Case: 4:15-cr-00049-CDP-DDN Doc. #: 150 Filed: 04/29/15 Page: 1 of 13 PageID #: 785

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 4:15-CR-49 DDN/CDP

NIHAD ROSIC,

Defendant.

DETENTION HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID D. NOCE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

MARCH 31, 2015

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: Matthew Drake, Esq.

OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY

111 South 10th Street, 20th Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102

For Defendant: JoAnn Trog, Esq.

MENEES WHITNEY BURNET & TROG

121 West Adams

St. Louis, MO 63122

Transcribed By: SHANNON L. WHITE, RMR, CRR, CSR, CCR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

111 South Tenth Street, Third Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102

(314) 244-7966

PRODUCED BY COURT REPORTER COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

(PROCEEDINGS STARTED AT 1:09 PM.)

(THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD IN OPEN COURT AND WITH THE DEFENDANT PRESENT:)

THE COURT: United States against Nihad Rosic, Case
No. 4:15-CR-49. The matter is before the Court this afternoon
for a detention hearing. Mr. Drake is here for the United
States. Ms. Trog is here representing the defendant, and the
defendant is present.

All right. I believe the last time that we had this proceeding that there was certain information provided to the Court and the defense wished further -- an opportunity for more time to obtain further information, then, to make arguments.

So, Ms. Trog, did you have any other information or evidence to offer at this time?

MS. TROG: I do, Your Honor -- (inaudible).

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. TROG: They're all the same -- (inaudible) -Your Honor. They're all the same statement, and different
people have signed off on them. And I just got them late -well, yesterday afternoon, and I provided Mr. Drake a copy.
Obviously, nobody is here, but they're just letters of
support. If we could enter those for the limited purpose of
this hearing.

MR. DRAKE: Absolutely. No objection.

1 THE COURT: All right.

2 MS. TROG: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. The record should reflect the defense has provided the Court with one, two, three, four prepared statements in behalf of Mr. Rosic. Each of them are identical paragraphs, but they're signed by a number of different people, and that would be taken by the Court as evidence of a -- a proffer evidence of information for the Court to consider on the issue of detention or release.

And for the record, Mr. Drake, did you have any objection to that information being provided to the Court?

MR. DRAKE: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Did you have any other factual information, Ms. Trog?

MS. TROG: No. Your Honor, we did file a memorandum under seal, and we did provide the Government's attorneys copy via email -- via email so that they were all privy to it.

Minutes after I filed it with the Court under seal, I did an email to each of the attorneys who are listed so that they would know exactly where we would be coming from, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you, Mr. Drake, does the Government have any factual information, further factual information, that you would provide to the Court?

MR. DRAKE: No further factual information, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Either one can go first -- it doesn't matter -- with respect to argument.

MS. TROG: Your Honor, we believe that the additional information provided with regards to Mr. and Mrs. Rosic, the parents of Nihad Rosic, relocating here to St. Louis would dictate and obviate one of the difficulties that perhaps pretrial services had, and that was his unstable living arrangements.

As we listed in the memorandum, the address and the phone number for his mother, we believe, Your Honor, that, in tandem with the various numerous conditions that we have listed in that memorandum, that there would be numerous safeguards to allow Mr. Nihad -- excuse me -- to provide Mr. Rosic the ability to be out, to be earning gainful employment for his family, and with the numerous restrictions that, including the appointment of his mother, it was a third party -- third-party custodian, that there would be enough indicia that it would allow the Court to be satisfied that Mr. Rosic would appear at each and every instance that he was required to by this Court.

I would note by -- that the Eighth Circuit's ruling in the *United States v. Orta* Says that the Court can -- this Court, when I'm talking about "the Court" -- that this Court cannot require more than an objectively reasonable assurance of community safety and the defendant's appearance at trial.

And this is in reference to the detention hearing.

We're not here to talk about the ultimate guilt or innocence. We're not here to talk about anything else, Your Honor, I believe, than to assure that Mr. Rosic will appear at each and every court appearance that this Court would mandate and certainly at any subsequent trial.

