Fair enough. I appreciate that.

A couple more questions. Do you have any knowledge of my client trying to recruit people to join ISIS other than his codefendants?

A. I do.

2

3

4

5

6

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. In the United States?
- 7 | A. Um -- yes.
- 8 | Q. And when was that?
 - A. Again we're going to get into --
- 10 | Q. Okay.
- 11 A. We're going to get into that material.
- 12 Q. And can you -- was it an extensive effort? Without parsing what "extensive" means.

THE COURT: The Court won't consider this. In terms of today's purpose in determining whether the government has sustained its burden for pretrial detention, I'm not going to consider that evidence.

MR. ZAMBON: Okay.

THE COURT: Any evidence that cannot be explored because it is classified will remain unspoken, but the Court is not going to rely upon it. At the end of the day the Court has to be satisfied that the defendants' due process rights have been preserved.

Go ahead, Mr. Zambon.

Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) The Secretary of State has listed an FTO,

- CROSS-EXAMINATION OF PAUL DUNHAM correct? And it's the Islamic State, ISIL, ISIS, et cetera. 1 2 Are they all one in the same? A. So there are various names by which ISIS is known, yes. 3 So those are all like synonyms. 4 So ISIS is like the umbrella, the group, and then other 5 6 people -- and they call themselves other names? A. So it would start with the Islamic State of Iraq and the 7 8 Levant or the Islamic State of Iraq and Al-Sham. That's how you get to ISIL and ISIS respectively. And then it starts to 9 10 tread into some of the Arabic words like Daesh, dawla, 11 et cetera. Other names that they are known by in other 12 languages. 13 Is there a relationship to Somalia in all of this? 14 A. So ISIS declared a caliphate, another welayah -- I 15 shouldn't say caliphate -- a welayah, another province in 16 Somalia, so ISIS al Somal, is the Somali province of ISIS. 17 MR. ZAMBON: If I may have just a minute, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Certainly. 19 MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor. I think that 20 wraps it up. 21 I have a couple of questions I want to THE COURT:
 - THE COURT: Special Agent Dunham, I believe you previously testified that undercover cooperating employee 1

Okay.

MR. ZAMBON:

ask, Mr. Zambon, and I'll give you an opportunity to follow up.

22

23

24

25

became involved June 21st of 2017.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Was introduced, I should say, more precisely.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.

THE COURT: And you've testified here that there was an undercover cooperating employee before UCE-1. Was that -- was that undercover cooperating employee actively in communication with any of the defendants?

THE WITNESS: The first party? I think we started to come up with our own nomenclature, I think it was something like the preundercover employee 1, was not in contact with the other two, no.

THE COURT: What I want to clear up is at what point was there active FBI involvement and communications with any of the defendants?

THE WITNESS: With any of them? It started in -- around March of 20 -- March of 2017.

THE COURT: All right. Now, the other question I have relates to something that Mr. Zambon was asking about. These Facebook records that are exhibits, for example, Exhibit 15, it lists a number of entries with dates and times. Do these records, to the extent we have them, reflect all the communications during that date and time? In other words, if there was somebody else that was -- I don't know if texting is

the right word -- communicating on Facebook with Mr. Muse Muse, for example, would that be on this page or this only contains communications between these individuals?

THE WITNESS: So Exhibit 15, as an example, is solely communications between the profile Abu Osama and Ebrahim Salmujahid al muhajir.

THE COURT: Understood. Thank you.

Anything further, Mr. Zambon?

- Q. (BY MR. ZAMBON) And is it the complete communication or were some not inserted here because you did not think they were important for the purpose of today?
- A. You're saying is this a complete communication? Like is there a reason to think that this doesn't run chronologically?
- Q. Not chronologically but completely. In other words, were there any other communications between these two people in this time frame that are not in there because they might be talking about something that you do not think was important to put in here?
 - A. So these excerpts were solely for the purpose of demonstrating either danger to the community or risk of flight. So these were basically passages we were trying to get material that was on point for the purpose of the hearing.
 - Q. Okay. Just for -- okay. I think you answered my question.

 MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor.
 - THE COURT: You're welcome, Mr. Zambon.

Mr. West or Mr. O'Connor, redirect? 1 MR. O'CONNOR: No further questions, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 May this weapon -- weapon -- this witness be excused? 4 All right, Special Agent, you may step down. 5 6 Any further proofs or proffer, Mr. O'Connor? 7 MR. O'CONNOR: Yes, Your Honor. We would like to introduce some evidence through proffer. We have no other live 8 9 witnesses today. 10 THE COURT: Okay. MR. O'CONNOR: I'll start by proffering what's been 11 12 marked as Government Exhibit 20. May I approach? 13 THE COURT: You may. 14 MR. O'CONNOR: Your Honor, Government Exhibit 20 is an 15 excerpt from a 2016 report issued by the U.S. Department of 16 Defense. The cover page and page 35 of that report. 17 government proffers the information that appears on the bottom 18 half of Government Exhibit 20 on that page 35 which indicates 19 that approximately half or 50.8 percent of all active-duty 20 enlisted personnel are 25 years of age or younger in the 21 United States military. And I would move Government Exhibit 20 22 into evidence. 23 MR. ZAMBON: I'm not sure I see the relevance. 24 THE COURT: Well, I was going to ask that myself.

Mr. O'Connor, what is the relevance of this?

25

MR. O'CONNOR: We heard a lot of questioning,
Your Honor, last week from defense counsel concerning the ages
of the defendants. There were references to defendants being
teenagers. This evidence will be used by the government to
rebut any argument by defense counsel that these individuals
were of a certain age that does not pose any danger to the
community by the fact of their tender ages, as seemingly argued
through the cross-examination last week.

THE COURT: I'm assuming you're not suggesting enlisted members of our Armed Forces are a danger to the community. The point is that if they are old enough to join the Army, they are old enough to be dangerous?

MR. O'CONNOR: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's of tenuous relevance, I think.

Thank you.

Next.

MR. O'CONNOR: I have other information to proffer,
Your Honor. I don't know if the Court wishes for me to do that
now separate from argument. Or I know typically we tend to
combine proffered information from the background information
compiled by the Probation Office with argument, so I'll defer
to the Court's --

THE COURT: I think in this instance it makes sense to separate the proffered information from argument and we'll go from there.

This Court has to make an individualized assessment, and I don't want things to get blurred.

MR. O'CONNOR: Certainly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you. The government then also proffers information concerning some information provided by the investigation conducted by Pretrial Services.

First, with respect to Mr. Haji, he was arrested on December 26th, 2018, for providing false identification to police. There is a pending criminal matter for his failure to provide his true identity to the police in December of 2018.