There are a couple other things, and I don't intend to revisit the entire memorandum, Your Honor, but I believe that the Government has provided certain exhibits that we stipulated to. And Exhibits 1, 2, and 2-A are references to various communications between Mr. Rosic utilizing the name that it was registered under his email address, which we said that is perfectly true, that he wasn't using his real name on these Facebook postings, but many people do not. I certainly do not. And the other individual involved is an individual that the Government has admitted that they believe he's dead or was killed, and there hasn't been any subsequent postings other than the last being on May 19 of 2014.

And so because the Facebook postings concern Mr. Rosic and the other individual who is now deceased, we do not believe that there were any other contacts which would show that Mr. Rosic had an ongoing communication with somebody abroad.

We would contest any indication that the \$500 contribution that was forwarded on to Mr. Hodzic, Codefendant

Hodzic, was nothing more than a donation to help his country, not in any way associated with fighting wars, terrorism, or anything else, but to help the deprivation of his own country.

Yes, he did have two attempts to leave the country, but on both attempts, Your Honor, he was going to Bosnia. He wasn't allowed to leave on either instance, so Lord knows he's not going to fly out of here because he couldn't fly when he wanted to. And when he wanted to fly, he was only going to fly to visit family members in Bosnia where he would like to eventually relocate his family.

And you say, well, why would he want to go to Bosnia,

Your Honor -- Ms. Trog? Why over there? And the perception

of Mr. Rosic is an existence for his children, his two

daughters who are 4 and 2, to be away from the mainstream

environment that we have here in America.

Mr. Rosic, in around 2011, turned a corner, Your Honor, and that corner that he turned around and turned down did away with his, his liking for a mixed martial arts. Yes, he had that. Yes, he has that degree, but -- and it's on Facebook, and he wasn't so successful on it, but he realized that there was more to life at the birth of his first daughter. And he then turned, turned the corner, and he realized that what he wanted to provide his daughters was a peaceful existence. And he realized that, in his religion, he needed to get away from all the opulence that we have here.

Whether we agree or disagree with it, that was where he was coming from, Your Honor.

He has been together with Alma since probably around 2005, 2006. Yes, there was an incident, but they are still together. She's very supportive of him. And if this Court would allow Mr. Rosic to be released, that he would stay here in St. Louis under all those prophylactic natures and that he would be able to obtain a job at this company who's run by his family or who is owned by his family, and that the ultimate goal is to bring his wife, the mother of his children, and his children here to St. Louis until he can sort out all of the matters related to this case.

The other reason, Your Honor, is, finally, is we have no idea, with all due respect to the Government, when we can reasonably anticipate that there might be a trial date, because, as this Court has set up 60-day status conferences beginning — the first one is tomorrow afternoon.

So to allow Mr. Rosic to stay in the Jennings jail run by St. Louis County doesn't seem that it's going to do anything except cost this court, the marshal service an extraordinary amount of money, whereas he could be out; he could be earning money; he could be under restrictions. And as he and I have talked again earlier today, that if he would violate any of these restrictions, he knows that this Court would pull him in and he would go back to Jennings jail.

Rather, Your Honor, we're asking that this Court look at what we're here for today and allow Mr. Rosic the ability to be back with his family.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

Mr. Drake?

MR. DRAKE: Thank you, Judge. Thank you, Your Honor. Judge, I think what we're really doing here is doing a risk analysis, a risk analysis for two reasons or two factors predominantly: A risk of a danger to the community at large and a flight risk.

And in assessing that, the Court has to weigh the various factors that are outlined in the Bail Reform Act.

That act has a presumption of detention in cases like that, cases involving international terrorism offenses.