With respect to family ties, the government proffers that Defendant Muse Muse is single and has no children.

Defendant Haji has never been married. He has one child age 4 who lives with his mother, not with Mr. Haji. And Mr. Haji sees that child every one to two weeks.

And Defendant Mohamud Muse, as the Court just heard, is married, is expecting his first child in March.

With respect to information relevant to ties to the community, the government submits that all three defendants were born in Africa. With respect to Muse Muse, he does not own a residence. He lives with codefendant Mohamud Muse. He's lived for approximately only two years in the Western District of Michigan. He had a valid U.S. passport. In fact had two passports at the time of the offense.

With respect to Mohamud Muse, he was only living in the Western District of Michigan for approximately two years. Also has a valid U.S. passport and has claimed that it was lost. It was not found, apparently, during any searches in this case. He also does not own his own home. He lives in an apartment.

With respect to Mr. Haji, he entered the United States from Africa in 2004. He also does not own a residence. His history, as the Court just heard through testimony, is very transient. He periodically stays with a friend Nick whose last name is not known. He sometimes stays at his parents' residence. And he does not recall where he lived before moving to Michigan. And he does also have a U.S. passport. And, excuse me, I think I may have misspoke. The testimony earlier was regarding Mohamud Muse and his transient residence.

MR. ZAMBON: Then if you could repeat that, because I was not paying attention because I did not think it applied to my client.

THE COURT: Mr. Zambon is clued in for when he hears his client's name, so would you repeat that, please.

MR. O'CONNOR: I will try to clarify, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. O'CONNOR: With respect to the testimony you just heard regarding Mohamud Muse, he has been very transient. He has moved residences frequently in the last year. Not always

updating his residence on his driver's license.

With respect to Mr. Haji, there's also evidence that he does not own a residence, that he is somewhat transient. He periodically stays with a friend by the first name of Nick. He did not know or would not provide the last name of this individual. That he sometimes stays at his parents' residence. And could not recall where he lived before moving to Michigan five to six years ago. Mr. Haji also has a valid U.S. passport.

With respect to employment, Your Honor, the government proffers that Mohamud Muse was working at WalMart in Grand Ledge before his arrest. Mr. Haji worked at a Meijer Distribution Center in Lansing. With respect to Muse Muse he is unemployed. In fact, it appears he quit his job prior to his departure for what he believed was Somalia.

And finally the government proffers evidence concerning the defendants' records of appearance in court proceedings. With respect to Muse Muse and Mohamud Muse there is no history, so we simply don't know. There is no history of appearing when required to appear.

And with respect to Mr. Haji, there is a record. We have evidence of a failure to pay fines and costs for failing to display a valid license, and he failed to appear in state court on December 18th, 2018, at which time a show cause order was entered.

Thank you, Your Honor. With that the government rests 1 2 its case on detention. THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. O'Connor. 3 Who would like to go first? Ms. Turek? 4 Your Honor, it's just proffer material. 5 MS. TUREK: 6 THE COURT: Go ahead. 7 MS. TUREK: Some of which is already in the Pretrial Services Report, but I would like to just expand on 8 some of it. 9 10 THE COURT: I'm sorry, Ms. Turek, to interrupt you. Jess, if you hear me, could you bring me my iPad, 11 12 please. 13 Go ahead, Ms. Turek. 14 MS. TUREK: Thank you. My client was born in Kenya. 15 He just turned 20 about a week and a half ago. He has a high 16 school diploma from Eastern High School in the Lansing area. 17 He took classes for one semester at L tri C, Lansing Community 18 Court -- Lansing Community College. 19 He became a naturalized citizen in this country in 20 either 2013 or '14. He has a large family. His parents are 21 here in this country, and he is one of 11 children. He's not 22 married. Has -- nor has he any children. He has no prior 23 criminal history. He has no substance abuse or alcohol issues. 24 He's in good physical health. He maintained a checking account

as noted in the Pretrial Services Report with modest means.

25

And that would be by way of proffer, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Ms. Turek.

MS. TUREK: Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Chartier.

MS. CHARTIER: Thank you, Your Honor. By way of proffer, some of the information is listed in the Presentence Investigation Report. Mr. Haji was employed at the Meijer Distribution Center for approximately five years. He worked an average of between 32 and 40 hours a week. He has extended family in Michigan, some of whom are in the courtroom today, including his parents. He was in the process of purchasing a home on Bement Street in Lansing.

THE COURT: When you say he was in the process, what do you mean?

MS. CHARTIER: I believe he had given some money to the individuals, and it seemed like it might have been something along like of a land contract.

THE COURT: I see. Okay.

MS. CHARTIER: As it relates to the allegations of a criminal history, I would point out that it was a traffic offense in May of 2018, and his failure to appear was actually failure to pay fines and costs. And then he was arrested on that.

The December 2018 for providing false identification to the police, it appears that that was a false name, and it

was Mr. Haji's nickname. So he did use Haji when he provided that information to the police. We're trying to get those records. But Mr. Haji was actually the passenger in a vehicle, and we have been unable to ascertain why the vehicle was even stopped by the police.

I will point out that on the Register of Actions no attorney was appointed to represent Mr. Haji. Generally what that means in Ingham County is that the court would not be placing Mr. Haji into custody even if he were to be convicted of the offense.

Mr. Haji is a United States citizen. His passport is, I believe, at a residence. His residence can be verified by his family, again whom are in the courtroom today. He does have one child and he's in a committed relationship with the child's mother. His ties to a foreign country are only that he was born there, but, again, he is a United States citizen. The pending charge, again, is a misdemeanor for which there would be no jail time allotted.

THE COURT: The pending charge in Ingham County?

MS. CHARTIER: In Ingham County District Court. It's a misdemeanor.

And I have nothing else to proffer. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Chartier.

Mr. Zambon.

MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor. My client has no ties to a foreign country. I have received prior to court, just prior to court this afternoon, his Certificate of Citizenship which shows that he is a citizen of the United States. I have that in my hand if the Court would like to look at that.

THE COURT: It is not necessary. It's in the Pretrial Services Report too, Mr. Zambon.

MR. ZAMBON: I believe in the Criminal Complaint it's stated that my client is a derivative citizen of the United States, which means to me that he has obtained citizenship. Derivative I think would be kind of like a chain migration they might call it, and we all know that the president's inlaws are citizens of the United States and are probably derivative. So I think that --

THE COURT: As I understand it, Mr. Zambon, a derivative citizenship means he was a minor at the time his parents became a citizen and he obtained the citizenship with their naturalization.

MR. ZAMBON: That's what I understand.

THE COURT: I try to avoid any discussion --

MR. ZAMBON: Okay.

THE COURT: -- that relates to any political topics.

MR. ZAMBON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

And I also have received his passport, which

Agent Dunham testified that there was no travel outside the United States. That's verified by the passport I have in my hand which I'll gladly turn over to pretrial release people to assure that he has does not travel outside the United States. But the passport itself shows no travel outside of the United States.

He has a verified address. I'm not sure why the Pretrial Release Report says unverified address. The police went there pursuant to a search warrant and searched his house.

He has a driver's license. There is listed on a driver's license, which is in the possession of the police, I understand that not only is the address on the driver's license but there's another address on the back of the license which shows that he does -- when he does move, he does attempt to change his address. Although I do think that he moved within the last 30 days and had not gotten around to changing his address a final time. But it's the same address where his wife, pregnant wife lives.

So he did not use an alias to -- for false identification. I'm not sure where that came from. I asked the agent that. He did not attempt to use false identification -- or an alias to obtain false identification.

He has financial ties to the Western District. He works. He has bank accounts. He has been employed at several places in the Lansing area. It's the first time I've heard of

the lack of a record as being a reason to think he won't appear. Usually that's a good thing. But also the fact that he lives in an apartment at age 23, I hate to tell you how old I was before I bought my first home, but it was substantially more than age 23, Your Honor. So I would -- I believe that's the extent of my proffer.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zambon.

Argument, Mr. O'Connor?

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

In this case there is no condition or combination of conditions that would reasonably assure the appearance of the defendants as required and to ensure the safety of any other person in the community.

As Your Honor pointed out this morning, we do have a presumption of detention in this case due to the grand jury finding of probable cause to indict each defendant of a terrorist offense, Title 18 §3142(e)(3)(B) and (C) both give us the presumption of detention in this case.

As this Court well knows, that means each defendant has the burden to produce evidence that he is not a flight risk or a danger to the community. Importantly, however, as the Sixth Circuit has told us in the Stone case that Your Honor cited also at the beginning of today's session, even if the defendants present some evidence to rebut the burden of detention, the presumption does not disappear. The presumption

becomes a factor that this Court should take into consideration. And that's because Congress has, in Congress's judgment, they decided that a particular class of defendants and types of cases should ordinarily be detained pending trial. So to the extent this Court finds that the rebuttable presumption has been rebutted, it's still a factor that the government requests this Court take into consideration.

The evidence that we have provided to the Court through the agent's testimony, the entire Complaint Affidavit which is in evidence, as well as the exhibits that were admitted into evidence at the last session, establishes clear and convincing evidence that the safety of the community cannot be assured and that there's a preponderance of the evidence that the defendants will not appear as required.

Simply put, the evidence in this case, Your Honor, shows that the defendants stated in their own words that if they were not able to travel to make hijrah to Somalia to join a fight with ISIS, they had a plan B. They talked about it. This plan was to attack nonbelievers. There were references to using vehicles and driving vehicles to attack nonbelievers. In their own words this Court heard them talk about their plan. So the fact that they were stopped and that Muse Muse was stopped specifically on January 21st from traveling to Mogadishu doesn't mean he's not a danger to the community. He's more of a danger to the United States now that his plan to

make hijrah has been thwarted. And the other defendants, as the evidence shows, joined him in his beliefs.

So we look at the factors that the Court should consider in this case. The nature and circumstances of the offense charged. We know Section 2339B is a federal crime of terrorism. And we know that there's a presumption of detention in a case like this.

With regard to the nature and seriousness of the danger to the community or any person, if any of these individuals were released, the Court saw through repeated exhibits, through a long period of time, Facebook communications, both between the defendants and in communications with FBI undercover employees, indicating their strong desire to either make hijrah and travel to join ISIS or to kill anyone, the kuffar, anyone who doesn't share their extremist Islam ideology.

Exhibits 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, those exhibits are all conversations between the defendants. Not conversations with undercover FBI employees. The record is full of examples of these defendants talking on their own about their desire to join ISIS, or if they can't do that, to kill nonbelievers here in the United States.

We heard evidence concerning the defendants' naturalized citizenship. Well, Your Honor, from the government's perspective that doesn't mean very much. Not when

you have evidence that each individual defendant recorded their own bay's video pledging allegiance not to the United States, not to the country that has conferred citizenship on them, but to ISIS, the terrorist organization that they wanted to join and fight with. So the fact that these individuals are naturalized citizens really doesn't give this Court much comfort when they have effectively renounced their citizenship by pledging allegiance to an enemy of the United States.

I think there are a few exhibits that the Court should pay particular attention to. Exhibit 3 in June of 2017, Mohamud Muse and Mr. Haji are communicating and they are referring with each other to speaking to a mujahid. And Mr. Haji says "I pray Allah gives the mujahideen the victory. Insha'Allah, always victory, Allah. And we are next to step up on the battlefield." This is back in June of 2017.

Before that in January of 2017, as the Court knows through the Complaint Affidavit in paragraph 12, Mr. Haji and Mohamud Muse are talking about how great these ISIS videos are that they are seeing. That they love it. They love how ISIS burned people. Haji wrote to Mohamud Muse: "He put fuel on that dude while he's burning. That's funny, dude." That's the mind-set of these individuals all the way back in January of 2017.

Mohamud Muse in June of 2017 expressly stated he planned to die with a gun in his hand fighting for ISIS.

In November of 2017 Muse Muse sent Mr. Haji a screen capture by Messenger -- again, this is not communications with FBI undercovers, these are communications with each other -- where Muse Muse sends a picture of that Tribeca truck attack in New York City on Halloween in 2017. And then they talk about what's happened the day before. And they talk about real civil war. "And if this doesn't wake the people up, nothing will. This is a call for hijrah. We can't live here. I'm trying to plan for hijrah now."

In March of 2018 in Exhibit 6 we see another conversation between Mr. Haji and Muse Muse. This is the exhibit that contains the picture of the slaughtered goat. And the context of delivering that picture was Mr. Haji saying "I want to catch kuffar," nonbelievers, "and do my jihad training on them. That would be in dawla," or ISIS.

In April of 2018 in Exhibit 7 Muse Muse is talking again with Mr. Haji and they are talking about ISIS videos and how hot they are. And Muse Muse says "You're absolutely right. Seeing those heads getting cut off heals the heart and makes me want to be with them more. May Allah make us steadfast upon this" -- a word I don't understand -- "until we are in the ranks of the khalifa and until we die." Again, not conversations with the FBI.

There's repeated examples, and I won't burden the Court going through each and every exhibit that the government

introduced, where there was conversation along these same lines. How they want to kill the kuffar. They want a lot of the kuffar dead.