The exhibits that are provided to the Court that Ms. Trog referenced, Exhibits 1, 2, and 2-A, speak to the weight of the evidence and also to the risk not only of flight but of danger to the community. In this instance, there's no doubt in those exhibits that Mr. Rosic, the defendant, communicated with Abdullah Ramo Pazara prior to Mr. Pazara's death on or about September of 2014. He knew what Abdullah Pazara was doing. He knew that Abdullah Pazara was in Syria. He communicated with him about attempting to come and visit Pazara and join him in his exploits. In fact, one of the exhibits indicates that "my brother," referring to Mr.

Pazara -- the defendant wrote: "My brother, I cannot wait to encounter the enemies. I swear to Allah."

One of the pictures that Mr. Rosic sent was of a sniper rifle or an assault weapon. He asked Pazara to find one for him and set it aside. Those are the activities of someone who is engaged in violence or has a desire to engage in violence, and that speaks volumes about the risk and danger to the community should the defendant be released.

Secondly, it also speaks of his flight risk. With all due respect to Ms. Trog and the defense, the Government's belief that Mr. Rosic was attempting to travel to Syria — that is self-evident from the exhibits. They reference the word "Sham," which is a common terminology for the region of Syria, and they were discussing in Exhibit 2-A arrangements to meet Pazara in Sham and join him and join the others that he was fighting with.

Granted, those communications did stop, and Ms. Trog is correct in that, but after Mr. Pazara was killed, their communications ceased, obviously. However, after that happened is the time, is the second time, that Mr. Rosic attempted to travel abroad. So whether he's trying to travel to Syria, obviously, that weighs heavily in the criminal case, or Bosnia, to go home, visit family or friends, the salient point is that he's trying to leave the country on two different occasions.

He has very limited ties to this district other than the fact that his mother and father recently relocated here to be closer to him during the pendency of these proceedings.

However, as we stand here right now and today, he does not have a permanent residence. He does not have a permanent job. The mother of his children resides in a district outside of the Eastern District of Missouri.

Furthermore, she is the subject of the Government's other exhibit which indicates the assaultive behavior Mr.

Rosic was involved in, which again weighs heavily against him as being a danger to the community and to others should he be released.

He also has -- he also has at least some measure of a failure to abide by the conditions of release from reporting. There is some honest, I think, not disagreement but honestly different views of what he would do while he was on probation with his assaultive behavior but then clearly was unable to or did not -- was not aware that he was supposed to report to his probation officer, and as a result, he was cited for failure to appear, and his probation was revoked, Judge.

So on at least a couple of occasions that are noted in the report, his track record for appearance at court proceedings is less than stellar, Judge.

For those reasons, Judge, I think that the risk analysis that the Court must engage in, not only the danger to

the community but of flight, weigh heavily against the defendant. And there are no combination of conditions that would allow him to be released to make sure that he will appear for future court proceedings.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Trog, do you have any reply?

MS. TROG: Very briefly, Your Honor. The Government

MS. TROG: Very briefly, Your Honor. The Government has brought up the domestic violence incident that occurred in 2012 involving Alma, the mother of his children, his wife.

One, the reason she's not here, she hasn't been able to relocate to St. Louis, is because she doesn't have any funds to relocate. And it would be Mr. Rosic's sincere desire that, if allowed on bond, that he could provide resources to allow his wife and children to be here with him.

The 2012 incident -- yes, it happened, yes, there was a violation, and, yes, there was miscommunication. He admitted his fault in it, and he was resentenced by the court up there, and he served his time. That was one instance. The only other instance is a brief failure to appear in a municipal court here where there was a warrant. He simply forgot about it. And the record will reflect that there are tens of thousands of people in the state of Missouri who don't attend to their traffic matters. That's a whole other different story.

But Mr. Rosic's case -- there is no longer any

(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 1:27 PM.)

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, Shannon L. White, do hereby certify that I am a duly appointed official court reporter for the United States

District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

I further certify the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription as heard and understood from the taped proceedings held in the above-entitled case as has been transcribed from said tape to the best of my ability.

This reporter does not certify any transcript nor takes any responsibility for missing or damaged pages of this transcript when said transcript is copied and delivered by any party other than this reporter.

	_	
04-29-15		Shannon L. White