There's conversations about martyrdom operations using a vehicle. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji in August of 2018 exchanged a series of conversations back and forth about how great it was that Muse Muse could drive now so that he could drive that stashahadi, which is the word for martyrdom, car, right.

There is one example the Court should consider in a conversation with an FBI undercover and that occurred in November of 2018. That's Exhibit 12. Muse Muse said to the undercover FBI employee "I've come this far. I'm not letting the kuffar stop me now. I swear to Allah I'd never go to jail. It's either hijrah or shahad." Which as you heard from the agent means death of a martyr.

He's told this Court in his own words, "If I can't get to Mogadishu, Somalia, and join ISIS, I'm not going to jail.

It's either hijrah or martyrdom." And they talked about the martyrdom that they were contemplating. There were references to the Paris attacks. There were references to vehicles. And that's the plan B that should shake everybody in this courtroom, to hear in their own words what their plans were if they couldn't make it to join ISIS. Muse Muse explained in December of 2018, "I was the first." Yet there are a lot of conversations between Muse Muse and Mr. Haji, I concede that

there are not quite as many -- because, of course, as the Court knows, Muse Muse and Mohamud Muse lived together -- so I understand some kids sit around the dinner table and text each other at the table, but we're not seeing as many conversations on Facebook Messenger. Probably because they lived together.

THE COURT: Well, that doesn't happen at my house,
Mr. O'Connor, and I'm not going to speculate about what happens
in someone else's house.

MR. O'CONNOR: Well, it doesn't happen in my house,
Your Honor, either because I don't have kids. But the point
is, there are lots of conversations between two of the
defendants. But make no mistake, Mohamud Muse makes it very
clear what his -- what his interest is with ISIS here. We saw
that all the way back in January of 2017. In fact, it's his
postings and comments in support of ISIS that launched this
whole investigation.

But jumping forward to December of 2018, Mohamud Muse has a conversation in Exhibit 15 with the FBI undercover employee and he describes his full understanding of dawla. And he says "I was supporting ISIS in my family before anyone else did. I just want Islam to win. I want to kill kuffar." And that's also in the Indictment -- or in the Complaint Affidavit at paragraph 29.

And if we haven't heard enough already, we know in December of 2018 on the 14th Muse Muse and Mr. Haji met with

somebody that they thought they were trying to recruit. So we have another element of danger in the community. We have evidence that these guys thought that UCE-3, an FBI undercover, was somebody that they could recruit to join them and join ISIS and to travel with them. In fact, Muse Muse thought he was going to the Gerald Ford Airport on December 21st to meet UCE-3. And they have a meet-up. The meet-up was their idea, not the undercover's. The undercover didn't suggest this. These guys say, "Hey, we want to meet." So they make arrangements to meet with the undercover officer in Benton Harbor, Michigan, where they helped him make his own pledge of allegiance to ISIS.

So we have expressions out of their mouths to each other about what they want to do and what they are going to do if they can't do it. And now we see them trying to recruit other people to do this. And what's really frightening about that interaction, Your Honor, is that on December 14th, 2018, Muse Muse says to the undercover FBI if he's not able to make hijrah, he's going to take a car and run down the kuffar. And he makes a reference to what happened in France. And Muse Muse and Mr. Haji stated that Allah commanded that martyrdom is the only option. And that's in paragraph 30 of the Complaint Affidavit.

And it doesn't stop there. This goes on. There are opportunities left and right from even before January of 2017,

but through 2017 and through 2018 and now into 2019 in January multiple opportunities for them to say "Wait a second. I'm not doing this. This is crazy. I don't know what I was thinking. We shouldn't be doing this. This isn't the right thing to do. We shouldn't be talking about running down nonbelievers. We shouldn't talk about joining ISIS."

But we know what happens in January. On January 9th, 2019, there's a conversation about -- from Mohamud Muse to FBI UCE-2 that he might have to leave his wife behind. He's at the point he's so dedicated to this, Your Honor -- we've heard this afternoon he's so dedicated to this, every time Facebook shuts down his account, he's opening a new one. He's not giving up. He's dedicated. He's determined to do this. He's following through. He changes the information. He changes his alias. They come up with these kunya names. They open up new Facebook accounts in these kunya names. This is dedication that these individuals have shown.

And on January 15th again Muse Muse and Mr. Haji meet up with the person they think they are recruiting to join Muse Muse to join ISIS in Somalia. They meet UCE-3 at a WalMart in Lansing to shop for supplies so they'd have in this case boots for the trip. And what happens again? Another frightening conversation. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji tell the FBI undercover that if they failed in their attempt to join ISIS, they would conduct an attack or a martyrdom operation. And

again there's a reference to France, to the terror attack in Paris. And that appears in paragraph 45 of the Affidavit.

Your Honor, these men have demonstrated to you through their own words with each other that they cannot be released. If this Court releases any of these defendants, the next step is grabbing a vehicle and running down kuffar. And you know that because they told you that that's what they would do. The government asks for detention pending trial in this matter. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. O'Connor.
Ms. Turek.

MS. TUREK: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, of the factors that you must consider, I'm going to start with the personal history and characteristics of my client. And I do that for a special reason. As we heard, he's young. He just turned 20 about a week and a half ago. When this -- when the FBI became involved in this case, you know, he was 16, 17 years old. He graduated from Eastern High School. Learned the language. Has a semester -- some classes at a community college. Has some employment record, although not as much as the others, perhaps because he's younger. He has a very supportive family. They were in the courtroom last week at the hearing. Many are back here today.

THE COURT: I remember you pointing them out.

MS. TUREK: Yes. Thank you. And many are still here

today.

He comes from a large family, and they are more than willing to have him stay with them should the Court release him.

He has no issues with substance abuse or alcohol. No mental health issues. And no prior record. Which I've always argued is a good thing, Your Honor, although today the government is arguing that not having contact is a bad thing. But he does have a very close family.

This young man with no criminal history is the man that the FBI, in my opinion, recruited for this conjured-up offense. And I don't say that lightly.

Since 2016 the FBI has been communicating with my client and the others. Since 2016 they have been putting ideas in the heads of these -- of my client. Even when -- even when it appeared to my client's father that something was wrong and he took my client's passport, the government still kept -- they were aware of it, but they still kept at my client. Since 2016. We're now in January of 2019. And for all that time, even though there were these communications which are not flattering to my client, nevertheless the government saw no -- were not concerned enough to make any arrests at that time. Some of these conversations, Facebook posts, are from a number of years back already and yet the government has not seen fit to arrest my client prior to just a few weeks ago.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My client has never been accused of having any sort of weapon. In the four years as -- four years -- almost four years since this case has been going on, my client took none of the steps that may have been the topics in some of the Facebook posts, but yet the FBI is cheerleading these guys on. And I think once we do find and have a chance to read all the Facebook posts, we're going to get a better picture of who was suggesting what to whom.

And we know that the government was putting thoughts in the heads of my client and the others because for the longest time there was -- the first Muse Facebook account, that was in existence well beyond April of 2016 -- well, before April of 2016 when it first came to the attention of the FBI. When in two thousand -- in June of 2017, when UCE-1 became involved, within a month that is when the Facebook account was suspended. So I think that what that demonstrates is that although there may have been some chatter and some conversations going back and forth about ISIS, it was only after the FBI became involved, until they began to focus those conversations and direct and steer those conversations that Facebook saw a reason to suspend the account. And I think that's very important because I think that demonstrates that the FBI wasn't just a passive listener or a passive reader of Facebook postings. They were putting ideas and putting things in motion until they had enough to charge my client.

It almost seems in just listening to the evidence last Friday, in looking at the limited discovery that we have, which consists right now of the exhibits, it almost seems that last November or December the government decided, hey, we have to ratchet things up. We have to get these guys to move because we want to make an arrest after three years or three and a half years. That's really what it seems to me when you look at this.

As I said, they were not concerned before that. There were these Facebook postings going on for years and the government took no action to stop them. It was only after -- they were only arrested after the government made it possible for an offense to be charged.

What I mean by that is take the idea of the passport. My client, as we heard the agent testify last week, they could have -- the FBI could have stopped my client from getting the passport. They didn't. They wanted him to get a passport. In fact, after they learned that his first passport was lost and he had applied for a second one, there was another opportunity, and he was issued that passport within two days.

Now, I've had the opportunity to apply for passports in my day because I like to travel, and I've also paid extra to have an expedited passport delivered to me at times. But it's not within two days.

The money. My client had no money to take a trip to

the east coast let alone halfway across the world. He didn't have the funds. Who supplied the funds? The government did. So it's the government that every step of the way was getting my client deeper and deeper involved in this and actually taking steps until they felt that they had enough to charge my client.

So, Your Honor, I think that's very important when you look at this and when you consider whether he's a danger or whether he will appear in court. I do believe that there are conditions that would secure his appearance here in court as well as provide the Court with some understanding that he would not be a -- pose a threat or a danger to the community, and I would suggest curfew or tether. No computer access. My client would gladly turn over his passport.

And as I've noted, he has a lot of family with whom he could reside during the pendency of this case. But I believe there are those conditions that the Court could impose.

Because as I see it, but for the government's involvement, but for the government's prodding of my client, of the FBI cheerleading him on to become more involved in this matter, he would still be working at Meijer's in all likelihood and perhaps looking to take additional classes at Lansing Community College. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Turek.

Ms. Chartier.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. CHARTIER: Thank you, Your Honor. Words spoken on a public forum are not a crime, and words spoken to individuals privately are not a crime. Even when they express beliefs that are anti-American and are pro-ISIS. The agent when I asked him questions last week said words are not a crime. If any steps were taken here that the government wants to indicate or craft into a crime, it's because the government urged them to be taken. Even in the limited context that we have of the In Exhibit 15 it's the government who asks: "Can exhibits. you get more people?" It's the government who says "Your situation is holding you back." That's not a government agent who is sitting passively by and waiting for individuals to express their willingness to act. This is the government actively encouraging individuals to participate in what they will later deem to be a crime.

In three years there were no steps taken until the government, as Ms. Turek indicates, seems to believe this is taking too long and so instead of just sending money to Mr. Muse, they decide to send a little bit to each individual so that way they can say they put their words and beliefs into action. All because the government decides to send money to a young man who didn't have it himself.

Mr. O'Connor said, "Well, Mr. Haji said 'We're the next to step up' in June of 2017." And you know what never happens? Mr. Haji doing anything to step up that's pro-ISIS.

He commits no crime at that point. In a year and a half. He is a passenger in a car that takes Mr. Muse Muse to the airport and ostensibly he provides the \$300 that were sent to him by the government to Mr. Muse Muse for his ticket. A roundtrip ticket we learned today. The FBI has provided a limited context for these conversations, but what we do know is that they encouraged these young men to get deeper and deeper. And then now the government wants to say that they are a threat to the community. And Mr. O'Connor says "Well, the next step is driving a car into a crowd." In three years not one of these young men has ever even done anything to indicate that that's what they would actually do.

This Court can dislike their words. This Court can dislike their sentiments. This Court can dislike their beliefs. But those are not crimes. And those are not reasons that these young men, and specifically Mr. Haji, should remain in jail.

Mr. Haji had a job for approximately five years working day after day after day at the Meijer warehouse.

That's not an individual who is doing anything more than being a productive member of the community.

His family was here last week. His family is here today. He can stay with his family if this Court releases him. He has a minimal criminal history. And he has, again, a place to live. To fault Mr. Haji for not having more money in the

bank or more financial or property ties faults poor people for being poor. You know who has a lot of money in the bank? People who make a lot of money. That's not someone who is working a minimum-wage job at Meijer.

Mr. Haji should not be faulted because he does not have more property and financial ties to the community. What he should be applauded for is having a job, having a family. And the only reason that he sits here today is because the government got tired of monitoring conversations and wanted to ratchet things up and bring an end to this investigation.

I would ask the Court to consider the full picture of what has occurred in this case. I would ask the Court to not be swayed by sentiments as stated by Mr. O'Connor, that the next step is a vehicle being driven into a crowd, which is purely meant to prey on the emotions of the Court. There's no indication that Mr. Haji would do anything of the sort.

Because, again, words are not a crime. And I would ask the Court to consider that there are mechanisms that could be placed into effect to ensure that Mr. Haji is where he needs to be. So, for example, home confinement and a tether that falls short of forcing him to remain in jail until a trial in this case. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Chartier.

Mr. Zambon.

MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor. I adopt the

arguments of fellow counsel here. I'll just add a couple of observations.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. ZAMBON: Mr. O'Connor talked about looking at the nature and circumstances of this case. The nature and the circumstance of the case are set forth in the Indictment where the defendants were supposed to provide material support to a terrorist organization. That material support appeared to be only them, that they wished to go to Somalia to either live there or to fight. Was one of the quotes that we heard last week.

This is a case of all talk and no action. If they had been accused or there was some evidence of, you know, purchasing firearms or explosives or even an automobile or a truck to run over people, we might have something there. But this is talk between the three of them.

As Ms. Chartier says, talk is not a crime. Talk plus something else, perhaps you would have a crime here. I don't believe that the government should view these gentlemen,
Mr. Mohamud Muse especially, as any danger to the community.
In fact, just the opposite. He has no criminal record. He has no ties to a foreign country. He's been in the United States for 15 years. He's been a citizen of the United States. Was willing to give up the passport. He has a verified residence, a pregnant wife. As the Court notes, family in the courtroom

last week and then today.

He has been employed at a number of jobs, which I think is very admirable. And as the Pretrial Release Report indicates, it appears that he becomes employed and then changes jobs in order to better himself to get a higher wage. I believe he was last making about -- well, \$11 an hour at WalMart.

He has ties to the community. Financial ties. The checking account, savings account. There's no indication whatsoever that he had ever dipped into those accounts to, you know, purchase any kind of physical material in support of ISIS. These were conversations mainly between three young people. We didn't hear about any particular conversations with any other known terrorists or anything like that. No action taken by my client.

I think that the Court could safely release

Mr. Mohamud Muse back to his family. He could be monitored

electronically. He could return to his job. He can be there

for the birth of his child here in a month or two. And that

there are a number of combinations that the Court can take into

account to ensure the safety as well as the appearance.

I don't think there's any doubt that he'll appear in court. He has no history of not appearing. In fact, he always appears to go to work. So he does have a history of appearing. Perhaps not in court, which is a good thing, because he has no

record. So I think that the Court can safely release Mr. Mohamud to the community under some kind of conditions. Reporting, curfew, electronic monitoring. And perhaps no communication via the internet. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Zambon.

This matter is governed by the Bail Reform Act of 1984. Pursuant to that statute I must release a defendant on his personal recognizance unless I find that such release will not reasonably assure the appearance of that person as required or will endanger the safety of any other person in the community.

The government has the burdens of proof. First of all, preponderate evidence that an individual poses a significant risk of flight that is more likely than not. And by clear and convincing evidence that the individual poses a danger to the safety of other persons in the community.

Even if the government meets its burden, that does not result in pretrial detention unless the judicial officer also determines that there is no condition or combination of conditions that will address the issue at hand. The statute includes 13 specific conditions the Court is to consider as well as any other the Court can fashion. And in all cases I consider every one of those.

In this case, as I've indicated earlier, the government enjoys a rebuttable presumption under the Bail

Reform Act, specifically Section 3142(e)(3)(C) which references eventually to 18 U.S.C. 2339B, the statute that was allegedly violated here.

As I've indicated, in United States versus Stone the Sixth Circuit ruled that the presentment of a grand jury Indictment is sufficient to trigger the rebuttable presumption. There's no need for a separate judicial determination of probable cause. But the Sixth Circuit in the Stone case also noted that the rebuttable presumption temporarily shifts the burden of production to the defendant, it does not shift the burden of persuasion. That remains with the government.

The Court also held that the burden of production that is shifted to the defendant is not a heavy one, however, the defendant must introduce some evidence to rebut it. It remains, if rebutted, a factor for the Court to consider. And the Sixth Circuit noted in the Stone case that their statutory rebuttable presumption reflects Congress's substantive judgment that particular classes of cases of offenders should be detained prior to trial. And the court also held, and I quote, "To rebut the presumption, therefore, a defendant should present all the special features of his case that take it outside the congressional paradigm." And that is from 9 -- 608 F.3d. at 946. The Sixth Circuit in turn quoting United States versus Jessup, a First Circuit case.

I also note that I must make an individualized

assessment of each of the defendants, and I'm going to do that here.

First of all, with respect to the statutory rebuttable presumption as to significant risk of flight, I find that -I'm going to deal with Mr. Muse Muse first. Again keeping in mind the Sixth Circuit's admonition that this burden is not heavy, and in fact I note that that case involved allegations similar to those in this case, and in fact similar to this one the court found that the presumption had been rebutted. I find that Mr. Muse Muse has rebutted the presumption, keeping in mind that burden is not very heavy, through the information that he is a U.S. citizen, he has extended family and family support here, involvement in employment until very recently. That he's been in school. And there's also some information in the Pretrial Services Report that supports that.

All right. Now, having made that determination -- and the irony here is that it takes little, relatively, to rebut the presumption, but I still have to determine whether the government has met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence, and the irony is sometimes both apply. And I find here that while Mr. Muse Muse rebutted the presumption, the government has met its burden by a preponderance of the evidence that Mr. Muse Muse does pose a significant risk of flight. He has limited property interests and other interests here, although he does have a family that cares about him.

And this will apply to all the defendants. They have demonstrated through the Facebook communications they have a strong interest in leaving this country. They have a strong interest in not returning. They have made oaths to a foreign terrorist organization and committed themselves over and over to leave this country to go and fight for that organization. That's pretty strong incentive to flee. That's certainly preponderance of the evidence.

Now let me deal -- turn to Mr. Haji. I'm going to deal with risk of flight before I deal with danger to the community.

Mr. Haji also has rebutted the statutory presumption with respect to significant risk of flight through his employment, his extended family, his attempts to purchase property. He's a U.S. citizen. Ms. Chartier has represented to me that his residence has been verified. And I trust all the counsel here implicitly in terms of the representations that they make. That's sufficient to rebut the presumption. However, for the same reasons I cited for Mr. Muse Muse, the government has also met its burden of preponderate evidence that he poses a significant risk of flight.

Mr. Mohamud Muse has also rebutted the statutory presumption through the fact that he's a citizen, no significant ties to any foreign country. He is willing to turn his passport over to Pretrial Services. A verified address.

He is married and expecting his first child in March of 2019. For the same reasons I articulated for Mr. Muse Muse, the government has met its burden of a preponderance of the evidence that he poses a significant risk of flight.

Now I will turn to the issue of danger to the community. I find that none of the defendants have rebutted that presumption, even though the burden is not very great. There is little, if any, evidence here that's been offered to the Court that rebuts -- or addresses I should say much less rebuts the issue of danger to the safety of any other person in the community.

Moreover, I find that even if the defendants had rebutted that presumption, the government has met its burden by clear and convincing evidence that each of the defendants pose a danger to others in the community. And I'm going to recount some of the evidence. I'm not going to do it all.

As to Mr. Muse Muse we have a Facebook account. A search warrant was executed -- obtained I should say on March 22nd of this year. The result of which showed multiple communications with Mr. Haji expressing a desire to fight for ISIS. They discuss specific acts of violence. There's a screen capture of the truck attack in New York City which is also demonstrated in the hearing Exhibit Number 4. No evidence of FBI involvement in any of these communications.

And let me mention, by the way, I understand where

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

defense counsel is coming from. This is not a criticism in any way, shape, or form. I've heard -- the elephant in the room here is entrapment, all right? That's not an issue that's That's not an issue that I'm supposed to decide nor before me. could I decide it based upon the record that's before me. I suspect that's going to be an issue Judge Quist is going to decide, and he's going to have a much more complete record upon which to decide it. So I don't want anybody to take anything I'm saying here today one way or the other about what I think of that issue. What I'm focused on is it is relevant to my determination whether a government agent is prompting somebody to say something that then in turn is being used as evidence to demonstrate their violent tendencies or their danger. And so I am focused on that aspect to that extent.

With respect to -- back to Mr. Muse Muse.

February 1st of this year he and Mr. Haji were exchanging messages discussing hijrah. And I also note that there's been contentions about the specific meaning of hijrah and the connotations of that term. I don't think any reasonable impartial person could look at the use of that term in the context of this case and see it as anything other than an interest and intent to fight for ISIS.

March 28th, 2018, Mr. Haji sent a dead goat picture to Mr. Muse Muse and he and Mr. Muse Muse discussed jihad with respect to that. I won't recite all the specific comments.

March 29th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji exchanged Facebook communications discussing ISIS videos decapitating victims, noting that they wanted to be with ISIS and to join in getting victory. This is not about the First Amendment. This is not about whether words are a crime. They are not. This is about whether someone says or does things that would cause this Court to believe they pose a danger to the community. And over and over again we have a number of comments here. And counsel wants me to treat them as just talk. Well, to do that, I have to assume that they were lying, that they were not telling the truth when they made these statements. I have no evidence to base such a conclusion.

July 5th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji were on Facebook sharing a photo of a young martyr and discussing the killing of kuffar, nonbelievers.

August 17th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji again on Facebook. Mr. Muse Muse writes, and I quote, "Hijrah is the only thing," spelling incorrect, "that can save us unless we do istishhadi," martyrdom.

August 31st, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji on Facebook discussing going to Somalia. The fact that law enforcement may be reading their Facebook content. They discussed domestic jihad if placed on the no-fly list. No evidence the FBI put them up to that.

Mr. Muse Muse's Facebook was searched by a warrant

that was issued on October 17th, 2018, which showed exchanges between Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji between August of 2018 and October of that year, including using a vehicle for an attack. I heard no evidence to suggest the FBI ever suggested to any of the defendants that they use vehicles to attack people.

October 18th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse told Undercover Employee Number 2, "I plan on doing hijrah to Somalia and joining those who are establishing the Sharia of Allah."

Now, this was in response to UCE-2's communication regarding the situation in Somalia. The evidence doesn't tell me specifically what that communication was, but I haven't heard any evidence to suggest that the FBI specifically asked them to come to Somalia.

October 30th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse communicated with UCE-2. He wrote he wanted to travel to Somalia to make his bay'a, his oath, allegiance to ISIS, and to fight in the front lines. Mr. Muse Muse stated he would be able to save enough money to join ISIS in six to eight months. The UCE-2 then cautioned Mr. Muse Muse about the steps he needed to take. Now, here, arguably, the FBI is providing information, but there's nothing to suggest or to demonstrate that Mr. Muse Muse was only acting at the direction of any FBI agent.

Mr. Muse Muse sent a video on November 7th, 2018, to UCE-2 with his oaths -- with an oath to ISIS. No evidence that the FBI helped to make that video or told him what to say.

November 15, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse broached the subject of needing financial support. Now, pursuant to that request it seems to have prompted the FBI to offer money to help them make the trip.

November 17th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse sent two videos to UCE-2 containing Mohamud Muse and Mr. Haji's oath of allegiance to ISIS with Mohamud Muse and Haji's -- Mr. Haji's, excuse me -- contact information.

On December 14th of last year Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji met with UCE-3 in Benton Harbor. Both Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji coached UCE-3 through the recitation. Here it looks like Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji are the ones doing the coaching, not the FBI.

December 17th, 2018, the State Department received Mr. Muse Muse's passport application. That could be construed as an action to effect the conspiracy.

December 18th of last year Mr. Muse Muse went to UCE-3 -- sent to him I should say, or her, a link to flights from Chicago to Mogadishu. So apparently the FBI is not the one finding the flights.

December 20th through the 21st of last year

Mr. Muse Muse advised UCE-3 that if their passports arrived

before January 21st they would leave sooner. That they were

booking a flight, that they found a flight at the cost of

\$1,799. Mr. Muse Muse stated that the purchase of the tickets

will be proof of his sincerity.

December 21, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse wrote to UCE-2 and said that he and UCE-3 had found a ticket, gave the dates of travel, and the cost. At that point Mr. Muse Muse requested \$1,200 from who he thought was a representative from ISIS.

January 7th of this year Mr. Muse Muse communicated with UCE-2 that he and UCE-3 were planning to buy tickets and would be on a flight.

Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji met with UCE-3 at WalMart in Lansing and purchased combat-style boots. They also told UCE-3 at that time that if they failed to join ISIS, they would conduct an attack or martyrdom operation, referencing the Paris attack. No evidence the FBI suggested that.

January 21st all three drove to Gerald R. Ford
Airport. Mr. Muse Muse obtained a boarding pass and went
through TSA before he was arrested. After his arrest in a
Mirandized interview he provided a statement saying that he
wanted to join ISIS in Somalia so he wouldn't have to do an
attack in the United States. That is clear and convincing
evidence that Mr. Muse Muse poses a danger to the community.

With respect to Mr. Mohamed Haji, prior to the June 21st, 2017, introduction of UCE-1 Mr. Haji was communicating on Mr. Mohamud Muse's Facebook indicating support and an interest in fighting for ISIS.

June 15th of 2017 Mr. Haji writes, "I pray Allah gives

the mujahideen the victory inshallah. Always victory Ya Allah.

And we are next to step up to the battlefield."

November 1st, 2017, Mr. Muse Muse sent Mr. Haji a screen shot of the truck attack I referenced earlier, which is Exhibit 4. Mr. Haji stated, and I quote, "Real civil war." Mr. Muse Muse stated, "If this don't wake up the people, nothing will." Mr. Haji responded, "Yeah, I'm ready inshallah." God willing. Mr. Haji then added, "This is a call for hijrah." There was no FBI involvement that I could glean from any of that interaction.

February 1st, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji exchanged messages discussing hijrah and Dawla, which is ISIS.

On March 28th, 2018, Mr. Haji sent a dead goat picture as I indicated earlier. Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji discussed jihad. Mr. Haji writes -- wrote, and I quote, "Yeah, next time I want to catch kuffar and do my jihad training on them."

April 29th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji exchanged communications on Facebook discussing ISIS videos decapitating victims, noting that they wanted to be with ISIS and join in getting the victory.

Please note I'm not repeating the comments about whether -- how they felt about that. Ms. Chartier, I think, is the one who made this point. She's right. This Court should not be making decisions of this nature based on any sort of emotion. It's not. This is based upon Mr. Haji's and

Mr. Muse Muse's statements indicating that they had an interest in being involved in such activity.

July 5th, 2018, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji were on Facebook sharing a photo of a young martyr as I said before, and both of them discussing killing kuffar, nonbelievers.

August 31st of last year, Mr. Muse Muse and Mr. Haji were on Facebook discussing going to Somalia. Again discussing the fact that law enforcement reads Facebook contact -- content and their intention to engage in domestic jihad.

And Mr. Haji wrote, and I quote, "I just want to dispatch them to the hellfire." People can have whatever religious or other beliefs they want, but when they express an interest in killing people, that's an interest to this Court.

Mr. Haji's Facebook was searched pursuant to a warrant issued on August 28th of last year. It showed communications between June and August of 2018, communications with Mr. Muse Muse regarding a desire to fight for ISIS. Mr. Haji wrote on one occasion, "Kuffar, I want to kill one. My days are coming. I want a lot of this kuffar dead." No FBI involvement in that.

October of 2018 UCE-3 introduced to the investigation.

Between October 18 and December of 2018 Mr. Haji communicated
with UCE-3 about his desire to make hijrah and jihad.

On November 15 of last year Mr. Muse Muse sent a video to UCE-3 containing Mr. Haji's oath of allegiance to ISIS. And

sometime between December 6th and 7th of last year Mr. Haji asked UCE-3 for a face-to-face meeting. Mr. Haji sent UCE-3 a written ISIS oath and audio of his recitation of the ISIS pledge.

On December 14th of last year Mr. Haji and Mr. Muse Muse met with UCE-3 in Benton Harbor. They coached him through the recitation of the oath and Mr. Haji recorded it.

December 17th of last year Mr. Haji contacted UCE-2 asking for financial assistance to travel. For Muse Muse to travel.

January 7th Mr. Haji communicated with UCE-2 and stated, "I will find it and work hard for it. Will be coming with Muse at the same time or not too long inshallah." God willing.

January 15th of this year Mr. Haji and Mr. Muse Muse met with UCE-3 at the WalMart, were buying boots and discussing domestic jihad. And all three of them drove to the Grand Rapids airport on the 21st. That is clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Haji poses a danger to others in the community.

As to Mr. Mohamud Abdikadir Muse -- Muse, excuse me -there's a Facebook account of his from June of 2017 referenced
in the Complaint. Mohamud -- Mr. Mohamud Muse told UCE-1 he
wanted to join ISIS in Syria and was saving for a trip to

Syria. He had a valid passport. That he planned to die with a qun in his hand.

I reviewed all of these exhibits very carefully again, and I could find nothing to suggest that the interest in going to Syria was prompted by an FBI agent.

September 13th, 2017, search warrant of
Mr. Mohamud Muse's Facebook, communications between

January 2017 and June of that year between Mr. Mohamud Muse and
Mr. Haji again expressing support for and interest in fighting
for ISIS. And Mr. Mohamud Muse asked for more ISIS videos.

February 8th of 2018, a search warrant obtained on Mr. Mohamud Muse's Facebook account. A look found messages between August and October of 2017 between Mr. Mohamud Muse and Mr. Muse Muse discussing support for ISIS.

Sometime prior to November 17th of last year

Mr. Mohamud Muse made a video making an oath of allegiance to

ISIS which Mr. Muse Muse sent to UCE-2.

On December 11th or 12th of last year Mr. Mohamud Muse communicated with UCE-2 stating, "I was supporting Dawla in my family before anyone did." He also wrote that he was saving money for hijrah soon. And he stated, "Brother, I just want Islam to win. I want to kill kuffar."

December 17th, 2018, Mr. Mohamud Muse communicated with UCE-2 that he would travel to Somalia to join ISIS soon after the birth of his child.

January 7th of this year he advised UCE-2 that -- and I quote -- that "Haji, my brother-in-law, and, yes, we talked, we agree to leave together," and he joined the others in a trip to the Grand Rapids airport resulting in his arrest. That is clear and convincing evidence that Mr. Mohamud Muse poses a danger to the community.

Even crediting the defense argument concerning the FBI role here, it seems to me the defendants needed little encouragement. They discussed committing domestic terrorism if they were unable to fight for ISIS. There's no evidence anybody from the FBI suggested that. And they expressed not only an interest in killing for ISIS but a willingness to die for the cause. To be martyrs for the cause.

Given such extremism, there is no reason to believe that anyone with those opinions and views would be dissuaded by any term or condition of bond that this Court could set.

Accordingly, I am issuing an order remanding Mr. Muse Muse, Mr. Mohamud Muse, and Mr. Mohamed Haji to the custody of the United States Marshal pending further proceedings in this case.

Mr. O'Connor, is there anything else we need to take up at this time?

MR. O'CONNOR: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Zambon?

MR. ZAMBON: Only with regard to the passport,
Your Honor. I'll return that to the family. I don't think

there's any need for the pretrial release people to keep that. 1 2 I agree with you, and I know of no legal THE COURT: basis by which he's required to surrender it at this time. 3 4 MR. ZAMBON: Thank you. THE COURT: Ms. Chartier. 5 6 MS. CHARTIER: Nothing else. Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Turek. 7 Nothing. Thank you, Your Honor. 8 MS. TUREK: I want to thank all three counsel for 9 THE COURT: 10 their work on this case. I know if I were charged with a federal crime, I would want somebody just like one of you 11 12 representing me, and I appreciate your advocacy on the part of your clients. 13 14 MR. ZAMBON: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 MS. CHARTIER: Thank you. 16 MS. TUREK: Thank you. 17 (Proceeding concluded at 4:31 p.m.) 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a transcript from the Liberty Court Recording System digital recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, transcribed to the best of my ability.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

May 14, 2019

/s/ Glenda Trexler
Glenda Trexler, CSR-1436, RPR, CRR

						21.
	EXAI	MINA	ATION IND)EX		
					PAGE	
CROSS-EXAMINATION	BY I	MR.	ZAMBON:		143	
	CROSS-EXAMINATION			EXAMINATION INC CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZAMBON:	EXAMINATION INDEX CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ZAMBON:	PAGE